

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21st February, 1961.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. T. W. MILLER and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting which was held on the 14th February, 1961, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members. Unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*) There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present Message No. 4/1961 from His Excellency the Governor forwarding the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1961-62.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Statement showing Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to 31st December, 1960.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from a recently formed Committee asking this House to incorporate the Barbados National Trust. The Petition is respectfully worded, and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

Mr. TALMA entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$5,273,878 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure to be incurred during the Financial Year 1961-62 on Capital Works included in the Estimates 1961-62, Part II - Capital.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Annual Estimates of the Port Department annexed to the Estimates of the island for the year 1961-62.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$213 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 Part I - Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 38, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to approve the lease by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Messrs. Central Foundry Limited of a parcel of land known as the Dock Site in the parish of St. Michael.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Resolution to approve the Compulsory acquisition of an area of land in Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of Housing Development and the use as a Community Playing Field.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the 31st of March, 1962.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: A Bill to amend the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) Act, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to lay the Oral Reply to Question No. 3/1961 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding negotiations between Government and the Mitchell Engineering Company.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I also beg to lay the following replies:-

Reply to Oral Question No. 4/1961 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the transfer of Ordinary Shares by the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation to Mitchell Engineering Group Ltd.

Reply to Oral Question No. 10/1961 asked by the hon. senior member for Christ Church regarding the establishment of a Compulsory Insurance Scheme for all types of workers.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Reply to Oral Question No. 18/1961 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the employment of District Postmasters and Postmistresses in the Public Service.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the Barbados National Trust in this Island with limited liability.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTIONS

Mr. GODDARD: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is the Minister aware of the need for the extension of the Transport Service to include the Rockley New Road?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will he seek to meet the transport needs of domestic employees and school children of the area by providing the following services:-

6.00 - 9.30 a. m.
11.00 - 12.00 noon
4.00 - 8.00 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government take all necessary measures to ensure, at this year's local General Elections, Barbadians resident in U.K. and U.S.A. will have opportunity provided to cast their votes for said Elections in this Island, by setting-up requisite machinery forthwith?
12.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I beg to give notice of the following question:-

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Is it true that the Principal of the Technical Institute has resigned?

2. If true, why has he?

3. What is the Hon. Minister going to do about it?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending 31st March, 1962 be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) Act, 1958, be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to incorporate the Barbados National Trust in this Island with limited liabilities be now read a first time.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re DEATH OF Mr. PATRICE LUMUMBA

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the Day is proceeded with, I should like to ask leave to move a Resolution of Sympathy to the widow of Mr. Patrice Lumumba, the late Prime Minister of the Congo.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to move a Resolution of sympathy re the death of Mr. Patrice Lumumba. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follow:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplore the tragic death of Mr. Patrice Lumumba, Prime Minister of the Congo Republic and the circumstances surrounding his passing;

AND FURTHER that this House express its profound sympathy with his sorrowing relatives;

AND FURTHER that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow."

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the whole civilised world is shocked and horrified at the murder of the Prime Minister of the Congo. When I heard of it I felt very anxious and worried over the fact that, here was a man who had done his best to relieve his people from the yoke of slavery which the Belgian people had imposed upon them for all these years, and after having been able to set these people free, apparently some of the stooges of the Belgians in addition to some others, had decided to murder him.

We on this side, although we have not been as outspoken and sympathetic towards the cause of freedom in those countries, or have not perhaps shown it in any tangible manner, share the views of those in that part of the world who deplore the murder of the late Prime Minister, Mr. Patrice Lumumba. His death is similar to that in Hungary, some years ago, when both Maleter and Nagy were murdered; and although I may not say much more on this at this stage, I think it is the most brutal, inhuman and uncivilised act that could ever have been carried out against any individual.

We share the sorrows of those whom Mr. Lumumba leaves behind; and we would like to assure the House that, if in our small way there is anything we can do to bring comfort to his relatives, we would most willingly do it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg formally to second the motion for the passage of this Resolution. In so doing I associate the Opposition entirely with the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the House in respect of the untimely and tragic demise of the late Mr. Patrice Lumumba. Whether one approves or disapproves of another's politics, one feels the same abhorrence when so untimely an end is come to by a certainly distinguished and remarkable public figure.

I do not suppose there could be a stronger or more severe commentary on the inadequacy, the inefficiency or the incompetence of Belgian Colonial administration, than that the affairs in the Congo, after the Belgians have cleared out, have come to such a pass. It is clear that all the Belgian nation was doing in respect of the Congo was

providing revenue for the people of Belgium without, in any way, attempting to fit the people of the Congo for self-rule, self-government or independence.
12.35 p.m.

Their interest in the people of the Congo was purely to be reckoned in the terms of pounds, shillings and pence; and as a result of the condition in which the Belgians left that African Territory, we find not only that chaos is still reigning supreme, but that this terrible catastrophe has occurred in that part of Africa with the imprisonment and the death of Mr. Lumumba.

We not only on this side express our sympathy—I have no doubt my hon. friend, the Hon. Leader of the House, also does—with the children of Mrs. Lumumba, I am sure we are looking forward to the United Nations full investigation which has been promised; and we are looking forward to adequate punishment meted out to those who are responsible for the death of so outstanding an African Colonial leader.

Sir, I am happy to be associated with the passing of this Resolution, and with the remarks of the Hon. Minister who said that if there was anything which could be done for the widow and the children, he will do that which is possible. If the Hon. Minister will originate something, I can assure him that it will meet with our careful and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my Party's feelings with the Resolution. The Congo has been divided into strife ever since it became independent; and we on this side look on any killing of a political figure for political reasons, no matter on what side of the fence he may belong, with absolute dismay and horror. As the hon. Introducer of the Resolution pointed out, this tragic affair is similar to that which happened when the Russians moved into Hungary and mowed down people who were striving for their independence. Although we did not have a Resolution in the House at that time, there is no reason why we should not have one at this time to express our feelings.

It is to be hoped that this House will always come down on the side of right, and show its disapproval to things which are wrong. Public figures should not be so treated as a means of putting them away from everyone; and for that reason I associate myself with the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I hold different views from many hon. members of this Chamber on this matter. I feel that this is part of the price which Africans are paying for their independence; this is something which is being done all over Africa. The British are still doing it in parts of Africa today; in Kenya there is a man who is held in prison by the British and they will hold people like him as long as they can. In Algeria, the French have done it; and so too the Dutch have done it. All those imperialist powers who own colonies in Africa have divided Africa to the extent that today the death of Mr. Lumumba is part of their policy to allow them to hold out as long as they can; and when they cannot hold out any longer, and they have to turn it over to the natives, they look forward to those natives who capture the Government as the ones to divide and rule.

Sir, I am not going into details because the United Nations are going into that aspect of it. We sympathise with the passing of this leader and we send our sympathy to his family. I take this opportunity of emphasising that we in these parts have to be careful that a similar thing will not take place here, because the power which independence gives is so complete that you can very well understand what it means. It means that you must be ready and willing to accept all that it involves; independence is something to be cherished and to be cared for, but over which you must exercise a watchful eye.

The Belgians did not prepare and allow the people to share in what independence really means. They kept the Congolese people ignorant and would not educate them. It is a sad commentary for anybody to say of that country. You can count the number of people of the Congo who are literate on your hands and toes, in comparison to the teeming millions who are illiterate. That is the sort of legacy which

the Belgians have left in that country after giving the people independence. As I have said, the imperialists' policy is to divide and rule.

I do not share the views of the Hon. Leader of the House when he says "We on this side." May be he may mean we on this side of the House also, but hon. members on that side have not shown much of their willingness to come out and take a stand on these things and to make forthright statements as you ought to have done when the freedom of Jomo Kenyatta was taken away. I am on that side when you take such action; and when you speak out against dictators, whether they are so much to the right, so much to the left or so much to the centre. We have dictators to the right like Franco in Spain, dictators to the left like Khrushchev of Russia and dictators to the centre like Salazar of Portugal. All of these things, just as what was done to Lumumba, are what you get coming from the hands of the dictators and the imperialist powers. I am on the side of right. It does not matter to me who is right but what is right.

In this sad instance, Mr. Patrice Lumumba was the victim of these peculiar circumstances which have arisen out of colonial rule and colonial imperialism, and for that reason I share the view of those hon. members who have sympathised with his relatives; but I say again that this is the price which some people have to pay for freedom.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I rise to join in the sympathy expressed to Mr. Patrice Lumumba by other speakers who have drawn attention to this act of inhuman brutality done to Mr. Lumumba and his colleagues. I have heard some hon. members make reference to United Nations and different places, but I will refer back to thousands of years ago where this evil of the enemy was existing. Wherever there is a state of goodness trying to rise up for the liberation of the people of this world, you find that there is an enormous lot of people who perish for it. I remember, Sir, that even from old Herod had tried to destroy the Lord Jesus Christ whom God himself had sent to awaken poor people from under the bondage of suffering. People were trying to take advantage of the poor Congolese nation, not only now, but before now. In 1914 when I was in my youthful stage, I heard a Frenchman say, when the Belgians were being overrun by the Germans, that lots of people rose up and cried that the Belgians were receiving what they had handed out to other people.
12.45 p.m.

He said that the tree of liberty is glad to be grown, but it can only be grown when it is watered with the blood of tyrants. Whenever disaster is in the world, I hope that the United Nations or the League of Nations will join together and force that evil out of existence. Wherever you look in this world you will see a dark spot and therefore it is evil; those who have a keen eye will see it. Whenever there is coming into being an independent country, someone will have to give way. I remember that Belgians were nourished from the Congo for many years; and now that Mr. Patrice Lumumba has risen up to give independence to these poor people in the Congo, it is the Belgians which are causing such disaster. As long as the Belgians are there, there will be destruction all the time. They are joining together in order to get the poor people back in ignorance. I hope that God will bless the innocent people of the Congo and that they will unite as a fully democratic people.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I, like all other members, share the view that it is very unfortunate at this stage to have lost in Africa a man like the late Mr. Lumumba. We share the view of people of goodwill throughout the world. What seems to be for this side of the Atlantic is that Mr. Lumumba was of a progressive mind; he hated slavery and loved liberty and freedom. We feel at this moment that that is the price which any African will have to pay.

As you go back through the annals of Christian society you will find that Christianity teaches us that all civilisation is based on sacrifice, and it seems to be a matter of sanguinary sacrifice at that. If Mr. Lumumba is one of the young Africans who lived to shed his blood because of the principle of emancipating fellow Africans, then all I can say is: "May he rest in peace". I am not afraid to say that

many years ago I stood on the floor of this House and fore-saw exactly what was going to happen in Africa. Mr. Lumumba's death is only the beginning of things to come. It is only by the shedding of blood that we will have emancipation.

While I have great sympathy for Mr. Lumumba's wife and those who are near and dear to him, I am sure this is the price which the Africans must pay. The Imperialists are more changed today than they were three hundred years ago. We cannot expect to get liberty and freedom easily on a gold and silver platter; people must be courageous enough to have a principle and to fight, and if needs be, die for that principle. It is true that Mr. Lumumba has gone one before us, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there are those of us who will have to face the question sooner or later if things go on as they are even in these victories. As I see it, there is no clear-cut policy even amongst us; and there are little groups forming in this Federation who care nothing about the progress of their fellowmen; there are those who think in terms of depression, and they will sacrifice a nation in order to satisfy their desire. It is well known that they feel that they want to be the 'T'; they will sacrifice God knows whom.

Those who think of progress for posterity in our time, hate to be assassinated and murdered, but we are conscious of the fact that just as Christ on Calvary had to pay the price, anyone who wants emancipation and liberty and to see our fellowmen rise up to the standard of civilised people, must pay the price. I have searched the Christian religion and I see no alternative. I stand between God and this House of Assembly and I say that the highest authority tells me that without the shedding of blood there will be no emancipation. We have great sorrow of heart to think that this young man did not have the chance of doing for his country what he intended to do for it. Perhaps that young man was very much misunderstood, but what man with a principle will not be misunderstood?

If you are going to kow-tow, be weak-kneed and have no strong convictions, nobody thinks anything about you. I prefer to be a controversial character and let people know where I stand, rather than be weak-kneed, apologetic and try to please everybody, because you cannot do that. We, in this part of the Western Hemisphere, must take introspection and see if we are doing the right thing.

As we stand today, on the threshold of independence in the West Indies, let us look around and see these small minds, these bigoted idiots who, for the sake of themselves and their own personality will destroy anybody. That would not do any good; and when it begins to show its ugly head, I cannot say what is going to happen in the West Indies. 12.55 p.m.

I am not going to speak any longer because I think everybody in Barbados knows that on this question I can speak for a year. I do not speak here superficially. My heart is in Africa unlike some people. I believe in my root, and my roots are in Africa. History tells me that my fore-parents were brought from there, and I love my mother. I therefore make no apology. I do not know if I came from the Congo, Ashanti or Ghana, but I do know that my roots are in Africa.

I do not care how many Lumumbas are killed or how many connivances are carried out by the United Nations, but there is one thing I am absolutely sure of; and when I am dead and gone, I am sure that my children and my children's children will see an absolutely free and redeemed Africa, just as you have an absolutely free and redeemed United States of America. No man, no power, no deterrent and no atomic bomb can stop that from happening. Only God will move. Kill Lumumba, kill Nkrumah, kill anybody, but God marches on. (Cheers.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will show their assent to this Resolution by standing for one minute.

Hon. members stood for one minute.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1

and 2 under Government Business be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1960-61 No. 37

Head XVI - Prisons - was called

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under Item 29, Prisoners Earning Scheme, I think it is very well known that this scheme exists at the Prisons. The amount voted in the Estimates has been nearly spent, and this is a supplementary estimate to carry on that work. The Minister concerned will give further details. I formally beg to move that Head XVI - Prisons - stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second the motion. It will be remembered by members of this House that this scheme was started at Glendairy Prison in 1956. The rates paid are 12 cents a week, 24 cents, 48 cents and in very special cases 60 cents a week. The amount voted last year, \$2,000, fell short by \$662, and deferred payments on certain stocks, particularly items for the Canteen had to be held over for this year's Estimate. We now know what is required to tide over to the end of the year, 1961; and the amount required now is \$525. Any information further on the details of this scheme I will be very happy to give on request from any of the members.

The question that Head XVI - Prisons - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XX - EDUCATION

Head XX - Education - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, Item 21 is to do with furniture and equipment at Erdiston College. The appropriate Minister will give further information. I beg to move that Head XX - Education, stand part.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second the motion. I want to say that the notes are pretty clear, but if there are any questions asked, I will be quite willing to supply the answers.

The question that Head XX - Education - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXXII - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Head XXXII - Highways and Transport - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is very well known by members of the House that after certain Utility Companies have dug up the roads and carried out their work, this vote is used for reinstatement of the roads. The amount is recoverable. The Minister of Highways and Transport will give further infor-

mation. I beg to move that Head XXXII - Highways and Transport - stand part.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the reinstatement of roads excavated by Utility Companies, some time ago I raised the matter in this House about some plan by the Minister in cooperation with the various Utility Companies, whereby we will not have a particular road, as is still happening, being excavated by one Utility Company and then within a very short time after that - perhaps a few weeks - to have another Utility Company excavating the same road.
1.05 p.m.

The heads of those companies should be called together in conference, or informed by circular, to submit to the Minister a list of the roads which they propose to excavate. The Minister should say: let me have a list from all the companies of what they are going to do and then let me point out to Company A that Company B is seeking to excavate such and such a road, therefore, let them as far as possible do the excavations or the repair work at the same time so that the public would not be inconvenienced as they certainly are now.

Another aspect of the matter is this: When the excavations are completed and the roads restored to normalcy, it very often happens that the restoration is incomplete. You may have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that in the St. James border where excavations have recently taken place, that right across the road in two or three places there is a very rough and uneven surface about eighteen inches across. That is an indication that even after the restoration has taken place, that the job is not complete; therefore, whoever is directly responsible for supervision of this work might well pay more attention to it. The supervision is not as adequate and efficient as it should be and, certainly, there is a complete absence of planning.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this same item, I am not in a position today to criticise the Government for the bringing down of the Resolution. I realise that these utility Companies pay for the repairing of the roads; but what I would like the Government to do is to make these public utility companies subscribe a certain amount of money for the upkeep of these particular roads which they have dug up for a certain amount of time. I say that because when these roads are repaired, they do not have time to mature; and every now and then, you find that the Government has to return to that road and repair it again so as to keep it in order. Utility companies should be put in a position where they should contribute to the upkeep of those roads for a certain number of years, let us say five or six years after they have made excavations to them. By so doing, they would be easing the taxpayers. We are using the taxpayers' money to keep them in order. I think by that way it would be a help to the Government.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would just like to say that I know of no case, since I made the pronouncement as I did to give us reasonable notice in advance of what they intended doing, of one company digging up a road shortly after another company had it reinstated. The Director of Transport has asked all these companies to give him at least six months' notice of their intention to dig up a highway in order to do some work or to lay some service; and, as far as I know, since they have been given that notice, they have worked along those lines. It is true that in one case there has been some deviation because of some unforeseen circumstances. However, in most cases they have stuck to that requirement. I would be glad if the hon. member can tell me where that order has not been complied with so that I can look into the matter.

When the Department of Highways and Transport reinstates a piece of work, it is done properly. We try to do it so that it can last. We do not do any patchwork. We so do it that years will go by before it wants repairing again.

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

HEAD XXXIV - ELECTRICAL INSPECTION

Head XXXIV - Electrical Inspection - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the item under this Head to be dealt with is Cost of Living Allowance. As the note sets out, this amount is required to meet Cost of Living consequent on the appointment of two additional officers in June, 1960. I beg to move that Head XXXIV stand part.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

1.15 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that a Resolution for the sum of \$16,807 do now pass.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable Leader of the House:- To move the passing of an Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech delivered at the opening of the Legislature.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to take charge of this Order.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will understand, this Order is for the passing of an Address in reply to His Excellency the Governor thanking him for the Speech which he delivered at the opening of the Legislature last month. This Address reads as follows:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session, 1961.

The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economic advancement of the Island and the many Constitutional changes and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address and beg to assure Your Excellency that all these and other matters submitted to them will be given their careful consideration and support, during the Session.

I am sure that all hon. members will congratulate and sympathise with His Excellency for the marathon innings

which he enacted when he read the programme of the Government for the current year. I think that that Speech must have taken His Excellency at least one full hour to deliver. There are those who think that that was the hardest time he has worked since he was here with us. When one considers our constitutional progress, one will find less reasons for using any Head of the Administration in an executive capacity; and therefore we think it is essential that we should have a Head of the Administration who can carry out these other duties with a certain amount of decorum and certainly with interest. Let His Excellency be assured that we will expect him to take an interest in things like this and in other social matters in which he seems to be displaying an interest.

There is one point about the Address which I have cause for concern; and it is when I recall that in our last Address to His Excellency at the opening of the Legislature, among other things we said that we look forward with eagerness to the next Five Year Plan. I think it is therefore a cause for concern that we would have to be replying again to His Excellency's Speech and the Five Year Plan, on which a lot of work must have been done, is not yet before us. I think it is only right that we should be expressing our anxiety to Government on this matter, and allowing the Government to say if they would give us any firm answer as to when we might expect the Five Year Plan. We have noticed that on occasions the Government has had to take items out of the proposed Five Year Plan and bring them down to the Legislature before the full plan is before us. We would therefore like to know how soon we will be able to get this comprehensive plan because it is on plans like these that we have to work for the development.

With reference to our constitutional advancement, I do not think one needs to belabour that particular item unduly. One thing which has always struck us, who are of the younger generation, is that we are always hearing about a further measure of constitutional advancement or about a further measure of internal self-government; and of course, we look forward to the final measure of internal self-government. We do not need to move with such trepidation but with firm resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is right for me, in the course of this Address, to mention some of the things which my Party as a Party is really interested in, even although the Government machinery might have moved very slowly in the attainment of this debate. With reference to the constitutional changes of which I have just spoken, one of the things I happen to know that the Labour Party is interested in, is that there should be at some future date, and certainly in the not too distant future, an official residence for the Premier.
1.25 p.m.

We have said, Sir, that we consider that in keeping with the principles of constitutional development in our island....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order to know if you are permitting the hon. member in reply to the Governor's Speech to refer to proposals in the Labour Party manifesto; if so, I will have to refer to everybody's manifesto. As I understand it, the Address is in reply to the Speech made by His Excellency the Governor, and the Address as enounced in these terms should be replied to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is so far outside the Address; nor do I think there is anything wrong in the hon. member saying what his Party proposes. Any member has that privilege.

Mr. STRAUGHN: As far as I know, we were dealing with constitutional development to which reference....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did mention something about the Labour Party.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Yes, Sir; I mentioned it on more than one occasion in this speech. After all, I do belong to the Barbados Labour Party. I was saying that we consider that

there should be an official residence for the Premier of this Island; and we think that that should be so in line with our constitutional developments. If the hon. member does not think that that is part of constitutional development, then he is entitled to say so when he gets a chance to speak.

Sir, His Excellency also mentioned the ecclesiastical problems with which we are faced. We are also hoping that there will be no undue delay in this particular phase, particularly in the section which deals with the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church. This matter has certainly faced us, and I might say hounded us for many a long year; and I sometimes wonder if we really do not make too much heavy weather on the points of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. I am quite certain that the Church itself will benefit immensely from it; and even though there might be certain details which might prove inconvenient in the particular change-over, those are just the necessary concomitants to any disestablishment and disendowment which will take place.

It is for us to note that other Churches - and in that I mention particularly the Roman Catholic Church - are making particular advancement in this island without the help of any endowment or establishment from Government; this should be a sign to all other denominations. I say to Government that they will be acting not only right in principle, but acting with the general support of the community when they expedite this matter of getting the Anglican Church to have disendowment and disestablishment.

On the question of West Indian Federation, I am certain that we all look forward to the coming Inter-Governmental Conference; and I am certain too that this Assembly stands committed to the strongest possible Federation for the good of our West Indian people. I want to mention, too, Mr. Speaker, that when we consider that a lot of working Parties and Committees have been meeting for the better part of the last year since the last Inter-Governmental Conference with respect to Federation, I feel that it is time that this Legislature, and in particular this Hon. Chamber, should pay some attention to the reports of these committees, and if necessary, before the next Inter-Governmental Conference comes off, we should have a full-dress debate in the House of Assembly on our attitudes and aims for our West Indian Federation. It would be wrong if we just allowed the working committees to meet and make reports, and the Governments to meet again without the general body of the various elected Chambers in the West Indies carrying out a full-dress debate on our aims, objects and aspirations for the West Indies Federation.

