

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th March, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P. (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. G. V. BATSON (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 26th February, 1963, have been circulated, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare that those Minutes are now confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Message No. 1/1963 forwarding the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1963-64.

I should also like to say, if I may, that it is proposed that the copies be laid today, and hon. members will have a week to peruse them, and then we should like to begin their consideration at the next meeting on Tuesday next.

On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay The Fire Service (Duty Allowance) (Revocation) Regulations, 1963.

On my own behalf I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Diamond powder and bort for cutting and polishing Diamonds) Order, 1963.

Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Development Board for the period 1st April, 1961 to 31st March, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$13,749,252 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure to be incurred during the financial year 1963-64 on Capital Works included in the Estimates Part II - Capital.

Resolution to approve the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1963-64.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of \$45,000 made by the Transport Board for the purpose of meeting its obligations and discharging its functions under the Transport Board Act, 1955.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolution of which notice was given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the unemployment of workers in Barbados is a matter of deep and serious concern to the whole community, and if it continues to rise will cause serious social and economic dislocations,

AND WHEREAS the modern industrial development method is to mechanise and to utilise automatic equipment which reduces the demand for manual labour,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the House of Assembly request the Government to set up a committee to study the needs for industrial training, and re-training, and the establishment of Trade Schools throughout the island to meet the pressing present-day industrial requirements."

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any answers to Oral Questions to be laid today?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to

Parliamentary Question No. 91/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is now ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 99/1963 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is now ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: 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 Island for the year ending on 31st day of March, 1964, be now read a first time.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, and the answer has been laid to Question No. 91/1962 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that there is grave dissatisfaction over the number of retired Civil Servants who are still employed in the Civil Service?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government seek to have this practice stopped in view of the large number of boys and girls leaving school yearly, highly qualified and capable of filling such posts?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

"Sir,

The Government is aware that there are a few retired Civil Servants who are still employed in the Civil Service.

Every effort is being made to reduce such employment to the absolute minimum compatible with efficiency, but occasionally certain technical or professional posts have to be filled on a temporary basis with retired officers until a suitable qualified permanent replacement may be found.

As a result of action which was started nearly two months before the Honourable Member asked the question, a circular was issued to Heads of Departments to the effect that special written permission must be granted before officers and employees who reach the age of retirement are re-employed.

No such permission has had to be given since the circular was issued early in December last year."
2.50 p.m.

KITCHEN GARDENS AT PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question is No. 99, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the House. I did say that the reply to this question was ready, but possibly by some inadvertence, the reply has not yet reached me; so I ask to defer it until the next meeting of the House if the hon. member would like to ask it then.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more answers ready and the House will now revert to Private Members' Business.

THE TRUSTEES FOR ROMAN CATHOLIC PURPOSES BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James: Third reading of a Bill to incorporate "The Trustees for Roman Catholic Purposes" as a Trust Corporation. On the last occasion, the Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee has met on this Bill but is not yet in the position to report.

RESHAPING OF ROADS AND TRACKS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next item is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution re the reshaping of roads and tracks throughout the Island in preparation for the coming crop season.

When this debate was adjourned on the last occasion, the Hon. Leader of the House attempted to speak and I pointed out to the House, Standing Order No. 27, under which a Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer.

If the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour wants to speak, by virtue of that Standing Order, he is so entitled to do.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was not much which it was necessary to add to the question owing to the comprehensive replies given by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. I only thought it was necessary to actually remind the House of certain observations which the Hon. Minister has made in this connection because certain remarks of the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, might have tended to have beclouded the issue somewhat.

The Resolution itself calls for action of the Government to assist small cane growers of the Island in bulldozing roads and tracks with tractors or bulldozers to assist these cane growers in getting their canes out of the ground during the reaping season. The Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing said that the Government has already taken action on this matter, and further stated that any specific roads in St. Joseph which the Hon. Introducer had in mind he should name, if he wanted them to be noted and given attention; but the Hon. Introducer replied to the effect that it was not incumbent on him to specify those roads, that the mere fact of the Government expressing its intention to implement the suggestion of the Resolution would be enough to induce the people adjacent to the roads in question to come forward.

This was completely to ignore the assertion made by the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to the effect that the Government had already begun to repair such roads and, moreover, the actual places in which work of this sort had already commenced were named. They comprised of Mount All, Baxters, St. Andrew; King Street, St. Simons, Swans Condemned Road, St. Andrew; and the road over the Spa Hill. As a matter of fact, these are the names of roads of the type referred to in the Resolution on which the Hon. Minister stated in most emphatic terms that work had already commenced. I am further informed that another road was actually started a week ago in Rock Hall, St. Andrew.

I mentioned this to emphasise that apparently the assertion by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not founded on fact. The contention by the Hon. Minister holds good. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had in mind specific areas to which he would like this treatment given, all he had to do was to specify the roads. Indeed all he had to do was to follow the example of his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, who on several occasions in the past came in here and specified by name areas in his constituency to which he wanted particular attention to be

paid. It is not good enough for the hon. member to try to throw dust in the eyes of members of the House or the public or his constituents by saying that the moment we begin to repair, we would be flooded with the list of the roads which require this attention. The onus is still on him, in view of the example set by the Government actually in starting work of this sort, to come in here and to give us the benefit of his specialised knowledge by drawing to our attentions areas which have not been included or which he wants to be included by the Government.
3.00 p.m.