We have had a number of discussions and debates recently on the Labour Department, Mr. Speaker, and one thing which might be noted is that the number registered as unemployed at the Labour Department has risen since the last Address of His Excellency. At that time we were forced to mention, even as His Excellency had done in his previous Address, that we were concerned; and it is with a note of regret that we did remark that the number which was registered was so small. That number has increased. It does not mean that the unemployment figure itself is very different, but it means that more people have decided to register at the Employment Exchange, and more people have decided to take that particular Department into their confidence and register as they have been asked to do.

With respect to the functions of the Employment Exchange, there is one other aspect which might be mentioned in addition to what has been mentioned in various departments from time to time, and that is the functioning of our Youth Employment Officer. What particularly are we aiming at when we have this Youth Employment Officer? Is he just an officer who would set a number of elementary tests or so for persons who come to register at the Employment Exchange, or want to be integrated, or is there really a heavier purpose for which we want to use a Youth Employment Officer? Is he in any way an officer who is equipped or required to give guidance, for instance, to young people after they have left school in any form of employment whatever? Inasmuch as a lot of our problems are mostly administrative problems and not necessarily prob-

lems of policy making, that is just one of the features I would like to see clarified as to what use we really make of the post which we consider as Youth Employment Officer. I would like to feel that such a figure is a lot more than just a Clerk in an office.

With respect to our Economic and Planning Unit, Mr. Speaker, I think I can well say "at last". It is said that when Charles Kingsley wrote his book "At Last", he did so when he arrived in Barbados, inasmuch as, for many years previously, he had a grandmother who lived in this island and who was writing back to England telling him what a lovely island this was, and when he arrived in Barbados he said "at last". With the same feeling I pronounce the words "at last" at the establishment of our Economic and Planning Unit. It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that Governments must be quite ponderous, and that they must move in that slow, ponderous fashion; and from my personal experience it probably would take at least two years for any idea which affects the basic Government policy, even though it might be agreed to in principle, to be enacted or expedited. 1.35 p.m.

From the time I first spoke on the Budget in this Chamber, from the time I was a member of this House, I was always stressing that I saw the need for an economic planning unit; and if it comes after two years I say that it is just as well that it has come.

There is one particular point which I would like to mention in the functioning of this unit and it is, to use a word which Americans like to use a lot, the word "co-ordinate". Sir, it is not enough just to talk of an economic planning unit as such and the making of plans, but what affects us very much is the way we are co-ordinating these plans. Just a few minutes ago, hon. members were asking the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works a question which has come up in here from time to time with respect to the Department of Highways and Transport whenever utility companies have to dig up the roads. I have heard him previously, when the Hon. Minister replied to a question such as that, say that public utilities other than the Highways and Transport Department are expected to give approximately six months' notice of their plans as regards the installation of their various services, especially when they have to dig up a highway. That will mean that the Waterworks Department, the Telephone Company, the Barbados Light and Power Company and the Barbados Gas Company would have to give six months' notice of what they want to do. I would like to say that considering the size of Government and the amount of work which Government as a business has to face up to - and certainly, it is the biggest business undertaking in this country - we certainly need to have co-ordinated plans of more than six months. I do not think that there is any business, which is a big business, which would think of only six months' planning; they think in terms of planning for three or five years. If we got these public utility companies to give us plans for longer periods than six months, there would be better co-ordination.

His Excellency also mentioned our Deep Water Harbour project to which I would refer later, under what I consider the head of general development.

With reference to the Town and Country Planning Department, we are glad to know that it is better staffed than it was a year ago, and therefore, it is able to carry out its duties in a very comprehensive way. Speaking as a member of the Northern Town and Country Planning Committee - and I certainly speak for all members of the Committee - we would like to know that your Town and Country Planning Department carry out a publicity campaign so as to let the people know in more detail of the functions of that Department. Many of the problems with which that Department is faced are what people have taken action on on their own; therefore, it is much better to let the people know what they have to put up with, rather than to say to them that you have done this and you have done it wrong, and that we have no alternative than to ask that you pull it down. Certainly, it is much better for people to be better informed, and therefore, know what is required of them by that Department. Another thing is that work in that Department ties in with our land development programme, which, I

expect, is set out in the coming Five-Year Plan. We should have a comprehensive picture as to how we would be developing our land resources when we come to deal with that plan.

I happen to read in His Excellency's Speech that there would be soon coming down to this House a comprehensive Beach Protection Act. That is something which we of the Northern District Town and Country Planning have put up to the Town and Country Planning Officer. We have considered public access to our beaches, especially those on the western side of the island, to be a matter of extreme urgency. We have mentioned it to the Town and Country Planning Officer, and we intend to approach that Department and the Minister concerned with what we consider to be a comprehensive conception of places where we think there should be public access to the beaches. We intend to do our job; of giving our recommendations with the hope that they would be implemented when the Beach Protection Act comes into effect; and we would like to feel that our recommendations are faithfully considered.

A lot of trouble with which the general public finds itself faced with in this Department, is that the Department can only accept properly drawn plans. Very often you find that it is the poor class of people who are unable to provide a properly drawn up plan of a building which they want to erect. It would be a help if some interested parties would so bind themselves into an advisory body, or what may be called a plan drawing department, at which people can get reasonable, clear and concise plans of buildings which they want to develop and at a cost which is not exorbitant. There are surveyors in this island who can render this service; and I think it would be better if it is done as a unit rather than by a group of people scattered all over the place because the Department would be dealing with a unified lot. It would be a benefit to all concerned.

How soon can we expect the official results of the survey that we have had in Bridgetown of the driving public? Having got the survey, how soon can we get any action to implement any recommendations which have been made? It does not need to be repeated too often that the driving problem in Bridgetown is in itself quite a big problem and a menace sometimes. 1.45 p.m.

There are organisations, to one of which I happen to belong, which will be participating in putting forward any recommendations they can for the settlement of that problem.

The Housing Authority has been praised by people in this island and by people outside the island. Praises have been received from all quarters of the community and of the globe, and such praises are certainly praises indeed. It is interesting to see some of the problems which the Housing Authority has had to face from the time of its inception; it was first called the Housing Board. One of the things which struck me as interesting is that in the early days the people who were interested in getting assistance for housing used to pay 25% of the cost of the housing unit, and then the amount was reduced to 10%. With the amount of money which the Authority had available to them, it was obvious that people instead of paying \$100 they had to provide only \$75. The Authority then said that instead of your providing \$75 out of \$100 we will give you \$90. The position was that although you were giving more help to persons, you would have less money to give out, and more people came in because the money qualification had been lowered. People were given more help and more people have come to take advantage of this offer.

The whole irony of the situation is that, whereas you decided to help people with some money on the down payment, you had less money and more applicants. In that ironical situation, the Housing Authority has come through very well. The Minister has said that he is aware of the fact that it is a matter of concern to the officers of the Housing Authority; that is, that the repayment of interest is creating a particular hardship on people who have been granted loans by the Housing Authority. Very often the Housing Authority, with its lenience,

found that a person who has made a loan from the Authority would have fallen into arrears as far as the payment is concerned; when the person who has amassed a few dollars goes back to pay, he finds that he is only paying off the interest which has developed. That is a matter which needs urgent consideration; it is one which cannot be deferred indefinitely.

The Minister has said that he is aware of the problem; probably he has given it active consideration, but the Housing Officers are particularly concerned about it. It breaks the morale of people who find that they are only paying back the interest when they think that they are clearing off the loan. One has to consider very seriously whether we will retain the principle of interest being paid on housing loans.

With regard to transport, which is another aspect of public utility, we have also had a lot of debate; and I am quite certain that we will have quite a lot more when the Estimates come around; and perhaps, we will have a lot more in speeches on this Reply to the Governor's Speech. The Government will have to decide as to what their policy of transport for the island will be. I think that it will arrive at the crux of the policy of all or none. You either run all the transport or you run none at all. It is re-assuring that by the system which is now being run, they have started to show that they are not losing money as heavily as when the system was first started. Indeed they have made a slight operating profit within recent months; but the sole operating profit cannot hope to offset the deficit with which the Board has been faced over the years, and the heavy loans which the Board has had to undertake.

Another problem is that of the transportation of school children. Where you have primary and junior schools and the more advanced secondary Modern Schools, you will find that these particular Secondary Modern Schools are allocated to areas; and children have to leave the Primary Schools and go to these schools. You will find a situation where the problem of the transportation of these children has become aggravated. This calls for the Government to make their pronouncement as to their transport policy - I mean what is their policy as regards the transportation of school children. I happen to know that the problem is considered to be so acute by members on my right that at our last party conference, there was a Resolution passed to the effect that free transportation be provided for these children. That gives an example as to how pressing the problem is. Even although we may not recognise the fact that people are interested in this matter, the Government will be asked to bear the burden of the transportation of these school children.

The question of health and social services came into favourable mention as well. There is a particular feature of it which I would like to take up in conjunction with the work of the Department. We have been told that there will be a wider survey by an expert of the World Health Organisation as to the supply and purity of the water which we use in Barbados. I can say that I can quite see that a survey like this would be utilising the services of your Town and Country Planning Department as time goes on, and it may also relate to the Land Development Programme.

1.55 p.m.

Sir, when I consider this water survey, an almost horrifying thought faces me because I know that the Government does not have any immediate plans for the institution of a sewerage scheme. When one considers that we get our water supply from underground and there are these sheet water areas, and the problem which we really face from the point of view of public health and sanitation is our water-borne sanitation and underground water-toilets, you can see how difficult, grievous and dangerous in a way such a problem can be. I do not foresee immediately how Government would be able to implement a particular sewerage scheme as such, but it is certainly a problem to which we must be seeing and not closing our eyes.

It would be a sad day, Mr. Speaker, if we had to rush into the House of Assembly and pass a law saying that

there will be no more water toilets in Barbados; that there should be dry pits. Nevertheless even though we hope that that day be very far distant, I would expect that very firm consideration should be given to this water survey, and what it does say as far as our underground water supply is concerned. There are a number of places now - and there is one particular hotel which I am very concerned about - that are established and erected on our sheet areas which, I believe, might be a potential danger to our water supply; but however I will wait for our survey to know what the results really are. I am particularly concerned because members of our Town and Country Planning Committee have encountered this problem in their activities in the Northern Area.

SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 3 was asked by the hon. junior member for St. John who I observe is not in his place.

Question No. 4 was asked by the same hon. member.

Question No. 10 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

COMPULSORY INSURANCE SCHEME

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

To enquire of the Honourable Premier:

1. Will the Government consider the setting up of a Committee with the guidance and assistance of the necessary experts from overseas (if necessary) for the purpose of considering, working out and establishing a Compulsory Insurance Scheme for all types of workers based on the lines of the National Insurance Acts (1946-57) of the United Kingdom?

2. Does Government realise that a Compulsory Insurance Scheme is the method adopted by the United Kingdom in implementing the "Beveridge Plan" for National Assistance, National Health and also Security for old Age etc.?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

"It is not necessary at present for Government to consider setting up a Committee for the purpose of considering working out and establishing a compulsory insurance scheme for all types of workers. Government has already taken steps to request advice from the United Nations on the possibility of implementing a social security scheme in Barbados, and has recently been informed of the inclusion of the project in the programme approved for the West Indies for 1961-62.

Government is aware that a compulsory insurance scheme is the method adopted by the United Kingdom in implementing the "Beveridge Plan" for National Assistance, National Health and also Security for old age."

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that the Government has taken steps for setting up this Committee, but when the word "already" has been used, I want to know if the Premier has in mind that until such a social security scheme is finally established, Government will consider granting increases or at least an adequate living wage for Government pensioners and also old age pensioners. I would like to know if in the interim between now and the establishment of this scheme the Government will do

something to alleviate the suffering of Government pensioners by granting them an adequate living wage. 2.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, has that supplementary arisen out of the answer which I gave? That seems to me something quite different.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier need not answer that.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I want to have some assurance that until this scheme is established, the question whether it be one scheme operated by the Federal Government or one scheme for each island.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking several questions. Whether the scheme will be applied to each territory is another subject.

Mr. TALMA: I would like a specific answer as to whether it would be one scheme for the West Indies, or whether each individual territory would have its own scheme.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I cannot answer for the rest of the unit territories or the Federal Government. I said that Barbados is undertaking its own scheme.

Mr. TALMA: I take it that there would be compulsory insurance based on the running of the National Insurance scheme? I am asking if this would be a case where both the employer and the worker would contribute and the State would control the Scheme and have the money invested to bear dividends whereby workers would be assisted not only in the case of old age and sickness, but also in the case of unemployment? In short, I would like to know if it is a comprehensive scheme based on that line.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is what the Government has in mind but we have to await the advice and information which we are seeking before we say offhand that that would be so.

POSTMASTERS AND POSTMISTRESSES EMPLOYED IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 18.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

1. Will the Minister state how many District Postmasters or Postmistresses are at present employed in the Public Service of this Island?
2. Will he further state, in detail,
 - (a) the nature of their duties,
 - (b) their other responsibilities, if any, and
 - (c) their minimum and maximum salaries?
3. Will he further state whether it is intended to re-grade their salaries to a level commensurate with such responsibilities?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 1, is thirteen.

2. (a) Normal postal counter services, viz:- stamp selling, registering of letters, issue and payment of money and postal orders, parcel post (receipt and delivery), they despatch postal packets and parcels collected at their respective offices to the General Post Office daily, and, with the exception of the Postmaster at Welches Road, St. Michael, they supervise the postmen allotted to their areas.
- (b) Payment of old age pensions weekly, savings, bank business (deposits and withdrawals), collection of prefab house repayments where applicable.

(c) \$1,632 x 96 - 2,016; \$2,112 x 96 - 2,400; \$2,640 x 120 - 2,800.

3. Government is contemplating the revision of salaries of all Government servants and this will include District Postmasters and Postmistresses.

Mr. BRANCKER: Will the Hon. Minister assure this House, in respect of Government's revision of salaries as contemplated, in dealing with these particular officers, namely, of District Postmasters or of Postmistresses, that special regard will be paid to them in respect of such revision because of the several and important additional duties which it is admitted they are required to perform in answers to (b) of (2) which the Hon. Minister has just given?

My second supplementary is to let the Minister indicate to this House, on the contemplated salaries revision by Government, by whom that revision will be undertaken, and when it is proposed to commence that salaries revision.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In reply to the last supplementary, that is a different question; and does not arise out of the replies which I have given. As regards the former supplementary, I think I can say that special regard will be given to all of the Civil Servants whose duties and responsibilities demand special regard.

Mr. BRANCKER: Is it to be understood that the Minister has given the assurance, in respect of these District Postmasters and Postmistresses, that their other duties will be treated as additional posts which so to speak have been added to their substantial duties, and that there will be substantial additional compensation in respect of these laborious duties which they are compelled to perform?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: It has not been so understood by anyone who understands what I have said.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, if the answer by the Hon. Minister to the third question is that the Government was contemplating the revision of salaries, the next query is when is this revision of salaries expected to take place? Who is the person, or persons, to undertake the salaries revision?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do agree with the Hon. Minister that the last supplementary question put by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition does not relate to what has arisen out of the question which was first proposed by the questioner.

Mr. BRANCKER: I did not suggest that it arose out of the question, but it arose from the answer to Question No. 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister cannot be forced or required to reply to that.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: One cannot overlook the indiscretion of answers given to certain questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further questions ready to be dealt with, the House will proceed to Private Member's Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS ADDRESS re SINGLE MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution/re Single Member Constituencies and the appointment of a Commission with respect thereto. On the last occasion when the House was discussing this order, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will not be very long today; I will be to the point. During the last debate on this matter, I had to mention that the opposition by the Govern-

ment Bench to this measure came from the Leader of the House; and it started in a report in the United Kingdom in which he said that this idea of Single Member Constituencies was a conservative idea, and that people who associated themselves with it were trying to bring the Conservatives back into power. In a *sotto voce* remark, the Minister of Agriculture said he was never a member of the Electors' Association but implied that I was a member of that Association. I said that the Minister of Agriculture was one of the signatories to a petition from the Vestry which objected to the idea of adult suffrage being introduced.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. No Vestry, at any time, had any objections to adult suffrage as far as I know. They had their own business to do and that was absolutely separate and distinct from adult suffrage. The hon. member should have his facts clearly before he propounds heresies. Before long I will get the debate as far as adult suffrage is concerned, and I will read my speech to this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know that we will get the debate; we will have to get the newspaper reports. Some of the people are still alive and that will be evidence enough. The Deputy Speaker was in the Chair, and he was the most astonished person to hear the hon. member make a denial of that remark. Some people's consciences do not worry them. I happened to do a little research.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that you were a member of the Party when it was known as the Barbados Progressive League. (Mr. SPEAKER: I was.) Oh, you were; then you did agree to the policy of the league. In 1944 when I was accused of being a Conservative, the Hon. Leader of the House was a candidate for the parish of St. Michael. He said that he was not working for anybody; well, I was working for somebody in those days; and for weeks I fought his election campaign without any reward. He was a poor man, and he was eventually elected to this House in the face of the then Electors' Association's powers; and I even lost my voice so that I could not speak for about two weeks after that election. In those days there were no microphones; I remember speaking in Black Rock and some people felt that I, myself, should be a candidate.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. Am I to understand that the hon. member was fighting for an individual or for a Party? I am of the impression that he was fighting for one member; but I thought he was fighting the cause of the Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not relevant to the debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member anticipated me; he does not realise that English is not spoken in one sentence. Do you want me to break off and say that a cause is always greater than the man? If the Hon. Leader of the House was a part of the cause for which I was fighting, it is the same Leader of the House today who has the effrontery and the brass to say that I was a member of the Electors' Association. I am only showing you the wickedness of the matter. When you had all to lose and nothing to gain, you fought for a cause; but now the hon. member says that we are fighting for something in which he did not believe; he never believed in the principle of single member constituencies.

Let us see how straight the hon. member is. I hold in my hand the Progressive League Policy and Programme printed in 1944, and this is what is found on the last page of it: "The League is still in favour of Adult Suffrage and the abolition of all property qualification." This is the programme which the Hon. Leader of the House agreed to at that time. He was a candidate and I fought for the cause when the snob was thrown at him that he was only a taxi driver; and the question was asked if you would put him in the House! That came from the Conservatives. (Hon. M. E. COX: It came from you too.)

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when we were discussing this matter, I was at pains to try and keep the speakers to the subject and to try, as far as possible, to get

them to see that they need not pay any serious attention to asides because, at best, they are calculated to throw the speaker off his strain, and, possibly to do what is more than that; they may foment ill temper. If we really go on with the Resolution, there is enough to be spoken on it; and we need not bother so much about personalities. It is just a question of one person saying one thing and another person saying that he did not say it; it is a question of statement and denial.

Mr. WALCOTT: I shall not say what one person's belief in political matters is as against what another person's belief is; this is just an illustration to show what the position was as far back as 1944. The then Progressive League had these members in the House of Assembly: the Premier, the Prime Minister of the West Indies, Mr. J. T. C. Ramsay, Mr. H. W. Springer, and I think that Mr. Graham Gittens was also a member of the Party.
2.55 p.m.

In 1944 the Party, which is now the Government, had five seats out of twenty-four. It was not a Government at that time, and we outside of the House banded ourselves together and supported the cause because we believed in these things. One of the first platforms on which I spoke was that of the Hon. Minister, and yet he said in a *sotto voce* remark that I was on a platform decrying his vocation. I never go in for that. That goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that since 1944 the Electors Association did not come into power; and that one has been a member and not even a supporter of those people prior to that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member if he realises that at the time of the election in 1944 my age was 28. Ask him what cause he was on when he was 28? Let him therefore go back to my youth; my philosophy was a philosophy made known. I was working for a man and I could have been dismissed by him; but I was not guided by the man's philosophy. I was not working with a Labourite or with a Socialist, I was working with a Conservative; but I got on the Party's platform and supported a man who had nothing to give; and it is the same man who today said that I was a member of the Electors Association.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member should take that seriously.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is true that the Minister of Agriculture was not a member of it then; he was an opponent, so what I am reading does not apply to him; he was not associated with this programme. Let the members who now say that single member constituencies is a conservative plot see what the League said seventeen years ago when they were fighting for power and wanted to be in the Government:

"It believes that there should be redistribution of seats according to population and single member constituencies."

That is what the hon. member said in 1944 on a platform; and that is what we stood by; but, today, he is saying that this is a conservative plot, and those of us who believe in single member constituencies are trying to bring back the Conservatives into power. Is that not a vicious, malicious statement for anyone to make after this record of seventeen years? Now they are picking their teeth; but there will be gnashing of teeth as prophesied by Biblical injunction, and not the bad manners of picking of teeth in public. Only an atrocious liar could assign himself to a thing like this, believe it, and then come back and say it is something associated with somebody else and nothing to do with him. How can you reconcile believing in adult suffrage in 1944 and now in 1961 you do not believe in it? How can you reconcile that in 1944 you did not believe in property qualification and now in 1961 you believe in it? How is it that in 1944 you believed in the re-distribution of population when it was smaller than what it is now in 1961, and today you do not believe in it? How is it that you believed in single member constituencies in 1944 and in 1961 you do not believe in it? What in that is policy and what is detail?

Mr. Speaker, the members are forgetting that these are things they said they believed in. I believe in God the Father Almighty; should I believe in Him today, and tomorrow, because people do not believe in God anymore, I should go on with the crowd? You believed in adult suffrage and in single member constituencies. A belief is something difficult to express; it is something within your soul. A belief is something you hold dear. Today, Mr. Speaker, you say that that has changed. Why has it changed? It has changed for the same reason. They believed in adult suffrage and I was a party to that belief. We did not believe in property qualification and we wiped it out. I say that the reason which the Prime Minister of the West Indies gave this public for not agreeing with what he believed in is because he too had forgotten that this was part of what he had believed in. It is the same reason that the Congress Party was fighting the Labour Party when a Bill was sent down for adult suffrage.

This Party got an equal number of seats in the 1944 elections in Barbados. How were the seats distributed? The Progressive League had eight, the Congress Party had eight, and eight seats went to the other people. Since that day the distribution of seats was the highest. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: I think there were nine, eight and seven seats respectively.) The hon. member said there were nine, eight and seven seats which means that the Conservatives had the most. Since then they have changed the name, because the middle class people who supported it in the beginning did not believe in the word "labour" — just like the hon. member does not believe in the word "servant"; it is the same peculiarity which the people had in mind about the word "league"; so they had to find a neutral term — "The Progressive League". There is a poet who wrote a poem on the Leagues.

What is fitting, Mr. Speaker, is that this does not need a Solomon or a Barrister to examine it. At that time it was the Progressive League and not the Barbados Labour Party; progression had to be the operative word. In 1938 and 1939 when the labourer and the working man did not have the vote, you had to use a name to court the man who was not the working class man. You did not want to go and tell those people whom you were wooing that you wanted to call yourselves the Labour Party; so you said you had better use what you have and call it the "League" so that the respectable element in the community would not feel that you were associating them with labour. The word "labour" connoted that you were putting them with the bare-footed man; just as in the Trade Union today, the white collar worker feels that if he joins the Union he is joining with men who work on the Wharf and you should not associate these people together.

3.05 p.m.

Now, the Hon. Minister says that the people must decide that we must have single constituencies. I say that that has been put before the people already; that party has reminded the people of that already. The hon. member was elected with this policy of single-member constituencies as his programme. That is what we carried to the people on platforms at Bank Hall pasture, Black Rock, Brittons Hill and all about. I remember one night that a man nearly beat me in Brittons Hill. Some of those members over there were too great to light the lamp; I was the servant so I had to light the lamp.

Any member on the Government Party today after having been reminded of this, would know that this was their programme. It is contained in this pamphlet "Present, Past and Future". One of the items under that programme is that there should be a re-distribution of seats according to population under single-member constituencies. That is sound. Why did you say that you believed in it in 1944 when you did not have Ministerial Government, and when you did not have the size population which you have now or the authority which you now possess, and why do you not believe in it now? What are the issues it has in store now? On some point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House said that the reason why the Conservatives wanted single-member constituencies was because they did not believe in plumping.

Because a man may have a different philosophy from yours, it does not mean that he differs from you on every issue. The question of single-member constituencies was never a fundamental difference between the parties; it was never raised as a matter of difference between the parties. What we know is that any man who feels that he can be elected to the House under this double-member constituency always feel that it is easier to say that he is supporting you to get in; therefore, you will say "all right, we will work together." It was never any question of saying that it was a Conservative idea, and the Labourites did not believe in it.

The Hon. Leader of the House gives the impression sometimes on issues raised, that the reason why you are agreeing with the matter is because it is associated with bringing back the old idea. Any man who takes an analysis of the population of any country will find that in a country which has predominantly a white population, that the people vote for white leaders. You talk of a camel going through the eye of a needle; but I say that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a black person to become the President of the U.S.A.. Would you expect to go to India and find a European as Premier instead of Mr. Nehru? Here in this community, as long as you have adult suffrage, you will have the leader of this country in keeping with the wishes of the majority of people in the country. In any community where you have adult suffrage, the election is symbolic of the adult population which is voting. In a plural society like ours where there is class society, where you have not yet broken down class differences, you have this class thinking. A man was speaking to me at a hotel sometime ago and he said that he met a man of stature who was making friends with a mason or carpenter, and he thought that that man should not be making friends with masons or carpenters but with somebody like a lawyer. He is associating a friend with something which he feels belongs to his class. In a community like this, you will get people thinking on a basis of class feeling that way.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael who is now Deputy Prime Minister was there with another friend, and he was amazed to hear me talking in the manner as I did as compared with what he was talking to his friend about me. I told my friend that the reason why the hon. member was not made Premier by Sir Grantley Adams was because Sir Grantley felt that a man like him should not be Premier, and that a Premier should be a man of the standing of himself. The man turned to me and said "You have said that, but you do not know what this man has said about you". (A VOICE: Call his name.) Jonathan Grant, the Minister of Labour in Dominica.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like the hon. member to say what I said about him.

Mr. WALCOTT: It was not in complimentary terms.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have the opportunity to tell the hon. member that somewhere outside of this Chamber.

Hon. M. E. COX: Statements which are made in parliament should be refuted or verified in parliament. That is what I am asking for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave that for somewhere outside.

Hon. M. E. COX: I believe I know something of parliamentary proceedings. With the greatest respect, Your Honour, the hon. member has made a statement to the effect that what I spoke about him was not in complimentary terms, or in the same way as he had spoken about me. I am asking the hon. member to state what was reported to him that I said about him.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member should be sufficiently grown up to know that, as I put it to the Chamber,

it was not a dialogue or report in order to prosecute anybody. I am conscious that we live in a class society. I was emphasizing the point which I made in so far as this document with the caption "Progressive League". This Organisation became a Labour organisation when there were those of us who were not afraid of saying that we represented Labour. Other people felt that this word "Progressive" should be used. I am saying that this document represented the name of an era; and when I went to work with people, I found that it was so, and I say that it is still so up to today. How can the hon. member say that anything we say about single-member constituencies and redistribution of seats is anything to do with the Conservatives? Seventeen years ago there was this plank in the Labour Party's platform when the floodgates were opened; the onslaught came in 1944 and we are part of that whole era because it was the same 1944 Session which brought us here.

Twenty-five years ago the hon. junior member for St. James could not have seen the light; he could not be in here saying that he represented Labour with that complexion. The hon. member could not get in here if he said he represented Labour; he could not even get a job, far from getting a seat in here; but now people like himself will vote for him because he says he represents Labour, whether he does it or not. The hon. junior member for St. James would have been a part of the Conservative stock. Therefore, in polite terms, when some hon. members lose their sense they begin to talk of us as if we have no right being in here.

The hon. member must get his philosophies straight. You believed in something in 1944; you felt that there should have been a redistribution of seats. From what the hon. member said not long ago, he is an avid reader and student of Parliamentary Procedure. In the parish of St. Michael in 1944, although there was a restricted franchise at that time, the hon. member was returned with a substantial majority; and if you had a redistribution of seats you would have had more seats in St. Michael than what your opponents had. The Conservatives lost their seats all over the place where they had seats prior to that period. The only three members in this Chamber now who claim to be Conservatives are the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for Christ Church. I do not think that anyone could say that these people are coming back into power; and if they are coming back into power, that is only because of the stupidity of the Government in power. Do not let the hon. member bring down the wrath of everybody and look ridiculous. If a man is your opponent and he wins at an Election then there is the end of that.

This programme of the Barbados Progressive League goes on to say this:-

"The League considers that the members of the Executive Committee should function as Ministers and should be responsible to the House from which they are chosen for the efficient working of the Departments of which they have control."

Do you still believe in that? This is something in which you believed a long time ago. The programme goes on to say this:-

"This is our policy, this is our programme and with your aid we can make it a reality."

That is how the Manifesto ended. Speaking for myself, when any hon. member over there can associate me with the Conservatives, I would like to say that I have been through many battles in this country and I have not been locked up. In the year 1958 everybody was after my blood when the Sugar strike was on; but I am the sort of man whom you cannot fight with any Jury. The hon. senior member for St. Michael made a speech in St. John, and I told the Governor that you cannot institute a Commission of Enquiry and then speak on the matter like that on a platform. (Hon. M. E. COX: What happened?) Well, a man can steal and nothing can happen.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not subject to any dictation either by the Governor or by anybody else. (Mr. WALCOTT: You are subject to propriety.) I asked the hon. member what happened because I was at the meeting.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is not everybody who steals who goes to gaol; and everybody who commits murder does not get hanged.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to tell the Hon. Leader of the House that it is no point of order to ask a question of a personal nature.

Hon. M. E. COX: What I wanted to convey is this; I wanted the hon. member to tell the House what happened. 3.25, p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: You see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not understand constitutional propriety. He thinks that because you have to report to the Government that you must have a Governor at the head of the Constitution; and, therefore, if anything happens in which the Governor is supposed to accept the advice of the Ministers, the Governor must set up a Commission of Enquiry. As I told the Governor, if it had happened in other circumstances and it was not an elected Minister, there would have been a riot in this place. When it comes to constitutional propriety, if you are a Minister and set up a Board of Enquiry, you should keep yourself free from making comment on the issues that are supposed to be under consideration.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That equally applies to the other person involved. The Law lays it down that, whenever there is a deadlock between the employers and employees, the matter should be reported to the Government. From then on it is in the hands of the Government. If you go out after the Government has taken over and incite the people to do what they should not do, and to starve, and to deprive themselves of what they would normally get if they followed the constitutional way, surely it is time that a Minister or anybody in charge gave the people the proper and right lead.

Mr. WALCOTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is only a question of propriety; and anybody can deduce from that what it really means. If you believe in Ministerial Government, then all I say is that an industrial dispute is not a dispute between the Trade Union and the Government; it is between the two combatants. There is nothing in law, constitutional practice or industrial practice which says that when a dispute has been submitted to arbitration that the Union itself cannot say to the public what are the issues submitted to arbitration.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The constitution does not say that the Minister or a member of the Government cannot give the facts to the community either.

Mr. WALCOTT: The constitution does not say anything about this. I am talking about political propriety. If he does not understand what it is, then he does not understand what is ordinary everyday propriety. If you invited me to come to your house to dinner, I would not expect you to send me to the shop for the goods. There are certain things in which you must know what to do; and if you are an ardent student of constitutional and Parliamentary procedure, there are certain things that are elementary, and you do not need a Sixth Form boy to understand that.

What I believe, and what is to be pressed home in Barbados, is that if politics is going to take the role purely of expediency of on what issue you can win an election or cannot win an election, then the question of telling somebody of policy or a programme is nonsense. I have had the privilege of hearing a Civil Servant say, on the question of Ministerial Government, that we must go back and have an election, because we never put that issue to the people. That means that every time we want to do anything in the House of Assembly, we have to go and hold a mass meeting.

There is the supposed suggestion about the office of the Speakership. It would be a completely different thing in which we would have to have a full-dress debate in Parliament to see whether Parliament is of the opinion that the Speakership of the House should be elected from outside. Without discussing this with Your Honour, or knowing Your Honour's views, I am of the opinion.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not mind I will interrupt him for a while. It is high time that I should make a statement to the public of Barbados. Several people have approached me on this matter of the Speakership being an appointed position; and I have actually read things in the newspaper. May I let every Barbadian know here and now that I am not associated with any of these rumours. No member of the Labour Party, no member of the Democratic Labour Party, or no member who is an Independent in this House have I ever discussed the matter with; nor has he discussed it with me up to now. I do not know where this rumour has started. I do not know what is happening behind the scenes, because it must be behind the scenes and not in front of my face. Nobody has consulted me on the matter, and so I know nothing about whether or not the Speakership is going to be an appointed position or an extra constituency put out for the Speaker.

All these things I have heard, some of them I have read, but nobody of any authority, nobody who I would say is knowledgeable, no Parliamentarian at all or Government official, no responsible person has up to this day approached me on this matter. I would like that to be known by all Barbadians concerned.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you heard my remarks on that. I am one of those men who have not yet reached the stage where I cannot speak my mind freely. You live but once, and you know that a poet said that a coward dies a thousand times, but a brave man faces death but once. That is why I prefaced my remarks, because, I have had no discussion with Your Honour on this.

In so far as the position in this country is concerned, what I was going to make clear is that even if Your Honour had had any discussion with anybody, which you have not had, my attitude to the Speakership of this House is that it should be a post elected from among the members of this House; as it has always been so under the constitution; so that the Speaker would have what I regard as the added confidence and dignity of knowing that he is an equal or the first among equals in this Chamber.
3.35 p.m.

Sir, just like the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Speaker of the Jamaica House of Representatives, and the Speaker of the Bermuda House of Assembly, I feel that the Speaker of this Hon. Chamber should be elected and be in the same position. I do not see why we should change it at this eleventh hour to suit what I would call the Crown Colonies, or those colonies which have emerged from that status.

I am of the view that, as long as no person is going to contest the Speaker's seat - and I happen to be in an excellent position where the Speaker is concerned - nobody can press me to do anything. As long as you have double-member constituencies and you are the Speaker of the House, you should educate the people to the fact that you cannot have a Speaker of the House and people saying: "We do not hear the Speaker or hear him getting into any rows," or of their asking him questions about a standpipe or which road you are going to repair. It is for that reason I say that I think there should be an unwritten law that a candidate should not oppose a Speaker who has already been elected by this Chamber.

I will not go over what took place with the election of His Honour the Speaker on an occasion; it would be embarrassing to go over the sad history which has been associated with this high office. The Hon. Minister should not give the impression, or should not attempt publicly to give the impression, that the idea of single-member constituencies is something which is associated with conservatism. I am sure today after the Hon. Minister has heard what I

have read out, he would be bold-faced to say that it is not true; therefore, this suggestion that single-member constituencies is something wanted by the conservative people falls to the ground.

I have very much pleasure in supporting the Resolution for single-member constituencies. I support it on the same basis that it was stated by the Progressive League in 1945 as their opinion that they believed there should be re-distribution of seats according to population.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member give the name of the pamphlet from which he has read?

Mr. WALCOTT: It is "Barbados Progressive League - Past, Present and Future."

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I suppose at this stage it is appropriate for Government to reply. I promise not to tire the House. I think the Government's position was made quite clear in the House in December of last year when I replied on behalf of the Government. Our attitude, as far as Government is concerned, has not changed.

What is very amusing to me and, perhaps slightly amazing, is the fact that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is responsible for this motion before the House, has completely somersaulted or changed his tune only from December last. When I listened to him and heard him say that there was no question at this stage of depriving the country of constituencies of their two representatives, and least of all St. Lucy so as to ensure that that parish would have its two seats untouched, I said to myself that the hon. member had only brought back this Resolution at this stage to save his face. The whole trend of the debate hinges around the question of the number of seats in the Assembly remaining as they are today; that is, 24 seats, but that the boundaries should be realigned. I remember the hon. senior member for St. Lucy saying, in no uncertain manner "I suppose St. Lucy, St. Peter and part of St. Andrew should make a constituency;" and it is upon that more particularly than what the hon. Mover of the motion said, that I raised my argument that depriving those persons who had the right to vote for all these years and to send two representatives to this House would be an injustice.

As far as the hon. member who seconded the motion is concerned, the impression which he made when he was seconding the motion on the last occasion was different from what he said today. He completely somersaulted. He never at all touched upon that aspect of the situation, but rather avoided it completely. I have done a little research since the hon. member made that speech and referred to Sir Ivor Jennings; and I am prepared to quote what Jennings said here now to rebut what the hon. member said about "one man, one vote."

What is wrong with the system now if it has served in good stead for all these years? Surely, if you decide to abandon that system at some time or the other, then you ought to give reasonable ground for your intention to do so. Up to now, I have not really heard any cogent argument put forward by any member of the Opposition as to why this system should be changed.
3.45 p.m.

The Opposition argues that things change; there are single member constituencies in other countries and therefore we should fall into line. I would like to tell the hon. member that, while we are unique in this particular set up, it is also true that, in other parts of the world, members of the Houses of Parliament are not also members of Local Councils. In Great Britain it is not so.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member must not be so dogmatic. Mr. Herbert Morrison was a member of the House of Commons and also a member of the London County Council for years.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of order. However, what is the position? I will repeat what I said when I replied on behalf of the Government on the last occasion. I am not

yet dealing with the hon. senior member for St Peter, but I will, at this stage, refer to him in connection with his reference to the Manifesto published by the Barbados Progressive League in 1944. Although the name has been changed, I accept that the Barbados Labour Party is definitely the Barbados Progressive League. What the hon. member has failed to say is this:

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I referred to the hon. member not to the Party, as claiming in his own right that he said he believed in that Manifesto.

Hon. M. E. COX: That was in 1944. I was going to say that the hon. member has failed to say that we have had, since 1944, as many as four Elections and we have also published Manifestos. And in no Manifesto of ours since 1944 is there included any question of single-member constituencies. That is all I have to say on that matter at this stage.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If you believe in a thing you do not have to say in every Manifesto that you believe in it. You will go on to print something new, and in which you believe. Your plans are constant so that you do not have to change them overnight.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will flog the hon. member with those very words later on. I am very glad he has said that.

On this question of one vote, one man, the interpretation of that is the establishment of equality of human beings, and not of any question of single member constituencies. I pointed out on the last occasion that in 1957, when I was in England, I attended a Conference sponsored by the British Labour Party at Beatrice Webb's house in Surrey. I was Chairman of a particular committee session, and there was Mr. Jim Griffith who was a very important member of the Labour Party - in fact, he is one of the front-bench members of the Labour Party - and he spoke on this question. There were also present the shadow Minister for Colonial Affairs, the late Mr. Aneurin Bevan, Mr. Gaitskill and a large number of Africans who had attended the Conference. This question was discussed over and over again at every session, and the emphasis was that we believed in democratic socialism; and democratic socialism means that there should be one vote, one man. In other words, every man and woman irrespective of his or her station in life or of colour, class or creed, should have the right to vote. That is the meaning of one vote, one man.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the very author from which the hon. junior member for St. Lucy quoted on the last occasion. I am sure that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has one of these Editions; this is the Third Edition of Sir Ivor Jennings on page 179. The hon. member promised to lend me that edition but since then I have been able to purchase one. This is what the last paragraph states:

"Lord Morley's account is said to have been the work of Mr. Gladstone, although in Cabinet all its members stand on an equal footing to speak with equal voice and on the rare occasions," this is most important, "when a division is taken, are counted on the fraternal principle of one man one vote."

In the early 19th century, I say this in order to bear out my argument, there were dual-member constituencies in Great Britain. That was before I was born. There was this principle of dual-member constituencies... (ASIDES) I wish that the hon. senior member for St. Peter would behave himself. I am saying that the quotation made here applies to the time when there were dual-member constituencies in Great Britain. That was part of the British Party system. The hon. member can get a copy of this work; I tried to get this copy in 1952.
3.55 p.m.

There was the borough of Old Sarum. This borough used to elect two members on seven votes; that is what happened in England. There were dual member constituencies in Great Britain when what I quoted here was written.

If you check the Commonwealth Review of December 1961, you will see that in South Africa, on the question of voting, the Leader of the Progressive Party, Dr. Steytler, said that he did not believe in this question of one vote, one man. What I am trying to point out is that there are single member constituencies in South Africa, but as late as last year Dr. Steytler said that he does not believe in this one man, one vote. What he believes in is all responsible people.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If the hon. member does not mind, I would regard it as a positive insult to those of us in this Chamber to hear the hon. member reading anything from South Africa as evidence for us to go by. We had to ban their goods, therefore South Africa is no place to quote as guidance. They must be quoted in derogatory terms. Dr. Steytler should be put against a wall and shot, and not to be quoted in here. It is an insult to quote South Africa.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I understand, whether or not he believes it, that you have friends in Heaven and Hell also; and I do know, in spite of what the hon. member may say, that in South Africa the black people have white friends. There are some white people who are as anxious to see the abolition of apartheid as we are in this country. I am sure about that. I have quoted an instance which I experienced in Geneva in 1957 when two ladies waited outside the door until I came out, started to discuss this question with me and told me how hard they were working to assist African people; so much so that, when some of the Africans were gaoled, and they went to look for them to give assistance, they were rounded up by the South African Government. Dr. Steytler is the Leader of the Opposition to the Verwoerd Government, and that is what he said.

I am confident that there are some white people in South Africa who would do more to help the black people of that country than even some of the black Bajans we have here, as the Minister of Agriculture indicated in his speech earlier today. The Leader of the Progressives, Dr. Steytler, said that his Party did not subscribe to the doctrine of one man, one vote, but believed that every responsible person should be permitted to take part in the Government of the country. I quoted that, however much it may annoy the member to show that the interpretation given by them of this one man one vote could not be accepted, when people who know far better than they, and who have laid down this thing, are telling you that the one man one vote applies to the fraternal principle. What it means is that we are all brothers.

Mr. Speaker, how can members link this one man one vote with the question of single member constituencies? As I pointed out on the last occasion, one man one vote establishes a principle of the equality of human beings. That is the fundamental basis upon which one man one vote is founded - that you and I are equal. It established the principle of equality in so far as voting is concerned. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it means that if one individual has the right to cast 100 votes, another individual has equal right to cast the same hundred votes, and has absolutely nothing to do with single member constituencies.

I hope, Sir, that I have been able to satisfy members. It is all well to come in here and talk all over your face and try to fool and hoodwink people who are not conversant with these various things, but whenever the questions are properly analysed and put to people, and put by people who have absolutely no intent of misleading or fooling anybody, then the people have to think between the lines and decide who is right. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that the majority - I do not speak for the minority, the minority will see and yet close their eyes - are bound to accept what is said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when this point was raised, I said, that there is absolutely no mandate from the people of Barbados for us to have single member constituencies in Barbados.
4.05 p.m.

It would be immaterial to me whether there would be single-member, or as they are, double-member con-

stituencies. I have no fear of what the results would be. I feel that I can go in any parish and capture a seat, whether it be a single or dual. The hon. junior member for St. John says that he doubts it. I can push him out too. (Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot.) It is alright for the hon. member to say that I cannot. On the last occasion when the Government had set up a Commission of Enquiry and the Government had made those awards in the sugar industry, that hon. member for St. Peter got on platforms of the hon. junior member for St. John and said that it was the hon. junior member for St. John who had got those awards.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member knows that he is lying.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must bear in mind that this is parliament and that the records will be read.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. senior member for St. Michael said that I got on a platform and said that the hon. junior member for St. John was responsible for those awards. That remark can only come from a fool. If I am General Secretary of the Trade Union and I am going to get on a platform and say that the hon. member for St. John is responsible for these awards, then the members of the Union should kick me out. That type of dishonesty is not going to do the hon. senior member for St. Michael any good.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I challenge the hon. member to say that he did not go to the hon. member's platform and speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. Yes. Everytime I went on his platform and spoke I said that I preferred to see him in the House of Assembly than Mr. Chenery, as a labourite. And if you bring back Mr. Chenery to run again, I will go on it again and say the same thing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am saying that, in so far as changes themselves are concerned, speaking for myself, it does not matter. I am not afraid of any electorate. What I am fighting for is a matter of principle. How can you tell me on the eve of an election, without any mandate, without putting it in your manifesto, without telling the people of this island, that you are prepared to introduce legislation to bring about single-member constituencies? How can you come into the House now and say that you are going to have single-member constituencies, and then you must get down Mr. X from England to appoint boundaries?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I heard the hon. member say that that is something which you have not put to the electorate. Is the hon. member suggesting that the only time you put something to the electorate is within the time the Parliament is meeting?

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of explanation. The hon. member is saying that this matter was never put to the electorate. I am saying that it was put to the electorate because in 1944, when the hon. member was elected to this House, single-member constituencies were in the manifesto of his party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, in 1944 the Barbados Labour Party got seven seats. We had it in our manifesto, and of the other parties who did not have it, one got nine seats and the other six seats.

Mr. WALCOTT: All the members said that it was put to the electorate.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I have said that this is a proposed major change in our constitutional setup. If you look at the history of all changes, you will find, as far as voting is concerned, that you had the Poll Act of 1886; the amendment to the constitution in 1884; then you come down to 1913 when the late Mr. Henry Walter Reece brought in an amendment to this House asking that the

franchise be reduced from £50 to £30; and in 1944 there was an amendment put up by Mr. E. K. Walcott.

(Loud Asides by Mr. WALCOTT.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must contain himself.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I do not mind being interrupted by the hon. member. When we come to this House, we come here to discuss the business of the people of this country and to do what we consider best in their interest and to improve the lot of the workers. We do not come here to abuse somebody, their mother and their father. What we come here for is to do as much good as we can. That is how I take it. May be, hon. members on the other side are of a different opinion. I do not want to wallow in the mud in which some of them wallow. I do not mean the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; I must confess that I have great respect for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must so speak as to make it appear as though he has respect for every other member.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I have respect for every other member, but not for their abuse. I quoted the different dates when proposals were made for amending our constitution: 1884, 1886, 1930, 1942, 1943, 1948 when we extended the life of the House to five years; in 1951 we brought into being Adult Suffrage. At no time was any question of single-member constituencies raised; it was not discussed or put to anybody. Since this is a change of such major importance, it should be discussed by the people of the country first so as to find out how they feel about it. It is of such importance, there should be a referendum on it; or whoever wants to put it to the country, ought to put it so that that group or Party would have a mandate to amend the constitution.

This is applicable in this sense, that in the constitution of the Federation of Nigeria, 1960, it is stated that alterations to Section 3 of this Constitution for the purpose of altering boundaries by the transfer of any part of one territory to another territory shall be effected only in accordance with the following procedure:-

"A referendum upon the question whether the act should have effect has been held in pursuance of provision made in that behalf by Parliament in every part of Nigeria that would be comprised in a new region or transferred from one territory to another, as the case may be, at which the persons entitled to vote were the persons who at the date of the referendum were entitled to vote in any constituency in that part of Nigeria would be under Section 46 of this constitution who at which at least three-fifths of all the persons who were entitled to vote at the referendum voted in favour of the act."

4.15 p.m.

What is the position in any of the other States? Here we have an author who, I understand, is an outstanding authority on Constitutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the name of the author?

Hon. M. E. COX: He is Professor K. G. Wheare. He is dealing with modern Constitutions. I hope that this book will not be made a document of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am in a position to quote the facts. (Asides) That book can be made a document of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Why does that boy not behave himself?

Mr. WALCOTT: Who is he calling a boy? Where do you think you are? Do you think you are out in Africa? You will get a slap in your face.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. senior member for St.

Peter. One had reference must produce another; and that puts the position in such a state that things get out of hand. I hope that these two hon. members will try and contain themselves.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I apologise for any reference I made and in which I have caused Your Honour's displeasure.

Hon. M. E. COX: I apologise too, Sir. This is what Mr. Wheare says:-

"Speaking generally, it would seem that the amending process in most modern constitutions is aimed at safeguarding one or more of four objectives. The first is that the constitution should be changed only with deliberation and not lightly or wantonly. The second is that the people should be given an opportunity of expressing their views before a change is made. The third is that in a Federal System the powers of the Units representing the Central Government should not be alterable by either party acting alone. The will of the people may be sought in a different way. The Legislature itself may be given power to make the amendment, but it may be required to delay its final action until a general election has been held, thus ensuring that the people may, if they choose, express their views upon the proposal in voting for candidates at the election. In Belgium when a proposal to amend the constitution is brought forward, both Houses of the Legislature must be dissolved and after re-election the amendment must be passed by a two-thirds majority in each House at a Session at which at least two-thirds of the members are present before it can become effective. In Denmark, before the proposed amendment is submitted to a referendum of the people as mentioned above, it must be approved in both Houses of the Legislature before and after a General Election. In Holland also, there must be a General Election of both Houses of the Legislature and thereafter the amendment must be passed by a two-thirds majority in both Houses. Sweden requires a majority vote in each House of the Riksdag before and after a General Election, while in Norway, there is added a further safeguard that the approval of a two-thirds majority of the Storting is necessary for the General Election. In Columbia and Ecuador an amendment must be approved by a majority in each House in two successive Congresses."

Mr. Speaker, I could go on quoting for the whole night in order to bear out what I am saying. The passage goes on:-

"By the Italian Constitution of 1948, the proposed amendment approved by the Legislature must be submitted to a referendum if, within three months, one-fifth of the members of the Lower House or five hundred thousand voters or five regional Councillors so request, unless the proposal was carried by a two-third majority in each House."

In Chile, Switzerland and in all of these places, it is required that you must have a majority of persons voting before such a change is made. As a matter of fact, I have an instance here which I would like to quote. It is as follows:-

"The experience of Denmark is perhaps a classic example. In 1939 proposals to amend the constitution had to be passed by both Houses of the Riksdag before and after a General Election, as the constitution amendments in 1915 required, were submitted to the people for approval. The constitution requires that an amendment to be carried must obtain the support not only of the electors voting but also at least 45 per cent of those entitled to vote. On this occasion, although the proposals received the support of a majority of those voting, they obtained the support of only 44.46 per cent of the qualified voters." And therefore the amendment could not be carried.

Mr. Speaker, I could quote from many authorities which I have here, but it would take about two or three hours to

show what the position is in an important issue such as this. Although the Government may not have a mandate from the people or have included such a proposal in its Manifesto, if the Government decides to bring forward an amendment there may be some point in it where the Government says: "We have a majority from the people and therefore we have the right to propose this amendment;" but when an Opposition proposes an amendment such as this, then that is a different question.

Mr. William Penn in his "England's Great Interest", "Choice of its new Parliament", in 1679 claimed the right of the people to share in legislation and alleged that their fundamental rights should not be infringed upon by legislation without their consent. That has brought Mr. Balfour, Mr. Gladstone and many Prime Ministers of Great Britain into trouble by their attempting, at one time or other, to pass important legislation without referring to the people. The Reform Act of 1832 was put to the people and the people voted on it.

When you come to this House of Assembly with an election around the corner, and you say that you want single member constituencies, you are attempting and with a limited number of seats --- Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I had better make this point before I forget to do so. The hon. junior member for St. John, in 1955, accused the Government of doing nothing to help unemployment, and so on. 4.25 p.m.

A week or two after, the members came in with a Resolution or an Address to the Governor asking to send down legislation to provide for one member to every three thousand electors in this island.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Since the hon. member is going to quote me, I am glad to see that somebody has a recollection that I am the person who brought an Address for single member constituencies. I have sent for the Resolution, but if the hon. member has it I would like him to quote it. As far as I can remember, the Resolution was for a more equitable distribution and allocation of seats on a single member constituency basis. The figure as far as I remember, was one in five thousand; but the hon. member is saying one in three thousand. The figure however is immaterial. I am glad that the member has reminded the House that in 1955 I asked for single member constituencies. If he does have the Resolution, I would like him to read it rather than trust to his very fallible memory.

Hon. M. E. COX: I remember well. After criticising the Government for doing nothing about unemployment, he attempted to solve the unemployment problem by adding more seats to the House.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Did the hon. member say I was adding more seats to the House?

Hon. M. E. COX: The Resolution would have increased the members of the House by having one for every three thousand electors.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I invite the hon. member to read the Resolution which I had. Do not get up and say that I was solving the unemployment problem by increasing the number of seats in the House; that was not the purpose of the Resolution at all. The purpose of the Resolution was for single member constituencies. I invite the Hon. Minister to read the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I had a copy of the Resolution which I read on platforms during the last General Election campaign; I do not have a copy here now. If the hon. member has sent for a copy, I hope he obtains it. I am definitely sure that he said that there should be one member to every three thousand electors; so, if we have 100,000 electors, there would be 34 or 36 members in the House. That is how he attempted to solve the unemployment problem in Barbados.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, the House will revert to Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON REPLY
TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, on the Suspension, I was dealing with the remarks His Excellency had made relative to health and social services in the island. I had said that our water supply was a cause for concern, especially when we think in terms of the water-borne sanitation and water closets which we do have in Barbados; and even though we do not hope that in the near future such a black day would descend upon us, it would certainly be an alarming situation if on some occasion we had to come to the House and pass a law saying that there should be no more water closets in Barbados because of our underground water supply.

This is certainly a matter which we must view with some concern. From my association with the General Board of Health and the Town and Country Planning Committee of the Northern Area, we have been quite concerned about it, because it appears to us that there are certain buildings and in particular one hotel of which I know, which strike us as being already on the sheet water area; and we are worried as to whether it may not eventually affect the purity of the water in that area. I said that such should be shown by the survey which is to be undertaken by an expert from W. H. O., and therefore we would not pursue the matter at this stage any further. We will await the outcome of such a survey, but certainly it should be known that we are not unaware of the situation.

I would like to refer, Sir, to our attitude towards public health education. We certainly feel that we would like our island to so bestir itself that could we engender a better attitude and feeling for public health education, and also show that we are ourselves believers in preventive medicine. I take it that, from the remarks made in His Excellency's Address, this is to a great extent the policy of the Government; but sometimes policies as policies do not get very far unless you can so bestir the population and let the people of a community take a positive interest in matters of this nature. The field of public health education and preventive medicine is one in which I feel we have a long way to go; and we certainly cannot do too much too quickly.

A lot will be said about hospital administration, and just as I have mentioned before that I consider the majority of our problems in Government today are not matters of policy themselves but mostly matters of administration and to some extent mal-administration, I would only say that we would expect particular consideration to be given to this subject of hospital administration when dealing with our health services. One of the things that I know members of the public have been asking for for a long time, and I believe would still take them a little time to get it, is the simple matter of regular visiting hours for the general wards of the Barbados General Hospital. It just seems to be administratively impossible at the moment to have a regular visiting hour at the hospital every day, simply because the wards are so large. The medical authorities find that every time they have visiting hours as such, it disrupts the medical routine service which they are running in the wards. We look forward to the new hospital where the rooms would be much smaller and where you would be able to administer such a state of affairs more effectively.

Certainly one thing that strikes me very strongly is that, in the private wards of the hospital, you can get visitors coming in very free and easy; and as a matter of fact, I think sometimes these visitors violate the medical arrangements by the ease in which they are able to make visits to that section of the hospital.

4.35 p.m.

I, myself, am a strong believer that any person who is in an institution must be subjected to the rules and regu-

lations of that institution. I do not at all feel, as far as visitors are concerned, or any other sort of medical routine is concerned, that there should be special rules for private wards and not for the general wards. Speaking for myself, I do not believe in private wards.

Sir, we come to the Civil Servants as mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. Every time His Excellency addresses members of this Legislature, he does make dutiful mention of the services which have been rendered by all members of the Civil Establishment; and especially since their added responsibility through internal self-government.

In his Address on this occasion, His Excellency mentioned that there will be a salaries revision for Civil Servants. This is regarded in an affable light; but I am inclined to the feeling that a salaries revision in the Civil Service is needed but not by just adding to the individual's salary. I regard it as an opportunity to institute a full enquiry into the operation of the Civil Service; and I feel very strongly on that.

There should be some concept of job-evaluation in the Civil Service, so that you can really know what a particular job really means to the organisation of Government. The big industries and Unions find job-evaluation such an important subject, very often they allow a research team of persons at Universities to investigate jobs in the organisation for them; and after that has been investigated, then there will be consideration as to the wages or salaries which should be given to those particular jobs.

The reason why I mentioned that job-evaluation was so big a thing is because, just as you will find that that itself is a big problem with industries, the value of any particular job to Government is a factor of its administration. You cannot run a Government properly, a business or any organisation, unless you have the particular jobs - which are services rendered - which are essential to that organisation; therefore, not only do you need to create posts as we do here in the House of Assembly, but also we are left in the situation where we attach salaries to those posts, and I do not think that we are as thorough as we may have been if there were a detailed investigation into the value of the particular job in the Service.

I will just give you a simple example which comes before my mind. When we are doing this salaries revision, would it be that we would be led away to the temptation of offering a sliding scale and upgrading salaries without taking into account what may be a comparison between a postman and say a messenger at Government Headquarters? What comparison there is between the service which these two types of individuals render? Whose job is really the more essential to the community and to which you give the greater amount of weight so far as carrying out the business of the Government?

Unless we get some clarification as to what jobs we consider most important and let people in an independent society know that that is work which we consider to be important in its own right, then we will always be in that state of creating anomalies when we talk of a salaries revision. We have 'been caught - and all other Governments have been caught - in the situation where you have inherited an administration where very often a job is created for the man, rather than finding a man for the particular job. If we have inherited that, we have got a lot of jobs which have been created for individuals; therefore when you come to value the job of the post itself, you will find that you cannot give a true evaluation because you are in that unfortunate position and therefore, you find that all you do, if you have a particular anomaly between two clerks and when you have stepped up their salaries by say 10%, all that you have done is to increase your anomalies.

I understand that the Civil Service Association are saying that they will prefer to bargain on this salaries re-

vision on their own rather than to get an independent commission. I say, Sir, with great respect that they cannot be too far wrong; because to get a Commissioner who would be coming into the island, he might appear to be disinterested and certainly uninterested in our precept of our internal self-government; and the whole trouble and worry which we have to contend with is to have a person come and do a job and all that he does in the end is to create more anomalies. Because of that, I say that the Civil Service Association cannot do worse than that. If you find that you are creating anomalies by not giving a thorough job-evaluation, you had better allow the Civil Service Association, being composed of members of our own community, to have that responsibility.

As far as the Civil Service Association is concerned, one of the biggest problems which we have to face is how can we develop the attitude among our people that giving service is more than filling a job. That is a particular problem in our social development which we have to face. I think all over the country is faced with it, but particularly so in the Civil Service. To have a salaries revision, which all will say is in order, should be deeper than the addition of a few cents and the creation of more anomalies. It should be the kind of revision to find a real meaning of what the Civil Service stands for; and at the same time make sure that jobs are set out on a more equitable basis. People would be encouraged to develop a feeling that the job which they are doing is really a vital service to the community and that they are not just working eight hours a day to get a salary without any interest in the job which they are doing.

4.45 p.m.

I do not regard enquiries into any particular branch of the Service as anything but an attempt to improve the particular administrative machinery of the service; and it should not be looked at in any other light.

From the point of view of administrative service, I would say that just a few figures would show where we are really faced with a monstrous, administrative problem. An example will suffice. In 1946 we carried a Budget of roughly \$5 million when Sir Hilary Blood said that he could not get the work done until he got additional help; now we have a Budget of over \$20 million, which is more than four times as much as we were handling then. In carrying through this programme, we have had in the Civil Service a number of old administrative personnel who would have reached the top in the days of a former political regime; and it would be difficult for some of those Civil Servants to want to accept the idea of carrying out the policy of a Labour Government. That is because they have all through their daily lives, grown up in the atmosphere of taking orders from the Keith Walcott regime; and therefore you will find it difficult to carry out the policies of the present Government. That is just an example of one of the troubles which the Government gets from the point of view of administration.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am afraid that I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. The hon. member is really replying to the Governor's Speech on behalf of the Government. I am afraid that that statement which he has just made is not correct; there may be one or two odd cases but I would say, generally speaking, that the Civil Service has been co-operating and falling in with these changes.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that there may only be one or two odd cases.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I hope the House hears what I have said. I said that there may be an odd case or so, but generally speaking, the Civil Servants co-operate with the Government. In my opinion, they are doing a good job.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anybody has said that the Civil Servants are not doing a good job; but we want to do a better job. There is no question

about it that these are situations which face us, and that these are matters for our consideration. One particular problem (*ASIDES*) You can go to any Department and in a few minutes' conversation you can discover the particular officer who would readily co-operate with the Government's policy or the one who would resist it. It does not take a psychiatrist to do that; anyone who takes that particular interest in the administration of the Government will be able to recognise what I have said easily.

Another problem is one of a personnel nature. We have not yet developed a clear-cut system as to how we should handle our personnel problems in our Civil Service; and this is nothing to which the Government has to accept blame as such. You will find that Civil Servants will go out of their way to put some of their grievances in the Press with the idea of feeling that they are getting their wrongs redressed; they do not always have the particular machinery within their organisation for handling these problems on an equitable basis. That is nothing, I repeat, for which you can blame the Government; it is a problem with which the Government becomes saddled; and you must try and tackle it in the best way. It is a fact that there is hardly any Department of Government where you have adequate machinery for the solving of personal problems, and therefore these problems will multiply. Consequently, people will think that one of the sources of redressing their grievances is the one to which they go. I would also say that the development of our Civil Service Association into a virile self-respecting body, is one of the best means by which we can counteract what is an undesirable situation.

I want to know that the Civil Service develops itself; but the members must carry a heavier responsibility in the attitude in which they carry on their work. You do not merely want to see what financial benefit you will get, but you want to see about the manner in which you carry out your work. That is a matter which has to be dealt with.

On the question of Education, I will summarise that by saying, as I have said before, that I, personally, think our Minister of Education should be renamed Minister of Development. In any developing community, you have to base your development on the development of the people you have around you. From the point of view of community development, education is one of the basic planks. I think it is most commendable that the Government has shown such evidence in the educational development of the country. I say that this is a problem which cannot be solved by just turning one's head away from it.

4.55 p.m.

We need the full scope of development in Primary, Secondary and further education. I would like to feel that we do not just put the emphasis on secondary education and forget Primary and further education. It is simply impossible for the development you need in education, and other social development in this island, to say you are going to handle it out of the current expenditure you have here. The time and generation will pass away and other problems will catch up with you before you do it. Has Government really given serious consideration to a loan on behalf of educational development? I would not like to hear anybody say that it could not be done; because if you cannot do it, what else are you going to do to handle all these problems that are facing you? You will find that you cannot handle the problem as it ought to be handled from the \$26 million budget I saw passed around here today.

We need to adjust ourselves to working and dealing with Organisations *per se*. We now live in an age of organisational pressure, and every organisation would be a political organisation: the Workers' Union Organisation, the Civil Service Association, the Chamber of Commerce and even the other Organisations like the Boys' Scouts Association and the St. John Ambulance Brigade. We must develop that technique of dealing with Organisations so that we will be able to pull our weight in this question of social development; and it is to our interest that we attempt to raise our standards on each one of these points. I feel that the Government has made a wonderful attempt in social develop-

ment, even though the problem is much vaster than we are able to touch so far.

One particular regret, Mr. Speaker, which I have cause to mention relative to His Excellency's Speech, is the absence of any reference at all to Radio Broadcasting in this country. We have read with a little joy that the Minister of Communications has just returned from Trinidad, and as far as the Press goes, has got some positive plans or had some constructive discussion on this subject; and I think that is a matter for which we should feel joyful. I am sorry that it was not in His Excellency's Speech as such. I know that my Party feels strongly on broadcasting; we feel very strongly on this question of mass communication, which we find happening all over the world, especially in the big countries where you are getting this combination of newspapers, radio and television studios working themselves into a particular monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, there is now an inquiry going on about this state of affairs in Britain. It is customary now in the United States of America to find a newspaper having shares in a television company and in a radio broadcasting company, and getting hold of the mass communication to the people, and giving direct public information sometimes for the good and sometimes for the very bad. It is a very dangerous thing for any Government to disregard a problem like this. Right now in Barbados I am certain that one of your Editors of the *Advocate* is on the Board of Directors of Barbados Rediffusion. The trend is there already as far as mass communication is concerned; and I think we must make positive statements on this question.

Even though there are many people who would say that they benefit from having Rediffusion in their house, I personally consider that Rediffusion, as it presently functions, is a cultural menace. Just because it serves the purpose of a domestic juke-box that does not mean that we must disregard the very important problem of mass communication in this age and generation. So strongly do we feel on this matter, again I would quote a Resolution showing what members of my Party felt on this subject. When you quote Resolutions showing what members of a Party feel, obviously it must be understood that a Party is an organisation in a particular sense; whereas, Government as Government, has certain restrictions by the fact that they are Government in the same sense; and Parties very often - the Party to which the Government belongs - can express themselves more virulently and strongly on certain items and with a wider scope than Government are able to do; but it does not mean that these other activities of the general Party should not be known, even though the Government may find it impracticable at a particular time to institute such Resolutions and policies that are passed at Conferences. The Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the technique of mass communications is regarded as a mammoth problem in the more developed countries of the world;

AND WHEREAS this problem has a more particular importance in the newly developing countries such as the West Indies;

AND WHEREAS it is against the best interest of any community to have a commercial broadcasting system enjoying a monopoly as is the case with Barbados Rediffusion Limited;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Barbados Government should immediately permit the installation of a Radio Broadcasting Unit in Barbados;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if such a new station is not a Government station, then it should be a private station other than Barbados Rediffusion Limited."

The people of Jamaica had the same problems. Radio Jamaica carried a monopoly and for ten years they went along like that; and they also found that although it was there to bring a juke-box to everybody's house, it did not mean that the programmes themselves were worthwhile. The ones you heard mostly were of the juke-box type.

Having discovered that, Jamaica cut down their franchise on Radio Jamaica, and they subsidised another radio broadcasting station, the Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation. Since that has been done, the programmes of both stations on radio education have stepped up tremendously.

Any broadcasting unit with a monopoly is one of the biggest dangers. Why I said that Rediffusion is a cultural menace is not because some of the people who work at Rediffusion are not good people - I have nothing against their personal character at all - not because some of the programmes could not be cultural programmes, but what happens to a people when you train them sub-consciously not to be selective? With Rediffusion in your home you do not select a station; you do not give yourself the trouble to say you want to listen or select a particular programme; you are not training yourself at all, you just have a noise in the corner.

5.05 p.m.

If the noise happens to be something which you want to listen to, you might turn your ear to it; and if the noise is something which you do not want to listen to, you just turn your ears against it - but you still hear it. It is really a dangerous thing for a developing community to be going along and hearing any sort of thing without making an effort to sift things, or to listen to something worthwhile and listen to it intelligently. I have the strongest feelings as far as this mass communication is concerned, and as far as radio broadcasting is concerned for Barbados. We are looking forward to what the Government has to say on the matter, especially since the Minister has had some discussion on this matter. I regret that it is not mentioned as a particular item in His Excellency's address. We need in any situation like this, to set certain goals.

If I may summarise from reading and studying the comprehensive speech which His Excellency the Governor has given to this Chamber and which I know is a programme of policy of the Government, I say that we have two particular set of goals to which we are aiming. One is from the Federal level; and that is, what can we really contribute for the benefit of our own people and for the benefit of the world from the West Indian standpoint? I think that we have a cultural contribution to make. This section is what I would call development for the smaller boys. It is the smaller boys like Nigeria and the West Indies, who are going to turn the scales of the United Nations debate by bringing their collective interest to bear on the bigger and more potential warmongering countries of the world. If you have this fund of idealism in the United Nations, we need to develop our West Indian Federation so that we can make a cultural impact on the debates in United Nations.

On the local scene we need to set up goals on conditions within the general developments of the country, that is, to develop your industries. We must concentrate on the development of our people so that we would be able to develop our industries. If there is the one thing which strikes me with the Deep Water Harbour, it is that our situation would have been a lot happier with the coming into existence of the Deep Water Harbour if, ten years previously, the people had thought of the development of skills for people who might have become displaced workers. If the people at that time had thought of that, these people would have been in a better position to face up to the situation. This is not a political situation, it is an economic situation which could not be helped by anyone.

You could not help developing your Deep Water Harbour; and they are a lot of young men who thought that the only skill needed was to lift a bag of sugar; therefore, you get the feeling in this agricultural atmosphere that you need one particular skill. Now you are changing over, people are not yet developed from the point of view of having skills to take care of themselves to the extent which you would like, in this period of transition. Therefore, I say from the point of view of local goals, you certainly need to put our energy into the social development of our people. With these remarks, I beg to move that the Address which I read out at the beginning do now pass.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasant duty now to second the motion for the passing of this Address to His Excellency the Governor. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has taken a very comprehensive view of this Address and has given us some elaborate things to consider. I do not propose to go over any of the things which he has said, but there is one thing which I would like to bring to the notice of the Government. Although His Excellency the Governor has not said anything with regard to the next Five Year Plan, I think that there are many things which are outstanding which would take the Government another five years to complete; therefore, it is no use taking on more things to do when there are things which you have not yet completed. The Deep Water Harbour is practically finished, but it will take a year or so to bring it to its useful purpose. We have got a new hospital to finish and that is going to take a large sum of money to complete. As to how the Government is going to get the money, that is left to them; they will have to find ways and means to get it.

As regards roads in this country, the programme is fairly well developed; and if things continue as they are at present, in the next two years or so we will have very little road work to do and will have to look for development along other certain lines. It is true that the East Coast Road is being talked about, but that in itself is another Deep Water Harbour; and it will take millions of dollars to finish; therefore if Government undertakes that project they will have a lot on their hands to do. I do not see how they can bring in another comprehensive plan for the next Five years.

Another thing is this, and it is a burning question: We in this country have adopted the policy of retiring individuals in the Public Service at 55 years, or on a doctor's certificate, and then we find immediately after retiring them that those individuals are in full firm health and strong enough to carry on further duties; and you find that they are appointed to other jobs again. That must automatically cease. If a man has obtained a doctor's certificate of ill health, well then, he is unable to undertake further duties, therefore, young men must be given the opportunity to perform those duties which you give to these people after they have resigned. I am speaking from the bottom of my heart and not from the point of view of building any row with anybody. I feel that the Government means well by doing so, but finally that costs this Government a lot of money. Besides that, you have the compulsory retiring age at 60 years. I say that the retiring age should be 65 years. A man at 60 years in this country is quite strong enough to carry on his duties efficiently. There are a few instances in which a man is sickly at that age, and will not be able to carry on; therefore, automatically, he will have to retire; but the majority of people in the Service at that age are quite able to carry on. Those are the things which can be rectified.

We come to Old Age Pensions. I am a believer in giving a man as much as we possibly can; but from my experience in Local Government I have come to the conclusion that there are some people at 65 years, 64, and 63 years who are more deserving of old age pension than some at 68 years.

5.15 p.m.

Now if this Government is not in a position financially to increase the Old Age Pension from \$1.80 per week to whatever they may feel like carrying it, the best thing for the Government to do is to reduce the qualifying age from sixty-eight to sixty-five years, and thereby bring in those people who would be in line to receive the pension. I know that in order to reduce the qualifying age from sixty-eight years to sixty-five, that will cost this country no less than half a million dollars. It would be better to give more people the \$1.80 per week having reduced the qualifying age to sixty-five years than to increase the figure of \$1.80 to \$2.40. In that way you will be helping more people who deserve help. I am therefore asking the Government that, if they do not see their way to reduce the qualifying age from sixty-eight years to sixty-five and bring in more people, then they should make the Old Age Pension a little more than \$1.80 per week. It is impossible for anybody to do anything more with \$1.80 per week than just buy milk. There are lots of things which the Government should forego and

give these unfortunate people something more on which to live. I am not saying what these things should cost; that can better be said in council; but I do know that there are things which the Government could forego and give these unfortunate people a little more.

So much has been said with regard to the policy of the Government by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I do not want to keep the House too long; the Opposition will probably take another day to reply and make this question a sore point. In passing an Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech, it is not so much a question of debate or telling a man what he should do or what he should not have done; you want to co-operate and do something for the country.

It is impossible for the Governor to visualise and say everything he would do for the country; this is a Reply to the Governor's Address and for us, as members of this House, whether we are backbenchers or Ministers, this is the time in our lives when we can speak with authority and independence. (Laughter) Every member of this House has the opportunity of putting forward his point of view, and I am not going to fail in that. I can stand before Your Honour and speak for about another hour or two, but what is the use of going over something which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has already covered? Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasant duty to second the motion for the passing of this Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member who has just sat down, is at last a convert to my proposal which has been repeated Session after Session for about ten or twelve years, almost since the introduction of the Old Age Pension Act: that the age-limit should be reduced to a minimum of sixty-five years. I am now proposing an amendment to the Address as moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, by the deletion of the ultimate paragraph thereof and the substitution of one in its place. The substituted paragraph, which I propose to number (2) and which I beg formally now to move be that paragraph, reads as follows:-

"2. The House notes - and deplures - the complete absence of mention in the Speech of very many matters of exceptional and outstanding import, such as *inter alia*:-

Single member constituencies;

Comprehensive up-to-date Statement of Policy relative to public passenger transport;

Compulsory Education;

Free hot midday meals at public Elementary Schools;

Erection of new Grammar Schools;

Amendment to Old Age Pension Act;

Acceptance of principle of equal pay for equal work regardless of sex;

Provision for females to be eligible for Jury service.

Nevertheless the House affirms its readiness to consider thoroughly all measures introduced into this Chamber, and to support such as are genuinely *pro bono publico*."

The amendment which the Opposition is putting forward to the Reply to the Governor's Address will read with the first paragraph as it stands, and with the new substituted second paragraph entirely in place of the original paragraph 2.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding and most noticeable feature of the Governor's Speech at the opening of this Session was its omissions. I have specified a certain number - they are by no means all - in the amended paragraph which I am offering to be substituted for the deleted paragraph 2 as proposed by my motion. I will go through the various aspects of the Address and make comments as I go on. In

the Section of the Speech dealing with the Constitution I notice that this is what was said:-

"The freedom of action of the Judiciary from executive interference will be preserved, the Attorney General will retain freedom of action in those matters which are traditionally the functions of his office....."

It may well be that the Attorney General should not continue to retain freedom of action in those matters which are traditionally the functions of his office if, in permitting him to retain such freedom, we find obvious instances in which the Senior Crown Law Officer fails to institute proceedings in matters which are obviously crying out to be placed before a judicial tribunal for arbitrament.
5.25 p.m.

There have been obvious cases recently in which no attempt has been made by the Attorney General to institute proceedings against people of a certain type and of fair complexion, when, in another instance of a person of a dark complexion and an exactly similar type of case, proceedings were instituted by that office. The Rediffusion broadcasted a calypso over the air in respect of persons awaiting trial on a charge of murder. No more clearer contempt of Court, Mr. Speaker, could possibly have occurred. The result is that, since the calypso, we have had what many people have described as a calypso verdict by a Jury. Fortunately there are other tribunals which may in certain cases redress the balance, and do what lie in their somewhat restricted powers to ensure that justice is done un-influenced by banner headlines in newspapers and unaffected by calypsoes over Rediffusion in respect of people who are awaiting trial.

It is significant that the one case of the apparent cases of Contempt of Court recently by publication either over the air or in the Press, in which action was instituted, was the case in which the person charged was of a different complexion from that of the holder of the office of Attorney General in this island. So, Sir, it might well be that in certain instances it is not in the interest of justice in this Island that the Attorney General should retain his freedom of action in these matters which are traditionally the functions of his office if his office is going to discriminate and to pick and choose whom it is going to prosecute; and one sees from the result of that picking and choosing, that blondes escape the attention of his office, but the brunettes are singled out for special treatment by that office.

Now proceeding, Sir, to another paragraph under the same head, Constitution, His Excellency's Address says "after a year's experience here, I do not personally consider that the office of Chief Secretary need be replaced by one of Governor's Secretary as most of the duties formerly performed by the Chief Secretary are now being devolved upon various Ministries. As the House has accepted the terms of the Secretary of State's despatch No. 379 of the 15th September, 1959, which included a proposal that a post Governor's Secretary be created when the post of Chief Secretary is abolished, the matter will be referred back to the House shortly."

What interests me about that paragraph, Mr. Speaker, is that this is an Address prepared by and is the policy of Her Majesty's present Ministers in this country. I am sure every member in this community realises that, with the possible exception of the hon. member who spoke immediately before I did; he seems still to be very vague as to the authorship, or who is responsible for the Address in respect of which he was seconding the motion forwarding a reply. If this is an Address, as it must be taken to be, of the Queen's Ministers, and the point of view of Her Majesty's present advisers in this island, one wonders how this sentence crept in; and what is the significance of it when His Excellency said "I do not personally consider that the office of Chief Secretary need be replaced by one of Governor's Secretary." That would not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is putting forward or stating the attitude of the members of the Cabinet; it could never be; and I would like one of Her Majesty's Ministers, if any one of them sees fit to join in this debate, to explain what they regard as the significance and the reason for the inclusion of this sentence and the particular phrase in the sentence.

My third reference to this Address, Mr. Speaker, deals with the paragraph on Tourist Development, and particularly the statement that "the primary aim of the Board is to encourage more tourists to visit the island during the summer and so ensure that hotels are full throughout the year. With this in view, the Board has been doing its utmost through travel agents, airlines and steamship companies to bring about a reduction in fares."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is all well and good; but it is not, in my view, sufficient for the Board to do its utmost to bring about a reduction in fares by airlines and steamship companies, while doing nothing to bring about a reduction in the fares charged by hotels which are recommended by the same Tourist Board. I understand that there have been for this season increases in rates at many hotels. I would be glad if the Hon. Minister within whose portfolio these matters come would investigate, and let us know if it is a fact that there have not only been increases in fares but a reduction in meals.
5.35 p.m.

I do not mean in the quality. Certain hotels which serve three meals daily charge you the increased rate for two meals — breakfast and dinner; lunch is not included in the daily rate but to be paid for extra in case the guest decides to take lunch at his own hotel. You cannot hope to increase the number of guests and keep your hotels full throughout the year, even if you reduce the transportation cost, if on the other hand, you are increasing the cost of the accommodation at the hotels.

What is necessary too, in respect of tourist development is a genuine attempt to cater for the middle-class man, particularly the Englishman who is not as well off as his American counterpart, and who cannot pay \$20 per day and such other charges for his hotel board and lodging. I am told by quite a few English folk that they would come out to this island and spend their annual vacation if they could be assured of cheap hotel rates of accommodation; nothing above \$12 a day would their pockets be able to afford. I see no reason why decent, adequate and respectable board and lodging could not be provided at that rate as a maximum for the middle-class person who would like a holiday abroad and who would like to come to the West Indies and meet the people of these units.

There are some guest houses whose charges are reasonable. I know it is possible to get for \$6 or \$7 a day accommodation at certain guest houses; and I would say that it is excellent for the money. But there are too few of those; and those cannot cater for the considerable influx of visitors who would come here if they were assured of being able to get accommodation at the rate which they want.

Sir, under the head of Labour, which will be my fourth comment, there is stated in that paragraph: "On the 30th September, 1960, 5,200 persons were registered as unemployed at the Employment Exchange." Now, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister of Labour regards that number of 5,200 as being anything like a true picture of the number of unemployed in this island, registered as well as not registered, on the date in question. I wonder whether he regards that as presenting quite a false picture, or whether he feels the number of 5,200 represents a true state of affairs. If he does not regard this as representing a true state of affairs, I would urge that active steps be taken to encourage every possible unemployed human being in this island who is seeking employment to register; or by some other means let the Ministry find out and be in a position to tell Parliament what really is the number of unemployed persons in this island in crop or out of crop.

The number of 5,200 is an absolute and complete understatement. Of course that is only a statement of those who were registered, but it is an understatement as to the total number of unemployed in this island. I would very much like to get some reliable figures of the number of unemployed in the island. Even though the number might shock us, we would know the magnitude. Members of the Cabinet would realise the magnitude of the unemployment with which this island is faced.

Mr. Speaker, if I may return to Transport. I made specific reference in my amendment to the motion when I mentioned the omission in the Speech of an up-to-date system of policy relative to transport. We remember, Mr. Speaker, around June last year when our agitation was apace to keep the pick-ups on the road, that a statement was laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Transport, but that was vague, nebulous, and said practically nothing at all. It gave us the minimum of information.

What the Government has to decide, what the Minister has to make up his mind about, is whether we are going to continue running the public transport system with only certain of the routes while other routes are being run by separate private individual concessionaires. That unsatisfactory state of affairs cannot be allowed to go on indefinitely; and it is time that the Minister take his courage in his hands and present his policy to the Cabinet and let the Cabinet put it to Parliament: that their policy is to take over all the routes now run by the private concessionaires so that all routes may be serviced by the Transport Board.

You are preventing your Board making a proper success of their undertaking if you fail to put all of the routes and all of the buses in the hands of the Transport Board. The Government's attitude should really be that the time has come to make up their minds. If you do not give us all, you must have all or none. If it is a state of affairs where the Hon. Minister of Transport is unable to make up his mind to present a proper scheme to his Cabinet for presentation to the Legislature, that is not good enough; it has been going on too long. The Hon. Premier must realise what is happening. If the Hon. Minister is unable to make up his mind, if he is unable to come to a decision, just invite him to hand in his resignation and appoint somebody else if you have somebody else to appoint whom you think is less incompetent; or you can change your Ministries around by giving Social Services to the Minister who is unable to formulate a comprehensive statement of policy on the future of public passenger transport.

Under the Head of Education, there is mention in the Address that, with regard to Secondary Grammar Schools, work on the extension of St. Michael's Girls' School has begun. This extension will provide accommodation for another 200 pupils. That, Mr. Speaker, is totally inadequate. It suggests a complete lack of imagination and knowledge to handle this problem of education. What we need is more Grammar Schools.
5.45 p.m.

We know that the Government is very fond of erecting buildings, and, in fact, it is the only thing which the Government is doing. Of course, that is a very useful means of keeping workmen employed, but there are no buildings more necessary to be erected in this island than new Grammar Schools. They are the only things which will safeguard the future of the people of this colony. You have children who have perforce, as they cannot get into the well-run Government secondary schools, to attend the so-called secondary schools with inadequate accommodation, primitive sanitation, and teachers who have not got the desirable academic qualifications, because the Government refuses or declines to build or refrains from building more Grammar Schools.

It is said that supply creates demand. We have a tremendous demand, an insatiable thirst for secondary education, but there is no attempt by the Government to do anything about the matter, except to provide a half-hearted additional accommodation for school children. It is a question of having buildings and school places for many more children; and of having well-qualified teachers; otherwise, you might leave yourself open to the charge that you are not making any serious provision for the children of this country who will be the adults of tomorrow and who will be responsible for the running of this country in all its various phases of activity in years to come. That will be so unless, of course, the Government feels that too many children feel the need for secondary education.

I do not think that there would be any great difficulty, or any difficulty at all, in getting sites for these schools;

the greatest difficulty, of course, will be in getting teachers, but that difficulty will not be an insurmountable one. You will be able to get a reasonable number of teachers to staff your Grammar Schools if they are built this year; you will be able to get superior material to that which you have got at these schools which are springing up so quickly. I have never ceased to deplore the change in the award of certificates; you can now get a certificate for a particular subject; and when some people have got through the schools they announce that they have certificates in History and Religious Knowledge, and in the next year they have one for English Literature.

In the old days you would have the London Matriculation; there were certain compulsory subjects which you would have to get through; and unless you got through in five or six subjects, you did not get any certificate at all. It may be that a change was desirable in respect of these examinations, and in relation to compulsory subjects; some of us might never be able to do Mathematics but we may be very good in certain other subjects. In the case where Mathematics is a compulsory subject, then it may be difficult to get a certificate, but what is wrong with that is that we want to have some alternatives.

In this Speech from the Throne, no reference has been made to the Public Library being open at night. This is one of my hardy annuals; and every year, whoever represents the Government, always tells me that that matter is under consideration. If I am not mistaken, the Minister of Education told me that last year.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I did tell the hon. member that; and I also told him a few weeks ago that he could see that consideration was being given to the matter. So much so, we have had the Library extended.

Mr. BRANCKER: The only thing is, I am looking forward to a thing like that taking place in my lifetime, and in the lifetime of the Hon. Minister. I have been agitating for that along with the abolition of the Grand Jury and the establishment of the Government Printery; well, we have the Government Printery, and we have not got the Grand Jury. I am looking forward to meeting the Minister at the Library at night where we might discuss matters of literacy and leave out politics for the time being.

Then there is the Head, "Medical and Health Services". The most striking feature relative to this Head in the Address of His Excellency the Governor, is the absence of any reference to the staffing by Nurses and Specialists. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one on the Hospital Staff is more essential than a Nurse. We know that certain indispensable Specialist duties are performed by the qualified Medical and Surgical Staff; but the most brilliant Surgeon may perform the finest operation and if there is no proper nursing, the patient will still meet with the undertaker in a short space of time. There is the necessity for a fully-qualified Nursing Staff which has to be adequately paid. I know I will be told that there is the proposal to have a salary revision, but the rate of remuneration for qualified Nurses in this island is so low, having regard to the cost of living, that the matter cannot be attended to by way of a general salary revision. This is something like the Postmasters and Postmistresses with their multifarious duties.
5.55 p.m.

You have to consider giving them a substantial increase by themselves, and then letting them also be participants in the general increase in the all-round salaries revision and adjustment.

I have heard only a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, as I did a couple of years previously, that steps should be made to obtain a Specialist in Cerebro Surgery for the General Hospital. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have in this island any highly qualified Specialist in cardiac diseases. If I am wrong, of course I will be corrected by the Hon. Premier who is himself a medical man. I would like to know whether in these cases of cerebro surgery - two or three of which have cropped up among people of the poorer classes since I raised the question some time

ago in this Chamber - the University College Hospital of the West Indies would be able to deal with such cases as those we have sent to Edinburgh.

I was gratified to learn that only a few days ago the Minister for Education, although health is not his portfolio yet he must be as interested in health as all thinking persons in this community are, paid a visit to Jamaica. I would not at all be surprised if he could shed some light on this matter of the staffing at the U.C.W.I. Hospital, and whether they are able yet to deal with cases of cerebro surgery. We discussed the matter in this Chamber a short while before he left the island the other day, and since then he has been to Jamaica, and I have no doubt that he has taken the trouble to make enquiries and will not keep the results of his enquiries to himself, but will let us know what the U.C.W.I. can do for us in this respect.

There is only one doctor in this island who I know is regarded as a heart specialist; but I think he is so regarded because of the absence of any such highly qualified specialists. His brother practitioners feel him the best in the island on his particular subject and call him into consultation. I have known of many cases where they have had a difficult problem to solve; but, in the true sense of the term, I do not think he can fittingly be regarded as a heart specialist as such.

Under the Head "Local Government", Mr. Speaker, we are promised in the Governor's Address that we may expect certain legislation which would be amending legislation to the Local Government Act, 1958. I hope that that legislation will have some reference to expenditure and create some reasonable limitation on the expenditure of travelling in respect of Local Government Councillors. In the old days under the Vestry system, except in the case of the Churchwarden, the Chairman of the Poor Law Board, there was nothing provided for travelling. I would like very much, of course not on this occasion, to ascertain what is really being expended out of Local Government funds for Councillors' travelling. I understand the amount is by no means insignificant or negligible. The figures would be worthwhile to study; and I hope soon to have an opportunity of studying them; and what the Government has in mind in respect of its Local Government legislation will, I hope, also make provision to put a curb on any extravagant spending in respect of travelling by the Local Government Councillors.

The next Head which calls for comment, Mr. Speaker, is that of the Fire Brigade. Mention is made of the new Fire Station in St. James which was occupied in March, 1960. I had hoped and expected that there would have been reference to at least two more fire stations at strategic points in this island, especially when we consider how much is lost in the economy of this island by fire, and the importance not only of property but of life in keeping fire under immediate control. I would be surprised if the Chief Fire Officer and his Deputy would not recommend at least two more fire stations at strategic points of this island to cope with the demands on their services. Three are obviously manifestly inadequate - one in Bridgetown, one in Christ Church and one in St. James.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Windward coast of this island deserves one Fire Station if not two, along that area in St. Philip, St. John, St. Joseph, St. Andrew and the eastern part of St. Peter and St. Lucy. I see the need for at least two more Fire Stations in the immediate future. Government should seek the advice of the Fire Officer on this matter, and if he agrees with me to the necessity for such, take the necessary steps to send down a Resolution to Parliament for the purpose of giving effect to that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I notice under the Head "Civil Service" that the Government proposes, in keeping with other territories in the Caribbean area, to have a salaries revision during the forthcoming year.

6.05 p.m.

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

When, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard, and subsequently read, that the Government proposes a Salaries Revision in keeping with the other territories in the Caribbean, I thought I was not hearing or reading right. Surely what the Governor meant was: "My Government proposes in keeping with established practice every election year in this island since my Government has been in power that there will be a Salaries Revision during the forthcoming year to ensure that Government employees will attend the poll boxes with a satisfied feeling that the Government has provided them with an increase just before the date of the election." We have passed the buck and we are putting the blame on the other territories within the Caribbean area. They are revising salaries and we say that we are revising salaries too.

Who is going to revise salaries? Whether it is a West Indian Commissioner, a Barbadian, or the Cabinet, there is one thing which I must remind the Government and it is that they must start from the people in the lowest rung of the ladder, and must ensure that every such person gets a minimum wage on which he can live and maintain his household having regard to the present cost of living. If on completion of that, there is no more money available for salaries and the people at the top find that there is nothing for them, well there is nothing for them. That is all there is about it. It is the people in the lowest rung of the financial ladder who need a salaries revision. As regards those at the top, Your Honour knows that the more you have, the more you want; the more money you receive, the more you want to receive. But certainly, the average Head of Department, the average non-specialist, draws a salary of \$300 or \$400 a month and there is no justification to give them any more. To give them more, it would mean that the people at the bottom would not be able to get sufficient to keep them and for them to live in decency.

Sir, you know that it was quite a revelation when the Hon. Minister of Education told us of this Chamber what a free luncheon for school children would cost the island as we had advocated - a free hot midday meal for the population of public elementary schools. If a meal for the children provided by the Government which is non-profit making, works out at a cost of 55 cents, well then let the Government in making its salary adjustments ensure that its most lowly paid workers will be in receipt of a sufficient increase in salary as a result of this year's election salaries revision; that these workers will be receiving as much as will enable them to provide three meals per day for themselves and members of their household, and on a basis as they have suggested, that the lunch for a child would cost 55 cents. I think that Combermere School provided such a meal for 36 cents.

Anyhow, in respect of this year's salaries revision, we do not want a small, infinitesimal, negligible increase on the wages of those at the bottom while the man at the top gets \$50 or \$100 per month as an increase, and with all the perquisites which obtain to his office. Of course the professional man or woman must be paid adequately, otherwise you will not be able to get them; but the other people who have no special qualifications and who are already adequately paid, at least so paid that they can provide for the wants and necessities of their household, do not deserve any consideration unless you can satisfy the worker in the lowest paid category that he is getting an adequate minimum wage having regard to the cost of living and the expenses of running his household at the minimum standard of decency even if not of comfort and certainly not of luxury.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that I have made the comments which are most pertinent. I support the passing of the amendment which I have formally made to the Address which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, who is the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. In the course of my address, I would like to draw certain things to the Government. It is true that I

did not hear all of the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; and the parts which I heard, I do not like; but as regards the part where he made reference to the Civil Servants and their attitude to the new change, the Hon. Leader of the House made a correction which I would have made myself.

Sir, I am not going through this whole speech by the Head of the Administration. First of all, I would like to compliment the Government for the constitutional changes which are to come about, although I would like to know, from whoever is replying on behalf of the Government, why is it at this stage that there is still to be a further stage to reach towards internal self-government. What is keeping back our having full internal self-government?

I will tell the Hon. Premier what I mean by this. I believe that the Hon. Premier would see my points quicker than his predecessor; he sees certain fundamental issues in our governing ourselves in common with me. As I have said on many occasions, it is better to govern ourselves badly than to let people govern you. I do not personally consider that the office of Chief Secretary needs to be replaced by one of Governor's Secretary.
6.15 p.m.

I think I can find the debate in this Chamber in which I said that I did not believe that this post was necessary. I believe that there is a temptation in Barbados for us to follow others too much in this matter of constitutional changes. We feel that if Jamaica has a Governor's Secretary then we must have one, and so in the case of Trinidad. With my experience of Government House and of the Administration, I cannot see what a Governor's Secretary would have to do. I am pleased to know that that is not the Governor's views; I would compliment the Governor on his views.

Let us change the laws about the marriage licences and all that the Chief Secretary has to do in connection with them. When you consider what the Chief Secretary has to deal with marriage licences and things like that, I feel that we should get down to doing real work. If we want the same constitution which there is in Great Britain, well then, let us have it. I do not see why we should have anything less.

In his Address in connection with the Constitution, this is what the Governor said:-

"The membership of the Executive Committee will thus consist of the Governor, the Attorney General and the Ministers, as the post of Chief Secretary is to be abolished." The membership will then only consist of the Governor, the Attorney General and the Ministers.

The Governor went on to say this:-

"By convention the Governor will accept the advice of the Ministers on all matters falling within the powers and functions of that Committee. Full responsibility for the well being of this Island will then rest with the Cabinet answerable through the House of Assembly to the people of Barbados. The Secretary of State will no longer have any control over the Barbados Civil Service. The freedom of action of the Judiciary from executive interference will be preserved, the Attorney General will retain freedom of action in those matters which are traditionally the functions of his office....."

I do not agree with this Judiciary business. In 1953 when the former Premier was there, I had some differences with him, and, afterwards, I said that I could not speak to him but that I would write him. The Hon. Leader of the House purported to quote a letter I wrote to the Premier; and in a letter to the Press he said that I said that the Premier and the Ministers should have drivers with frock coats and so on.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have never said that the hon. member had written anything to the Premier. I dealt with the proposals put up by the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: His letter was written in the Advocate Newspaper on the 6th May, 1956. It is only that the lawyers are lazy otherwise the matter would not have been dealt with as it is being dealt with today. What I said then I still mean now. This is what I wrote to the then Premier:-

"I am of the opinion that if Barbados is to have Ministerial Government, it should be as close to reality as possible and not merely a gesture of some constitutional change. The power and responsibility for running the country should be placed in the hands of the elected representatives without the reservations stated in the Despatch. For us to accept these proposals our position in the Caribbean would become lower than the others. The Gold Coast has made rapid progress and is about to get more - and will get more too. I feel, therefore, that we should insist on the greater measure of responsibility."

It was the Gold Coast then, but it is now Ghana, the independent Republic of Ghana; therefore in 1961 my prognosis has come to be true.

Now we come to the specific question of the Boards and I said this: "I do not like the idea of the Police Advisory Board. Without Ministerial status we are trying to eliminate Boards and frankly, to set up a Board of this kind at the same time as the introduction of Ministerial status is a compromise which I do not accept." In 1953 I told the Premier that I did not like the idea of these Boards. The Hon. Minister has said that I had a lot of power with the Premier, but the other members did not hold such views, otherwise the Police Advisory Board might not have been established. This is what I went on to say:-

"This is another instance of fright. The Police Department is not like Education or some other aspect of Government that you need the views of the public to assist with the functions of the Department. I know it is the view of some of the officials of the Colonial Office that they cannot entrust law and order to natives. If there must be a compromise, put this department under the control of the Colonial Secretary."

The Colonial Secretary would therefore be on that sort of make-shift system; and the Police would become the duty of the Home Secretary as it is in England. If Mr. Butler is the Home Secretary and he is going to see after the Police, you do not want to have the situation here where you are incapable of dealing with these matters. I went further and said this:-

"I see no valid reasons to place the Judiciary, Magistracy and Registry under the control of the Chief Justice..."

The Chief Justice has got to be under somebody. We are not treating him as if he is the Head of a Department in that context. There must be a Minister responsible for Justice as in England. I do not see any reason why this old Colonial System must exist. We want to be able to function in the same manner as obtains in England. The hon. member does not understand these constitutional matters. You do not have to read Jennings; when you are entirely self-governing it means that you have complete control over every aspect of Government. Sovereignty in Great Britain means that you control everything; it is not a question of any soft-soaping.
6.25 p.m.

In England there is a Director of Prosecutions, and he takes orders from the Attorney General as to whom to prosecute; the Minister, Mr. Butler, does not want to prosecute somebody for jumping over a person's pailing. There are instances - just like here when they rushed me before the Court with a lot of bogus foolishness about the elections in which it was alleged that I spent \$4,000 - where when the Attorney General brings a case like that, and it is just a political case. If I were running the Government and a case like that was brought up, I would tell the Attorney General to go and look for people to convict on something and not bring these bogus cases; it would give the impression that it is a political case. The Government has

to protect itself against prosecutions that would give the wrong impression.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this happened in England, as I mentioned last week, when Sir Patrick Hastings was Attorney General and brought a case against Mr. C. R. Campbell. I do not leave anything to a man's judgment, just like the Premier today. I am of the opinion that Barbados should have complete self-government and that the Judiciary and the Magistracies should come within the portfolio of a Minister of Justice. There should be a Ministry of Justice or a Department *vis-a-vis* the Home Secretary in the United Kingdom, and there should be nothing short of that. Why do you want a Police Board? Why does that Department want a Police Board? To tell a man when to go off duty?

From the time there was some difficulty in British Guiana in 1953, there was the idea that you could not place Police in the hands of local administration. The whole idea is that these are black policemen and black Ministers, and they may turn loose black policemen on the white people and nothing would be done about it. The idea of these people living in England is that we would not know how to govern; and if what has happened in the Congo had happened before we had a semblance of self-government, they would have brought that and said "you see when you give them control what happens?" because these prognostications were made all the way back in 1950 and 1951 that we could not have self-government.

When I heard the Minister say today that you must go to the people on this question of single member constituencies, that is why I said that he is talking like a Conservative. The Colonial Secretary had the brass to tell us that, before we could introduce self-government and Ministerial status in Barbados, we should go back and have another election. We asked why we should have another election when we told the people that we believed in this a long time ago. Do you mean that every time we are going to have a change we must have an election? I do not like this habit of trotting out to the electorate this idea that you must go back and have an election because you did not put something to the people. These are views which I wrote in 1953. You would not believe that the Minister of Trade knew these things, and had the effrontery to write what he did in the newspaper. That is why I say that any man who can do these things you have to pray for; he is wicked beyond redemption.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I object to those remarks. The hon. member has read a lot of stuff, and up to now he has not dealt with the one question with respect to salaries and perquisites for Ministers. Is he going to say to this House that he has never raised the question of salaries and perquisites? The Hon. Premier was present; the meeting took place in the Hon. Premier's house.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot pump the Premier enough. The Premier knows that I wrote a letter to the former Premier telling him that I was clearing out; so do not tell me about the Premier.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member did write a letter. All of us are asked to send in our resignations as soon as a new Premier is appointed. But I am speaking about the letter sent by the Chief Secretary to some island in which the hon. member was at the time, telling him that he was no longer a member of the Executive Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member does not know what I am talking about. This was in 1954 and not 1953; I was not out of the island in 1953. It was in January 1954 that I was in Costa Rico. (Hon. M. E. COX: That is not true.) The hon. member says that is not true. Now when a man is so stupid as to say something is not true in which he was not a participant, what kind of fool is he? Is he not a convulsed fool? I wrote a letter to the former Premier after a dispute I had with him, but he is saying I did not send this letter to the.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think this letter has anything to do with the debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: With constitutional development?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you mean the particular letter about which you are speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: You allowed the Minister to get up on a point of order and speak about a letter, so I would like to know why he was permitted to speak of a letter of which he knew nothing?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard him say that you wrote something, and the hon. member, I took it, was replying to this.

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to set the records straight by saying that he does not know what letter I am talking about.

Hon. M. E. COX: Neither does the public!

Mr. WALCOTT: What I did intend saying, but the hon. member did not allow me to say, is that I spoke to the Premier on the matter long before 1954, but he is now saying that it is not true. I do not know if he happens to be the Premier's double that he knows it is not true. I had no discussion with him, but he knows it is not true that I had a discussion with the Premier. When a man can speak on something like that, what kind of fool is he?
6.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are making sport.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are the most wicked thing to which a woman ever gave birth.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I object to that statement. I cannot go down in the gutter with the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: When you make *sotto voce* remarks and you get over there and behave as you are doing, I can get down in the gutter with you.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am appealing to both hon. members. The kind of language which is being used across the House is certainly unparliamentary and does not do this Hon. Chamber any good. Have your say, talk your talk, but let it be on a high level. Let us get away from these objectionable statements which serve no purpose but which have a very bad reflection on the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, you must have the patience of Job and the hind of a rhinoceros to get away from the Hon. Leader of the House when you are debating these things. However you ignore him, he still comes back. He is one of these perennial bad pennies.

Hon. M. E. COX: The truth stings.

Mr. WALCOTT: It stings one way. The truth is a one-way traffic. The hon. member believes that the truth is for himself. Why should a Prime Minister accept a lower salary than that of a Colonial Secretary? His status must precede that of the Colonial Secretary who is a pensionable officer; the Premier is not a pensionable officer. Moreover it is an insult to ask even the Prime Minister of Tortola to accept \$600 as travelling and entertainment allowance. Which Prime Minister would you want to give \$600 to as travelling and entertainment allowance? I said that that was no money for a Prime Minister. Is that giving a man a frock coat? It is because of their own strong feeling of inferiority running through the whole thing that you get that remark. I said then that I did not agree with the salaries. My view is that you cannot have any objection to paying the people who hold the highest and most responsible posts in the island. It is not a job for a lifetime where you are going to get a pension along with salary. We must have vision and be able enough to face these issues. What in that is there for anyone to be ashamed about? What is in that for anyone to connote that you want perquisites?

The Hon. Minister wrote a letter which was published in the *Advocate* of May, 1956, saying that I had

set out in a memorandum to the then Premier, among other things, that what I wanted was a man to have a frock coat and the Ministers to have chauffeurs. When they asked him if they could find the note on that, he searched up hill and down dale and could not find a thing about it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member continues to say what he cares to say because there is nobody to substantiate it. Nobody asked me to find anything I wrote. What I said about what the member said is gospel truth, and what he propounded at the present Premier's home as regards salaries, perquisites, loans for cars, and everything else.

Mr. WALCOTT: He could not even help bringing the Hon. Premier into that. This is no Premier's house in my hand; this is the document which you wrote. My wife told me that he also said that in campaigning in the last election, I can bring the "Advocate" newspaper with that letter.

Now, this is a letter dated 31st July, 1953. It reads as follows:-

"Dear Grantley, - I am giving careful consideration to this."

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member cares to quote the letter in full, I am definitely sure that the letter does not say that. Let him quote the letter.

Mr. WALCOTT: The same newspaper asked me to accept an apology and I said that I did not want any apology from them. The then acting editor of the newspaper was Mr. Paul Foster, who is now Manager of the Tourist Board. When he got the letter from him, he rushed off and published it. When they saw the manuscript, they then found out that the letter did not square with that, and they were willing to make an apology to me. Against what I read, he says now that I said it at the Premier's house.

Hon. M. E. COX: Did we meet there or not?

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is a confirmed hypocrite.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am asking the hon. member whether we met at Dr. Cummin's house.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is all this passage of words relevant to the reply to the Governor's Speech? I respectfully say that it has nothing at all to do with it. I am asking you to rule so that it will not continue.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, it is not anything unusual, whenever I begin to speak on anything, for the Hon. Minister to get up; I am prepared for that. I am saying that it is relevant. This document is a letter written by me to the then Premier on constitutional changes, and I was drawing this letter to the attention of this House. In passing, I dealt with other issues which arose at that time, which were views suggested by me, but which were never stated.

Eight years after a thing like that happened, somebody comes along with the bright idea that they have a *verbatim* memory of an eight-year-old conversation in detail; but when they see what you have in writing about it, they say that it is not anywhere in writing. What can you do with a man who is capable of that sort of thing? This letter can be put in evidence against him.
6.45 p.m.

In this note I said: "My view is that the community cannot have any objection to paying the people who hold the highest and most responsible posts in the island an adequate salary....."

Did I say that the Ministers should not be paid or that they should not receive any allowance? Could you expect

a man to be a Minister and not be paid? Even the Ministers in the Church who preach about the future need something in the material sense here. In relation to the Judiciary the same system could be worked here as obtains in the United Kingdom, but let it be known that you have a Minister; everybody must come under the ambit of the Minister. I would not say what the then Premier gave as his reasons for not wanting to have that; these are private and confidential matters. If the present Premier is also of that view, I would not say what it is. On the constitutional position, I have said what I feel on the question of the Governor's Secretary; and I hope the Government will not implement it.

What I feel is a serious omission in the Governor's Address is a clear-cut statement on the question of policy in so far as employment goes. I do not know if the Premier or the Government is aware that one of the greatest changes through which Barbados is passing is, technologically, the employment changes. As to the Deep Water Harbour, the construction of that harbour and the installation of bulk loading of sugar is something which has not taken place in any Caribbean territory at any phase of its history. It is indeed a known fact that in Barbados sugar represents the major portion of this island exportable crop; no where in the world has any major industrial change taken place at one time which has affected so much of the population as this is going to affect. Nothing I say should be taken that I am in disagreement with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour; what I say is that this economic and financial metamorphosis, which has taken place, means that 160,000 of the 180,000 tons of sugar are now being handled in a completely different fashion suddenly. The Deep Water Harbour is going to be a sudden happening; it has not happened so in other spheres.

All the windmills did not come down in one day; neither did all the factories close down in one day; but all the sugar is now being shipped in a different way, the Port is going to be handled in a different way, and the minimum unemployed number of people will be about 100,000; thereby the purchasing power of those who work with the loading and unloading of sugar in these warehouses will be reduced. The bulk installation will employ considerably less people. We have been informed that the number of people who will be required will not exceed, at the most, 500 people and therefore you will have no fewer than 10,000 outside. I am saying this so as to draw the enormity of the situation to the attention of the Government, that with every thousand people not employed, notwithstanding the financial factor, there will be about \$1 million out of circulation. In other words, it means that the spending power of people will be reduced. Notwithstanding the fact that some will receive some compensation, I believe that a metamorphosis of this nature requires a metamorphosis in our thinking, and we cannot accept this process without thinking a great deal. There is the old slogan that while the grass is growing the horse is starving, so that we require a different treatment for this metamorphosis.

I am of the opinion, therefore, that the Government of Barbados should endeavour to set up or encourage the setting up of a development conference. It seems to me that you should not go past the 1st April, before you begin to make a study of this problem. There should be a development conference not later than April this year with broad terms of reference, namely, to study the social and economic problems of Barbados resulting from these sweeping technological changes.
6.55 p.m.

These are some of the necessary subjects for consideration I have written down:

- (1) the condition of the wage earning population;
- (2) the pattern of Barbados and Caribbean economy today; and
- (3) future prospects and potentialities.

I say that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because there are people being laid off in the Port and at factories; and in

the sugar industry technological changes are being planned at all levels. There is the possibility that more factories will close down; Fairfield factory may close down next year, and the Guinea in St. John may also close. The days are numbered for all the small factories manufacturing 4,000 tons of sugar annually. Since we have these things before us we should not wait until the evil day comes to make a study of them. This is a national situation, and not a political one.

That is one of the serious omissions from the Governor's Speech which is the Government's policy; and if the Mover of the motion was here, I would ask as an amendment that Government institute a Development Conference not later than 1st April, 1961 to make a study of the social and economic problems as a result of these swift, technological changes. The Premier will realise that I say that in all sincerity; and from my experience as a Trade Unionist who sees the problems before me. The impact on the social services in 1961 will be terrific, because, although we have given help, hon. members will realise that monetary assistance to a man who has been accustomed to steady employment, means that even the assistance you give to him is not spent in the same way as money that is earned and spent.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.

On Resumption,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the Suspension I was drawing to the attention of the Government the need for a Development Conference, and I will continue to draw further points to the Government's attention.

Yesterday there was a discussion with some of these Port Contractors; there are some 450 lightermen whose average earning was not negligible, but so far as the Port Contractors are concerned, they have no employment whatsoever for any of these people; there was only a little shipping at Speightstown. At this present moment there are about 300 men who have been accustomed to working at this time with no hope of employment.

What would happen, Mr. Speaker, if by accident, we did not have a fund known as the Ex-Wharf Fund which the Union discovered some years ago in which money should have accrued to workers for sugar which was paid for but went ex-wharf? The Union said that some of this money must go to this Fund; and it reached a proportion of \$240,000. This is a matter which applies to the Government, but I do not believe they want to hear it, because some excuse is going to be made that they know of these things; but the impact of this present situation is that these are men who would have been without a penny had it not been for this Fund; there is nothing available for them to do. The crop has started and these are men who would have been working at this time of the year.

The reason why I am making this statement at this stage is because there is absolutely no plan, or the beginning of any discussion, to say this is the hope for them. These men are left to believe — as I said it is an academic argument — that, as a result of the building of the Deep Water Harbour, this is the situation, but things would settle themselves in that they would find some sort of employment. This is a graver situation than members think; more so because the figures have not been presented to the people. You do not want a repetition of the situation with the coopers who have to waste their life away.

Mr. Speaker, I think a Development Conference is a very necessary thing, not only on the question of the Deep Water Harbour, but on the general economic position in Barbados. I made the point that both Fairfield and Guinea will be going out. We received a request from Guinea after we agreed to these wages asking us to reduce them. We could not agree to that, so you have this serious situation. 7.55 p.m.

The net result today is that the people who are likely to suffer, are the people who have been accustomed to employment; and, as you know, the man who is accustomed to employment is different from a man who has never been employed; a man who has been employed is accustomed to putting his hands to work, therefore, the production which you will get from a man like that is lost.

This is not a situation requiring meagre thinking; or to say that it has happened elsewhere; it has happened here in a way that it has not happened elsewhere. What was the situation in Trinidad? You had the Deep Water Harbour there long before you had bulk installation. In British Guiana and Jamaica it was the same thing; but in Barbados you have your Deep Water Harbour and bulk installation at the same time; therefore, the impact is greater than in any community any part of the world.

Let us think of the U.S.A. and see if there was any project there which they put into being that affected the whole revenue of that country. You have undertaken a project which represents a terrific sum, and if you do not plan in the light of that monumental change, you are not facing up to the change which is going to arise from that. Do not let anybody believe that this is not going to be a serious thing for you. Let us get away from this idea of saying that you have more roads built; and within the context of this situation which is facing us, let us have something where the national effort is concerned. If we had something which would put all the Ministers out of employment, then you would see something; the Ministers are not going to have the sufferings which these people are going to have as a result of the Deep Water Harbour and bulk installation. Hon. members over there seem to be smiling, but, Mr. Speaker, if you were really dealing with people who have the understanding of the seriousness of the situation, they would be more appreciative. Some people have the idea that giving a man 70 weeks' pay would serve a man's life. Do you realise that 70 weeks pay is less than two years? Do you expect that an amount of two years' money can keep a man forever?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I rise on a point of order. It is a bit worrying to see the hon. member pointing remarks at us. All we are asking is that the hon. member be more specific. If he has anything practical to put up, let us know it. Be more practical.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are dealing with a problem. I said from the beginning that I agreed with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour; but because you agree with it, it does not mean that you must lose sight of the effect which it is going to produce. I said from the beginning that as a result of these other technological changes, along with this new Deep Water Harbour, it would require a plan, but not from me. If you want a practical suggestion from me, I would say that you should have some development conference to go into the social and economic situation so that you would be able to get to grips with the situation. You should have a development conference committee set up with wide terms of reference.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government has to wait until Professor Lewis, the LL.O., the Federal Government or somebody come and say that this is what you have to do, well, I say that we will have to wait very long indeed. We must be capable of being able to take the initiative on certain matters ourselves. I want hon. members of the Government to understand that this is not an issue which affects the Government only; it affects all of us.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I rise on a point of order. This is a very important and final matter. It is because we are

not waiting on anybody that we are not setting up any committee to work it out. All of the Ministers are working on it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to humbly submit that we are talking of omissions. There is absolutely nothing in the Governor's Speech which takes into account anything being done as regards to the Deep Water Harbour. The Governor said in his speech that you are going to have a planning unit. What has the Government said about development?
8.00 p.m.

In relation to the head "Industry", this is what the Governor said in his Address:-

"The Government is conscious of the increasing pressure upon the resources of the Island caused by population growth. The annual rate of national increase in the population is just over 2%, so that without taking migration into account, the numbers can reasonably be expected to rise to between 255,000 to 260,000 by the beginning of 1966. More jobs have therefore to be found and industrial productivity increased."

The Governor went on to make this statement on this matter:-

"The Government has been giving close and urgent attention to this matter and has been exploring further means of encouraging productive investment. The Government has under consideration, for instance, certain measures to encourage the erection of factories for lease to new industries."

I should like to ask if that is a statement as a result of, or resulting from, the impact of this situation. That statement comes after the one in connection with the natural growth of the population and the question of employment. The natural growth of unemployment is greater owing to the figures you see in respect of migration; migration is not faster than population growth, and on this question of unemployment as a result of the growth of population, there is nothing in the Government's policy which says that as a result of this situation, this is what the Government is doing.

On the question of the erection of the Deep Water Harbour, this is what the Governor said:-

"A steady rate of progress has been maintained on the construction of the Deep Water Harbour during the past year. The Government is appreciative of the services of Captain Alistair Smith, a retired Port Manager, now attached to the Ministry of Transport in the United Kingdom, who advised it on matters connected with the Harbour during the year. The Harbour Bill passed the Legislature during last December. The Harbour Regulations and Rate and Tariff Book have been prepared in draft and it is also hoped that early legislative action will be taken to give effect to these Regulations."

The buildings which will be erected in the new Port have all been agreed with those vitally concerned, and construction will proceed on these as soon as the Public Works Department can obtain access to the site. The Bulk Sugar Store is expected to be ready to receive sugar very soon. Negotiations have been in progress between the Government and the proposed Landing and Shipping Company. These negotiations have reached the stage where the Company is prepared to proceed with the formalities for its registration and to enter into discussion with the Barbados Workers' Union on wages and conditions of Port Workers. The Government has also been in negotiation with representatives of the Sugar Producers' Association on the terms of the Lease to them of the Bulk Sugar Store. These discussions are still in progress."

What is there about the effect of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour on unemployment? There is nothing in the Speech to show that this is the statement which the Governor has made on the question of dealing with this

impact which is going to take place both on the Deep Water Harbour and the sugar industry. There are men in Speights-town who are without any work, because no boats are going down there. As to the men who used to work on the lorries, there will be about thirty-five of them and a helper, as compared with the large number of people who used to work in the handling of sugar. (Asides) I think that the Marshal of the House should pay strict attention to his duties, and not pay any attention to members of the Government when a discussion is going on. However, Sir, I want to tell the Government that the earning capacity of the population is going to be decreased and the spending power will be decreased by the large number of people who are going out of employment.

We have to do something to prevent any reduction in the standard of living. In the Government's Estimates, they estimate for a deficit of \$1 million, and \$1 million is less in the deficit than what is going to fall to the workers as a loss this year. I am not saying that from any point of view of establishing any point; I am saying it from the point of view of emphasizing the seriousness of the situation. And the Government say that they do not want any plan because they have a Planning Unit! After all, the Governments of Great Britain and of the United States of America have set up Committees with a view to dealing with these issues; they have Planning Units and they also have economists. It is not a question that you do not have something by which to work out the economics of the scheme; you must have groups of people in the community giving thought to matters. The economists do not go ahead of the people.
8.10 p.m.

With the introduction of the Deep Water Harbour and the swift technological changes that are taking place, you must have in this community an organisation to save the people from the misery of not knowing what is going to happen. We must have tri-Party discussions so that this whole thing cannot be turned into a political football. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, Government undertaking to work the Deep Water Harbour without anybody to speak on behalf of the workers.

It is surprising, Mr. Speaker, that when some people are talking to you privately or in different circumstances, they tell you that you are a statesman, but when they talk to you openly they say you are a vagabond. The Union has been extremely helpful to the Government in these issues; the Union put forward proposals to the Government which it wanted discussed in relation to matters which directly affected the people. It is not the Union's business to set up this machinery, but when it is set up we say how we feel about it. We will show the workers that we feel that something of this nature should be done on their behalf. If you do not feel that way about it, and if you do not want to cooperate and let us make a study of this, we can get cooperation; because, if you do not accept our cooperation when we are willing to give it, when you want it we will not give it. I say that seriously because there is no issue as serious as this; and you cannot discard it on the basis that you have an Economist in the Planning Unit to take care of all the details we hammer out.

Mr. Speaker, do you think for instance that the Economist in the Planning Unit is going to tell you what to do with Dodds Plantation? Why should we in this year be running Dodds Plantation on the same basis as it is run? Why not turn Dodds into something of a more productive nature from the workers' point of view and give the labourers more hope in their labours? Why not set the first example in collective farming so that you can show the workers what it is to pool their resources? With our redundant population in Barbados we cannot think in terms of a stark capitalist system like the United States of America; we have to think in terms of a place like India. We have to think of a different method so that the workers can give higher productive work than on the plantation system. If the average man can earn \$500 or \$600 a year, why not see if Dodds can give the people on that plantation \$1,000 or \$1,200 a year instead? That is the sort of new thinking we have to create in our own minds. We as politicians have got to be creative, and not leave the creation for the academic people to do. If they give you ideas, by all means use them, but do not tell us that

you do not have any need of us. Do not say that you do not want collective wisdom because you feel you have a monopoly of knowledge residing within Government confine. What community does not want to use its human resources, and having been committed to the idea of a Deep Water Harbour, does not want to utilise the forces of getting people together?

Let me make it clear that no economist is going to think more of the workers than they are going to think of themselves in their position. As long as I live in this community from day to day, I am hoping to be able to think of some of the problems that are going to arise, I must think in terms of the problems that arise and of a solution which suits the Barbadian context; I do not have to send to Brussels and ask a man to tell me what to do.

One of the biggest problems which our country is going to face is the question of unemployment. The normal social services are going to be strained very greatly, because as I said earlier, the impact is going to be great. To give you an example, Mr. Speaker, we had to release last week 25% of the total amount of money among these people in order to tide them over; which means that of the \$240,000 we released \$60,000. If we did not do that there would still be the question of food, house rent, school fees and other things which these people require. A man came to me and said that he has a radio in his house, a son sending to school, and bills to pay, and asked what he must do. We therefore had to agree to 25% for these workers; and he was a man who got \$300 until the 31st March. What would have been his plight if we did not have that money to draw from? But the ones who have left the sugar factories are not part of that Fund.

Let us be quite frank about it; when 1,000 men go out of employment with the number of boys who want employment, it means that forever 1,000 jobs have been cut off. This is a poor community with a low income, and the loss of any income would have a greater impact than on a community with a high income where there is more savings among the workers.

Another thing which the Minister must look at, is that this country has no social security. In 1958 there was recession in the United States of America, but because the United States has a big-income community with so many savings and stop gaps as purchasing power was concerned, the retail trade did more business in that year than in 1951. The recession did not prevent a man from going to the store or prevent his child from going to school or eating his regular meals. It would have been different from in 1929 or 1930 when the United States had the same blow and the people did not have savings. Here in Barbados the average worker is without unemployment benefits, and without any of these cushions which you get in communities that have built themselves up with social security benefits; and it means that your social services are going to be strained to accommodate such persons. That is why I say that it is very important for the Government to give thought to that matter.

Now I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph speaking about housing loans, supported the idea or not; it is very difficult to follow his feeling in this matter. He said that the situation surrounding the housing loans was ironic.
8.20 p.m.

The Housing Authority says that they can only lend you X dollars, their maximum; regardless of whether or not you have the ten percent, they are still going to lend you that X dollars.

There is no absolute validity today of asking a man to produce ten percent of any amount when he wants to make a loan from the Housing Authority. By asking for this ten percent, you only make a man walk around to borrow money from some other source; and then one of the gravest problems he has is to look to pay two different persons on the same debt.

Now, Sir, slum clearance is another thing. I hope that one of these days the Union will be able to approach the

Government and ask them to let us utilise some money, without income tax, for the purpose of building. I am in contact with international people who have great interest in underdeveloped territories; and some of them are very willing to help in this way; they do not do it for political purposes, but for the purpose of raising the standard of living of people. For example, the International Transport Federation did ask our organisation on one occasion about the erection of a seaman's hostel, but our difficulty was in the finding of a suitable place.

Government will have to pull down some of these slums in Bridgetown with this change in traffic as a result from the Deep Water Harbour. Something has to be done with Nelson Street; you cannot have Nelson Street festering all these evils relative to slums. You have to do something also about Chapman's Lane; we cannot have an area in the heart of the City which is still primitive. When it comes to housing, the Government has got to be extremely liberal to people who want to build houses, you should have some legislation that, if you build a house, you can have income tax off for such and such a period. Do you know the psychological effect it would have if you did this? If you give a man income tax off, you may get him to do it. I think that is something to which the Government should give some serious consideration.

As regards the West Indies Federation, Sir, I am very pleased to hear that the Government has sent an invitation to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to go with the Government delegation to that conference. I came back here some time ago and I told the House that the Hon. Minister of Trade should be given the opportunity of going to Israel some time. It would be a good thing if not only he, but the whole Barbados Government would go. I am not saying so because I would want to go with the Minister of Trade; I would not want to have that unfortunate situation again. The Chief Minister of Jamaica has gone and I think a Minister from Barbados should go. My idea is that you should go and carry all the people whom you think would be able to help you. You can carry the Hon. K. R. Hunte and people like him because it would be a more congenial atmosphere than if you were to have me with you. There are many things in Israel which I am satisfied in my mind that any Minister of this Government would find acceptable. You can give some people all the money in the world and they cannot make good use of it. Israel is a desert country, and for all practical purposes I have found that some of the driest places are made better use of than some of the wettest places in other countries. There you see people working in a desert place and making salt out of it. You can very well say of the people of Israel that they are getting to grips with all the problems of their country. Mr. Will Isaacs of Jamaica and Professor Arthur Lewis went to Israel.

Now, we have read that Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, is coming to the West Indies. Now, the Governor in his Speech made mention of emigration. When you see somebody of the standard of the Prime Minister of England coming to the West Indies, he is not coming just to see the West Indies. The Mediterranean which is near to him is a place which looks like the West Indies, and it has a more equable climate. I am satisfied in my mind, from the outside, that the pressure of the political group of the Conservative Party in England is growing so much on the Prime Minister, that may be he thinks that it is appropriate for him to talk with the Unit Governments of the West Indies and the Federal Government on this question of emigration to the United Kingdom.
8.30 p.m.

This is a matter in connection with which I believe the Premier and the Government of Barbados should search their minds. If we have Emigration Laws in the West Indies, it is a stupid thing which the West Indies must get removed. Both Trinidad and Jamaica believe that if Barbadians go there we are going to flood their countries. What work is there for people to do there? Smoke ganja? There are no jobs in Trinidad to be got for the asking, but their fear is that people are going to flood them out. Barbadians do not flood Dominica or St. Vincent.

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is coming to the West Indies, and I have a feeling that emigration to the

United Kingdom is one of the things which will be discussed. When you have something which has reached the stage of discussion in the House of Commons, and when a member of that Parliament in the United Kingdom has reached the stage that he has put something down on the Order Paper to be discussed, it has passed the rounds of approval of a lot of people. I do not mean that the Speaker has refused it, but the member knew he would get discussion from it; and that is why he put it down on the Order Paper. That is an indication of what is happening.

The West Indian Governments have an opportunity to say positively to the Prime Minister that one of the problems which has caused this emigration to the United Kingdom at this stage in our history, is the fact that these territories were so impoverished under Colonial rule that they could not establish themselves as viable economic units. They were kept to a stage of a moribund economy in that they were producing sugar to sell to the United Kingdom. The population has grown around that product, so that product cannot support the population which we have.

You take an analysis of people who want to go away; you will find that there is a higher percentage of the younger age group in the rural areas who want to emigrate than in St. Michael. What happens in the rural areas? You take a boy in St. James or St. Thomas who goes to a Secondary School; unless he goes into the teaching profession, the number of jobs in the district in which he lives is infinitesimal and therefore he has to come to Bridgetown. That is why the slums are coming up here; the land can only take a number of people. There is no point in asking people to go to the land only to get two or three days' work a week; if you send a boy to a Secondary School you want him to utilise his brain for more than three days; unless he becomes an overseer, what is there for him to do? I hope that the Government will make their views clear.

We have been reticent in speaking; until Jamaica speaks, you do not think we are speaking. I believe that we should make a positive attempt to allow our point of view to be made known. I hope the Premier understands that I have made points to which I have given serious consideration; I do not make any points to get any kudos; I make points in the interest of the country; and I hope that he will share with me the same aspiration for the people whom we represent. We do not want to delay anything which we can do for the people, and if we can do anything to stimulate or encourage something which is beneficial and we think of the psychological approach to it, the mere fact that the people feel that you are setting up something in which they are involved gives the idea that they are participating in it too. They are not bound to be at the meetings. If they feel, or if the majority of them feel, that they are participating in what is being done, I put that to the Premier as good common-sense which would appeal to any man.

There is a Trade Union movement which has grown to represent the workers of this island in a way that, in these present circumstances, if it had not been for an institution like that, the smoothness of this transient period would be more difficult to obtain. You know how human beings have resisted change; if you interpret changes to the masses and they begin to percolate, that is where democracy begins to mean something.

This proposition is not an empty one which has been made for political reasons; let us bring the community together where the community interest is involved. Every unemployed man is a potential danger; and therefore you should think in terms of making him useful and letting him think that we are making him useful.

My job is to give you an idea if it can help you. I would like to make an amendment to this Reply, because it will be necessary to do so if the suggestion which I have made is acceptable. I would move an additional paragraph asking the Government to call a Development Conference to make a study of the social and economic conditions of Barbados resulting from the swift technological changes, to study the condition of the wage-earning population, the pattern of Barbadian and Caribbean economy today and its future prospects and potentialities.

8.40 p.m.

I agree with the constitutional changes, but I would like to see the Government go further and have complete self-Government at every stage without any drawbacks. I do not see why Barbados should not have complete control of its affairs with the Governor being purely and simply like a constitutional monarch; and where the Attorney General would no longer be on the Executive Committee. I do not see why the Government should not be able to have its own Attorney General and have a Director of Prosecutions; so that the Director of Prosecutions would be the man for prosecuting, and the Attorney General would be a member of the Cabinet. You should have a Minister of Justice - but he would not be discussing at Cabinet who carried away somebody's fowls or who raped somebody. The Director of Prosecutions would not be a member of Cabinet; he would be a person purely dealing with the Court as is the case in England. At our stage of development, and West Indian history, does it mean that Barbados will get independence after the West Indies Federation who wants it next year? We want independence now, tomorrow morning; therefore, we should have a situation where we can run the country.

My idea about it, Mr. Speaker, is that we should not wait one moment longer for constitutional change and say "another step, another step". This idea of "another step" connotes that we have not reached the stage where we can do it. Who is to teach you to get the other steps, Mr. Speaker? I am very pleased to see that they have reached the stage of putting things where they should be, but I do not accept this idea that there cannot be a Minister of Home Affairs. If something happens and you have to call out the police, you should be able to do it. In England there is a Minister of War, but that does not mean that he goes about and looks for War; so I cannot see why we cannot be in the same position today *vis-a-vis* the United Kingdom with internal self-Government; the only difference would be that of pigmentation.

Mr. Speaker, the Government would not expect a speech like that from me, but I did not believe in single member constituencies in 1944 and do not today; what I believed in then, I believe in now, because if I can beat you, I will beat you anyhow - whether there are single member constituencies, double member constituencies or half way. I hope the Premier accepts what I say in good faith. I am not an economist; you have to pay an economist, but you do not have to pay me. I am sure it is a point of view which, if the Government has not thought of it, - and the Government cannot think of all things - in this instance they should give thought to it. I agree with complete constitutional change. I hope that Government will remove the 10% on housing loans, settle down to slum clearance and discuss the problem of emigration to England with Mr. Macmillan.

I congratulated the Premier on the stand he took in Trinidad, although I read subsequently that somebody said he had backed down from the original stand he had taken. That would make me feel very disappointed and ashamed of myself. Despite the criticisms that have been made, I think that any man who is the head of any Government must make other heads of Government understand that *vis-a-vis* in my Government I respect you and you must respect me. I deprecate the idea of Mr. Manley, my friend, publishing a letter saying that he had written to the Premier since some day and that he gave Barbados every chance. It is a good thing I am not the Premier, because I would tell him in plain language to go and do whatever he likes; because, if you tell the world that you wrote me and I did not reply, then it gives the impression that I am the keep back. I am very pleased that the Premier made that statement. When you go to Trinidad next time to the grand finale so to speak, you should let the people realise that unity for unity's sake is not unity, but you can have unity within diversity.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I came in unfortunately just when the hon. member was perhaps more than half way through his speech. It was my misfortune not to have been hear earlier to hear him, but at least I heard him say that he was offering an amendment, the purport of which, was to ask the Government to agree to the setting up of a Commission, I believe he said, to investigate the overall social and economic conditions of the island with respect to the changes in technology which are now taking place, and which will

continue to take place in the future in consequence of the establishment of the new harbour and other things. The hon. member's views on these matters are well known and well appreciated on this side of the House; and I am authorised by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, to state that when the amendment is drafted we shall certainly accept it for our Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is an estimate of Government's policy both of the past and of the future, and as such it lends itself to controversy, to debate and to disagreement. I believe that we have reached the stage in this House at least by now when we understand that it is no part of the duty of the Opposition to accept Government's view on public affairs; but, on the contrary, the Opposition's duty is to exert, if it can, the most searching criticism and the most far-reaching criticism of all or any of the aspects of the Government's policy.

Before I speak on the matters which engage my own attention, I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, how much I appreciate this development which has taken place with respect to the debate on the Address in reply. Hitherto, this debate has always been initiated in Private Members' time and always dragged on; and, consequently, the unity of the debate was severely cut and mangled, so that one could never appreciate the full force of Government's point of view or of the Opposition's. It was at our suggestion that Government decided to allot their own time for a discussion on what is after all their own policy; I think it is a good thing and I hope that it will be followed. The debate in reply to the Governor's Speech should always be a major debate; it should always have its own time set forth by Government and should never be shunted off into Private Members' Time at all. 8.50 p.m.

I wish to draw to the attention of the House the dissatisfaction which we feel over the educational policy of the colony. It is true that we have had quite a lot of opportunities within the last few months to put some very searching questions to the Hon. Minister of Education on all aspects of his policy; and we have received replies which show us, at any rate, that we are not far wrong — indeed not wrong at all — in our attitude to the questions or in our timing or in the contents of them. I may say that the replies received have been forthright; it has not yet been my experience that the Hon. Minister of Education has attempted to hide anything. He has been candid and blunt.

If there is one thing which seems to me to be lacking in Government's approach to education, it is not that the Government does not wish to spread the benefits of education in this island. Indeed, no Government in the Caribbean can appear as if it does not wish to do that. As a matter of fact, no Government in the world would appear to be lukewarm on education and so make it that some be educated and some should not. This Government's fault does not lie in that. It lies in the region that Government does not assess the vast needs for education and the diversity for which these needs call. They do not appreciate, at least not from their published statements, that particular need, and how diverse it is. Their policy leaves much to be desired; and it is this lack of assessment and of putting the proper emphasis where it should be which accounts for the Minister having to make the explanation which he did on our not having compulsory education.

Mr. Speaker, once you reach the idea that everyone in the community no matter who he is, what his background is, is entitled to that training of mind and spirit which we call education, the Government's duty is not to find reasons why it cannot be done, the Government's duty is to find all reasons for doing it; and instead of asking "can we afford it" the question should be "can we afford not to have it." You cannot keep back even one per cent of the children of school age of this island on the ground that you would not have class rooms if you brought them into school now, or on the grounds that you do not have enough teachers. No excuse is genuine enough, or strong enough, to prevent children from going to school. If you are short of teachers, you can get those who are retired to come to your assistance so long as they are vigorous. If there is lack of

school rooms, you may temporarily look for shelter — of course not on a long term basis of providing school buildings, but on a short term basis — by teaching children wherever it is convenient, as in churches and, best of all, in the open air. Do not let the lack of buildings or teachers be the reason why some children are kept out of primary schools.

When you come to secondary education, it is really amazing. Even in the cautious speech delivered by His Excellency we can see that at long last something of what we were told that could not be done, is now being promised. However, we have this halting step where free secondary education is concerned. For years we have been warning the Government that it is nothing to be afraid about and something which can be done. We have it on record that, from that side of the House, they told us that free secondary education was impossible; that we were asking for the moon and promising the people things which we know they could not have. Yet the same Government has gone on record many years ago, certainly before I came into politics, holding the view that free secondary education is desirable.

If you look at their 1944 manifesto, you will see reference made to free secondary education; not only that, but also the extension of scholarships as well as free books and clothes when necessary. That was their policy. One felt that it was still their policy; yet when we advocated it, we were called visionaries and impracticable people. We have lived to see it being done; therefore, I would be failing to my Party and to my conscience if I did not say that their decision at the last moment to move in the direction of free secondary education is not at all to their credit because it is too little and too late. Even what they advocate falls short of what should be done even now.

Let us examine the price of secondary education in this island. Twenty years ago, even probably less than that, it was possible for a man or woman, on the day before a Government grant-aided school opened for the September term, to take a child and have him or her entered at a school. It was still possible in the early 40's; and in my day you could even wait until the term had gone on three or four weeks and still get the child into that school. The reason for that is simple. In those days, very few people could afford even eight dollars a term to pay for the child's fees. Secondly, not only could they not afford it in those days, but the man in the street still held the view that secondary education was a good thing for a child if he could get it; but if he could not get it for his child, it was nothing which the child was supposed to have. In other words, our island was still divided into two nations for the purpose of education — those who could afford it and those who could not. 9.00 p.m.

Consequently, it was possible in those days for anybody who could afford it, to take his child and get him entered for fees. The children of poor people who attended those schools then did so as free scholars, and at times with great sacrifice on the part of their parents. Today there is scarcely a home in this island in which parents do not desire secondary training for their children. It is not now any question of saying: "If I could afford it"; the parents are trying to afford it. In the humblest cottage of this island parents have an ideology and outlook on education which is far in front of the Government; parents are ahead of the Government in their thinking because they are making sacrifices to educate their children. This enthusiasm on the part of the masses of the population as exhibited in the direction of education is far ahead of the sluggish, lackadaisical and halting approach of the Government. That explains why we have not had a new Secondary School built. There is a lot of confusion as to what is meant by a new Secondary School. By a new Secondary School we do not mean an extended school building; obviously, new school buildings will have to be erected.

Mr. Speaker, if you reflect for twenty years, you will see that we had ten grant-aided secondary schools and we now have only nine of these schools, because two of the

original ten have been amalgamated and they serve our respective constituencies. If the Government members were not afraid of grasping a firm policy and pushing it, they would not wait until now to promise that there will be more places in the schools, or to promise that if suitable conditions present themselves, a new grammar school will be built. The reason for that is simple. Do you realise that any child who is born now, would expect to be in a secondary school by this time in 1972? In other words, in the next eleven years we have got to find a place in a secondary school for any child which is born in this island today, provided, of course, that it lives.

If you have not got places for these children in the grant-aided schools today, it means that ten or twelve years ago the Government did not exercise sufficient foresight; it means that we have not made a sufficient approach to the problem in the past. You have ten or twelve years at the most in which to prepare the teacher to teach the child who is born today. You have that time in which to provide the books which he will read, the laboratory in which he is going to study and so on. The reason why I must bring my full weight of criticism on the Government is this: all that we are trying to do now cannot even help the present situation, let alone help the situation which is to come. The Government's school building programme cannot now be geared to meet the pressure on schools which now exist. We should hear the Minister say that they are starting to build two or three more secondary schools, not because we need them now, but in ten or twelve years to come we will need them, and that it will cost us less to build them now. We are still much behind hand; we are only now making good the deficiencies of the last year or so.

In our secondary education policy, I should rather say in their education policy, they are allowing untold hardships on the people of this island. I would explain that. Let us take Mr. Jones and Mr. Smith; well, not Mr. Smith because I do not want to come too near to the Deputy Speaker of this House. Let us take Mr. Jones and Mr. Brown. Mr. Jones has a son who goes to school at Harrison College and Mr. Brown has a son who goes to the Modern High School. Let us say that Mr. Jones pays \$24 a term and Mr. Brown pays \$22. Superficially, it seems as if one parent is not being called upon to make more sacrifice than the other because there is very little difference between \$24 and \$22. However let us analyse what happens. Mr. Jones whose son is at Harrison College, knows that it takes more than \$24 a term in order to maintain his son; and he also knows that there is a terrific Government subsidy going towards Harrison College every year, a part of which subsidy goes to the upkeep of the education of his son. However, of the total cost, Mr. Jones contributes \$24. But Mr. Brown is in a different position. He is also a taxpayer, but when both sets of children come to take the G.C.E. at Ordinary Level, we will see where the hardship comes. Mr. Jones whose son is at Harrison College is not called upon to provide entrance fees for his son's sitting of the G.C.E.
9.10 p.m.

Mr. Brown, whose son is at the Modern or Federal High School, has got in addition to terms fees, to find \$20, \$30, \$35 or \$36 for examination fees. Do you see what the situation is there? Mr. Brown is not only educating his own child out of his pocket, but he is educating Mr. Jones' child out of his taxes, and Mr. Jones does not have that comparable sacrifice.

It is all right to talk about how some of the private schools are not up to standard; that is well known; but in the nature of the case it must be that. So long as every family in this island remains convinced that any kind of secondary education is better than no kind, for just so long will the below par private schools flourish; but because of the mere existence of the private secondary schools, one set of parents are educating their children and educating other people's children as well. I have drawn it to the Minister's attention, have spoken on it in this House, and also on public platforms. It is undemocratic, unfair and unjust for one set of people to be paying for the education of two sets of children.

It is the same thing too when we complain about teacher training. What can you do about the untrained teacher in a private secondary school? Of course he is a menace, but there is no way to make him cease to be a menace unless you can get him trained and trained quickly. But what happens? The parents whose children are taught by the untrained teacher are paying to train the other teachers to teach the other people's children; so you see that there again they suffer a double disadvantage. Their own children run the risk of being not properly taught, other people's children in Government Schools are properly taught, while they are helping to pay for them. However you turn and twist this matter, there is no way out but to grasp this thing firmly by the hands; that is, first of all, abolish immediately — and I say this without fear of contradiction — the fees in the grant-aided secondary schools.

If you say you are going to give six thousand more scholarships and you have got four thousand people in the Government schools at the moment, it means that you envisage a situation in which ten thousand young children will receive free secondary training. The question may be asked that if you abolish the fees immediately at all the nine grant-aided secondary schools, what are you going to do with the private secondary schools? The answer to that is simple. These schools, in which the Department of Education has expressed satisfaction through approval, can be given progressive subsidies, teacher training facilities, and examination fees can be paid until they are gradually brought into the system. My own feeling is that when Government makes a bold move in this matter, it is possible that fully a dozen of the private secondary schools which now exist will be easily and painlessly absorbed into the Government system. The teachers who now teach at them when they are suitably qualified — and if you would train them they would be — would fit into your schools expansion programme, and there is no reason why you could not employ them and some of the heads of these schools.

I am not saying that all of this can be done overnight, Mr. Speaker; but when once you see and understand that the people of this island are demanding secondary education, if too because they themselves are filling out the gaps which the Government cannot fill out, it is Government's duty to take the bull by the horns and abolish the fees in the grant-aided secondary schools. If you abolish the fees in grant-aided schools, it does not mean of course that the schools as they now exist can accommodate every single child. We know they cannot; but you could progressively go on from there as the next step to treat with those schools among the private lot who are the nearest to your own standards, and work the system of progressive abolition of fees with subsidies, with teacher training and with the payment of examination entrances until over a period of five years you will have absorbed into the secondary school system the most efficient of the private secondary schools. If five years is not time enough for your own school building programme to materialise and fructify, then no good can be done whatever.

My policy therefore would be to set a five year period for this whole secondary school programme, to start with the schools which you control and abolish the fees now; then take the three or four first-rate private secondary schools which the Department of Education has approved and recommended, and enter negotiations with them with a view to giving them subsidies subject to the controls which Government of course has a right to impose on fees, the facilities for teacher training, and the payment of examination fees, and spread it over a five year period so that at the end of five years you will have in addition to your own grant-aided secondary schools four or five or at any rate the best of the now private secondary schools absorbed into the system. At the end of the five year period you would probably find yourself in a much better position, because instead of having nine or ten schools, you may find yourself with fifteen secondary schools; and in that period you would be taking care of a building to hold and to accommodate those who are coming into the system.

Mr. Speaker, let us not fool ourselves; we need about forty secondary schools of all types and descriptions in

this island; and if the Minister of Education does not look forward to that number, he little knows what he is doing. Now I said "of all types" and this is a good point at which I should discuss our attitude to the so-called senior elementary schools which the Government calls secondary modern schools.

9.20 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the education of children there is always room for experimenting; and I would not disapprove of any educational experiment merely on the ground that I do not like it. I have my private prejudice against the secondary modern schools, but I have refrained from voicing my criticism because I am determined that any educational experiments should have its fair chance of succeeding.

This is what I have against them. Secondary modern schools in structure are elementary schools, in propaganda they are secondary schools. In instruction, they are primary; by propaganda, they are secondary. The people of this island have been made to believe that everybody cannot get into Harrison College, Combermere, Queen's College, or wherever it is, and that everybody should try in any case, and that there is this type of secondary modern school which is as good as a secondary school.

Let us examine that. The existence of the secondary modern school is built on the fallacy - a fallacy which too many people have recommended but to me it is surely a fallacy - that there are three types of children; and at the age of eleven you know what those types of children are and what school suits them best. Those who are academically bent are suited for a grammar school education; the other type of children who are not academically interested, but who have just as good enough brain as those who are academically bent and have shown an aptitude for certain skills, should be encouraged to have a technical education; and the third type is those who are not academically bent but are still alive and equipped within their own sphere. It is that type of child for whom the secondary modern school is said to exist.

It is a fallacy to base the educational system, or an experiment of the educational system, on so narrow a supposition. Why are there only three and not four, or one hundred types of children? How do you know at eleven what any child would be? The story is told of Professor Einstein, that at the age of 19 years he could not do mathematics without a lot of trouble; yet, at the age of 25 years, Professor Einstein was a genius. The system which does not take into account the late developer is doing a lot of harm to the child; and I would not hope to see that we become so rigid in our set up that we provide three types of schools on the theory that there are only three types of intelligence.

What I would like to see and recommend to the Government - and have already recommended to my own Party - is two or three large comprehensive schools built accommodating anything like 2,000 children each; and then at each school provision is made for a varied curriculum embodying what is called the academical, the technical, the scientific, as well as the modern subjects. I would so like to frame my secondary policy in schools like that, that a child would not only have one chance only of showing its aptitude; and I would like to make the administration so flexible that if you did not discover the child's bent at eleven you could do it at thirteen, and if you did not do it at thirteen, you could do it at fifteen. When you put most of the children out of school at fourteen years you have not taken care of the late developers. Any school which is based on such rigid a theory, does not take care of or make allowance for the number of children whose backwardness is no fault of their own but who, given time and encouragement, would catch up with anybody else or make a name for themselves in a chosen sphere.

What I want to see is more genuine secondary schools. We have reached the stage where we can call a halt to modern secondary education; and no amount of propaganda should make a parent think that sending a child to the Princess Margaret or the Richmond School is the same as sending it to Harrison's College. Lenin used to say that no mat-

ter how statesmen talked, the people sometimes vote with their feet. This is the case where parents of children voted with their feet. If you give a parent the choice of sending a child to one of these modern secondary schools and of sending him to Lynch or Rudder, he or she is going to strain every nerve to send the child to Lynch or Rudder because they believe that Lynch or Rudder is a secondary school and the Princess Margaret is not. You are not going to overcome this prejudice. What are you going to do to make people believe that they are getting value for their money? There is only one way to do it and that is to make these secondary modern schools genuine secondary schools and not semi-primary schools.

You have to encourage the best qualified staff in these schools and tell parents that, since you do not pay any fees, keep you children at these schools until they are seventeen, eighteen or nineteen; and that if they can find the uniform you will find the tuition. Tell the parents and the children that from now you are going to give them free tuition at these schools until they are nineteen; and that if they keep the children there until they are nineteen that you are really going to provide the sort of curriculum there for them that would be secondary. That is the only way that I will be satisfied.

While we are at it, let us examine this other inconsistency in the Government's policy on education. You say that the Princess Margaret and the Richmond are secondary Schools and that they are not a bit inferior to the St. Michael's Girls' School and Combermere. (A VOICE: Who said so?) This is the propaganda of Government. I went to the Princess Margaret School recently to a farewell function for the headmaster, Mr. Thorne, who taught me and prepared me for Harrison College, and the whole burden of the speeches made by the Hon. Minister of Education, by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who was an honoured guest, by the former Director of Education and by the retiring head, was that these schools are secondary schools therefore, you should give them a chance and see what they would produce. Let us examine that. The inference is that if only the people would hold off their criticism and try these schools, they will prove that they are just as good. (A VOICE: That is your inference.) Well then, if it is my inference, it is the most reasonable inference to place on it. It seems to me as if the Government is now saying that even the claim which they have made out for these schools is not the true one.

9.30 p.m.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: On a point of order, I want to rebut the statement made by the hon. member to the effect that the Government is saying that Secondary Modern Schools are as good as Harrison College. I do not think that there is anyone of us in this Government who would be so wicked, or vile, as to try to infer that.

Mr. TUDOR: I wonder if the Minister really understands what he has said. If you are saying that, to say that these schools are as good as Harrison College would be a vile and wicked thing, do you realise what follows? It follows that they are worse than, if they are not as good as, Harrison College and therefore you are encouraging the people of this island to take something which is not good for them at all.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: On a point of order, I wonder if the hon. member would say that Combermere School or the Coleridge Parry School is as good as Harrison College.

Mr. TUDOR: They are not as good; the Government has prevented them from being as good as Harrison College. They would not even give the Coleridge Parry School a Cadet Corps. You do regard the Coleridge Parry School as being nearer to Harrison College than you do regard the Princess Margaret School in relation to the Coleridge Parry School.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I think I can settle the whole issue by saying that, if the hon. member or anybody else can find the necessary money with which to do these things, then they will be done. If the money is not forthcoming, if

the people are not able to undergo heavier taxation, then these things will not be done. That is all I have to say.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that is not a serious contribution to this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not debating, at least not yet.

Mr. TUDOR: Nobody argues that all the things which one wants to do can be done overnight; all this argument that you cannot do anything at all because you have not got the money to do it is fallacious. The Minister says that all of these things he has in mind to do, but they will have to be done in relation to the financial competence of the island. Of course, that leaves his audience firmly convinced of his good intention, but not knowing precisely when that good intention will be translated into action.

How long will this Government rest upon the excuse that all good things cannot now be done because there is no money to do them? It is the duty of the Government so to govern and administer this island that new wealth will be created for extending the services which have to be given. Do you mean to say that from now until 1970 the children cannot have this or that because there is no money to give it to them? It is the Government's duty, I repeat, to create wealth so as to provide for new services. You have to find the means of getting the money; you cannot keep back the people's children on the ground that there is no money. If that is their conception of what is to be done, well, obviously, nothing will be done.

Coming back to the problem of Secondary Modern Schools, I want a clear understanding given to the people of this island as to what exactly is the purpose and function of the Secondary Modern Schools. The people of this island are demanding secondary education; if you tell them that there is no reason to expect that these schools can measure up even to the worse of the grant-aided schools, then there is no hope for the people and you should not even have to tell them that.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to be generous to the Government. I imagine that the Secondary Modern Schools will be following the English model and you will be providing three types of genuine secondary schools. Even the English system would be an improvement on what we have, although I disagree with it. Nobody can prove to me that there are only three types of minds at the age of eleven years. If this is what you are doing, then the Princess Margaret School would become a Secondary School on the English Model and the pupils would take the G.C.E. in modern subjects. That would be an improvement on the present situation. If it did come to that, then that would be commendable; and you would be able to say that the Princess Margaret School is as good as the Foundation School. If that is not what is aimed at, then what are these schools doing? Why are they costing so much to be erected if that is not the aim.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order. For the purpose of the debate, would the hon. member enlighten us as to what is his idea of a Secondary School?

Mr. TUDOR: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would like to have your interpretation of a Secondary School.

Mr. TUDOR: My interpretation of a Secondary School is his experience; we both went to one. I know of no other; we have the same thing in common. I feel that a Secondary School, no matter how varied the curriculum is, must give training far in advance of the elementary stage. I do not know if the Minister would agree to that.

9.40 p.m.

To send a child out of school at 14 years does not seem to me to be right even from the point of view of the child; but certainly it seems to me to be inadequate from the point of training. So my point cannot be shaken. You can only prove to the people of this island that these

schools are secondary schools when the children remain in them long enough to get a full secondary training. If that is what you are aiming at, you have the support and blessing of this side. (Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: That is why you were asked to give them time to develop.)

Mr. Speaker, I pass from that now to the question of nourishment in the schools. Here again Government is behind the times. Some weeks ago I asked the Minister to supply me with the figures with respect to the cost both capital and re-current of a school meals service. He did supply the figures, Mr. Speaker, and according to the Government's figures it will take something like \$4 million a year, I am speaking subject to correction, to provide the school meals service; and they say that the cost of providing a single meal for a single child would be 55 cents. Now I would like to say here and now that it would be possible for me, speaking now personally, to accept Government's figure and still not be frightened by it for this reason: I feel that there is a world of difference between spending \$4 million inside a community and spending \$4 million outside. The first thing you have got to appreciate about a school meals service is that a considerable portion of the expenditure, no matter what level it is, will be expended within the country. For instance, you said that you will need something like 1,000 women to work in the preparation of meals, service and so on. Even if you pay them \$10 a week each, multiply 1,000 by \$10 and see what that wage bill means in terms of the circulation of money within this community.

When you are contemplating expenditure of that sort, you do not just say it is going to cost, say, \$4 million or whatever it is and shy away from the problem; you say to yourself that it looks as if it may cost \$4 million, but some of this will come back to you in income tax, in customs duty, in licenses and fees; better still, more than half of it will circulate among the people of this island.

I am convinced therefore that a school meals service, even if it costs the Government of this island \$2 million a year, would be well justified; you would be creating an extra circulation of \$2 million which might be equivalent to \$10 million coming in from outside. So you should not be afraid of the cost of it on that score. The next thing about it is this: you have to understand some of what goes on in this island. I see poor people's children daily, and do you know for the way the cost of living runs today, that no child can get a proper lunch under 30 cents? Most of the people can only afford to give their children ten cents, fifteen cents, twenty cents or a quarter; and that is why I say that if a man knows that nowadays it is difficult for his child to get a proper lunch even for 25 cents, what would be wrong if you established a school meals service and asked the parents to provide a subsidy say of 5 cents per meal? Do you realise, Mr. Speaker, what 41,000 children paying 5 cents each, if it comes to that, would amount to if you asked parents to provide each child with 5 cents? That in itself would pay for the serving of the meal and give a lot towards paying for the cost of some of the food. Each parent would willingly do it if you had to ask him, because....

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I might ask the hon. member if he is shifting his stand from a free school meals service to a subsidised one.

Mr. TUDOR: That is a proper question. The Hon. Minister is asking if I am shifting my stand from free school meals to a subsidised meal. I am in favour of a meal. If Government says that it cannot afford a free meal, I am saying that there is not a parent in this island who would not, if asked, give a child five cents as a cost towards it. It would not cover the cost, but if Government says it would cost \$4 million and you can get back \$3/4 million from the little five cent pieces, that would go to meeting some of the cost, and you would still be able to tell the parents that because they were willing to let their child pay five cents, you are willing to provide the 50 cents which the meal costs. Are you willing to do that? You have said on that side of the House that it costs too much and you cannot do it.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I said what it would cost; I do not think I added the words "too much."

Mr. TUDOR: But you implied.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I did not imply anything; I said what I wanted to say.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, can we now ask through you whether Government intends to provide the school meals service we have been asking them to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage.

Mr. TUDOR: The Hon. Minister is now saying that he never said it cost too much. What is the point of telling me it would cost \$4 million if you did not imply that you could not afford it? I asked what it cost because the Minister said the costs were prohibitive, and I told him to let me have the figures. This is putting our cards on the table.

If you say you cannot afford 55 cents, tell the people of this island that you are prepared to put 50 cents if they will put five cents. What could be fairer than that? Which parent in this island would not allow a child to get a balanced meal for five cents? That is the way to do it, but do not say you cannot do it and do not surreptitiously, when you think everybody has forgotten about it, come in and bring it as your programme. You cannot expect to get away with that all the time.
9.50 p.m.

You are now coming around to the idea that a school meal service is a practical proposition. If so, you are five years late; and I will not allow you to bribe the people with it. I say better late than never. You had to be driven to it. (A VOICE: Of course, you have to justify your time in the House as an Opposition member.) What do you mean? (A VOICE: You are in the Opposition so you have to find something to tell the people.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear some voices, some louder than others; and only one hon. member is addressing the Chair and is standing.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is no point about talking about the next election; after the next election a lot of them who are asiding now may not be asiding in here. Sir, if you can provide a wholesome and balanced hot meal for these children, it would have my blessing. I know that if you say to parents that it will cost 55 cents but you will have to give us back five cents, parents would give it to you because they are paying more than five cents now to give a child a lunch. As a matter of fact, I will go to them and tell them that if Government asked them to pay five cents to help subsidise a school meal service to do it, because they will be getting back more than that. That is how I feel about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to sound a warning which is not going to please the Hon. Minister of Education, the Government or anybody on that side of the House. I want to shift back to secondary education; the administrative side of it. I understand that it is Government's intention to do away with the Governing Bodies of Grant-aided Secondary Schools. I said that I understand so; and it will be for the Minister when he replies to say that it is not so.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I assure the hon. member that this is the first time that I have heard of it.

Mr. TUDOR: Well then, the backbenchers of the Government talk too much.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I feel as if I am getting victimised because there are so very few backbenchers. I am sure the hon. member can mention which one it is.

Mr. TUDOR: The fact that the hon. member has risen draws the curtain over the matter.

I also understand that a circular has been sent to the Heads of the Government-aided Secondary Schools admonishing them for their speech at Speech Days. They are not to ask for things as they are asking for things now. The portraying of their needs before parents and the public embarrasses the Government. Further, if a school wants anything, the school is to direct its request to Government. Is that true? Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister now if that is true.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: That is a sort of half truth. I do know that there has been a circular sent out to heads of grammar schools; and in the circular they were given to understand that the requests which they make at Speech Day functions for things which they want can be made, but that anything which they want from the Government should be forwarded to Government. No such statement was made about embarrassing the Government.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what was the purpose of telling them not to make public the needs of the school?

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: We did not tell them so.

Mr. TUDOR: You will always have trouble in this way. You ask a Minister of the Crown to state the facts in a matter concerning the Department. (Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I have stated the facts.) I am now asking the Hon. Minister, do you feel that such a request would embarrass the Government in an election year? (Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: You are saying that.)

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as if hon. members are willing to postpone debate on this matter at this stage. I am in a state of uncertainty as to whether I should ask leave to postpone further consideration of this motion, or whether I should continue to speak.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am not depriving any member of having any opportunity to speak. Even if it is against the rule, I would be willing to suspend or waive that rule to allow the hon. member to speak and put forward his points of view.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 18th February, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

10.00 p.m.