We have ourselves devoted time and attention to it. The matter is under the complete attention of the Government, and there is no necessity for the hon. member again to draw the matter to our attention, except in so far as he wants to impress his constituents that he is acting in their interest, and that grievances which exist in his constituency are receiving his attention. Therefore, I repeat that if the hon. member is so anxious to remedy the grievances of his constituents, he should let us know the roads to which he is referring.

There is one other point and it is this.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister is saying that I must state the grievances which exist.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I did not say that at all. I assumed.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member made use of the word "grievances".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I used that word, but not in that context. I wanted the hon. member to state the matter in precise terms by calling the names of any specific areas to which he wants attention given.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I did not mention the parish of St. Joseph only; I mentioned more than one parish. Would the hon. member want me to go through the parishes of St. Thomas and St. Andrew and all over the island so as to mention roads to them? The hon. member is speaking as if I represent the parish of St. Joseph alone: but I want him to understand that I am representing the island of Barbados.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to have this omniscient and omnipresent representative of the island of Barbados in the Assembly; but if Your Honour were to refer to the Resolution tabled by the hon. member you will see that the hon. member is asking us to give priority to the parishes of St. Joseph, St. Andrew and the neighbouring parishes of St. Thomas and St. John. Since the parish of St. Joseph is the hon. member's constituency and the Government has already started work on the roads of St. Joseph, all I wanted the hon. member to do, in so far as his constituency is concerned, is to acquaint the Government of a detailed specification of roads which he wanted done. I am quite sure that although the entire island appreciates the fact that the hon. member is its representative, yet the parish of St. Joseph would be more appreciative if he would confine his representation to that parish, and in a matter of this sort, spread out the grievances and difficulties which he wants remedied in that constituency. I am sure that the parish of St. Philip would be delighted to have the hon. member representing that parish and speaking for it. When there are grievances up there, I pay specialised attention to them. I am suggesting that, however stupid the suggestion may be, the constituency which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph represents, would be better served if he would give us the benefit of his specialised knowledge with regard to that parish.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further point and it is this; the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, in commenting on this Resolution on the last occasion, said that the Government did have some difficulties in some areas in St. Thomas with regard to obtaining permission from some landowners for work of this sort to be done on their lands. I am sure that the House appreciates that this was not to obscure the issue or to create apparently insurmountable difficulties. It was merely to point out that, regardless of however well-

intentioned the Government may be, or however well-intentioned even the hon. junior member for St. Joseph may be in this matter, one still had to get the permission of the landowners to widen tracks or roads on their lands; and secondly, some people feel that the wider you cut the roads from the same areas of land they have, the less land remains for cultivation, so that the observation of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was not any question of imagination; it issued as the result of actual experience by the Government in carrying out a scheme of this sort. I merely repeat it so as to clarify the issue and also to impress upon hon. members of this House, and particularly the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the desirability for informing people who bring requests of this sort, to think of the fact that if and when the Government attempts an operation of this sort on their lands, it is expected that they will co-operate by enabling the Government to have the required areas in order to widen these tracks and roads so as to assist these people in getting out their canes.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph:- To resume debate on a Resolution relative to the increased cost to peasants of the harvesting of their crops and assistance to such peasants with payments from the Price Stabilisation Fund. In that connection, the report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the Sugar industry, has not yet been presented and that was the reason for the postponement of the consideration of this debate.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George:- To move the third reading of a Bill to authorise the sale of certain lands at St. George's Rectory, St. George.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I must report that, up to the present time, the Select Committee to which this Bill has been referred has not yet held any meeting to consider its report. Therefore, I will not be able to carry on with this Bill today.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I would like to know why it is that when Select Committees are appointed they take so much time before they can present their Reports.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that is not a point of privilege; that is an enquiry. A point of privilege is something which directly concerns the privileges of this House or a matter which suddenly arises.
3.10 p.m.

I would willingly accommodate the hon. member, but the Standing Orders preclude me. Anyhow, he has said something which I could not arrest that may appear in Hansard.

Mr. CORBIN: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I notice that hon. member is not in his place. Likewise, No. 6, and that hon. member is not in his place.

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John who is not in his place.

Order No. 10 also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John and a similar observation applies.

Order No. 11 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George: to move the third reading of a Bill to incorporate the Young Women's Christian Association of Barbados.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 12 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John who is not in his place; and Order No. 13 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael to resume debate on a Resolution re the operation of the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme. When that matter was last debated, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew spoke and move seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Michael, Minister of Communications, that further consideration be postponed. That motion was carried. Does the Hon. Minister of Social Services desire to continue or again to move that further consideration be postponed?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not ready to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the Hon. Minister of Social Services rise to move that further consideration be postponed?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration be postponed.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I take it from that that the matter will come up again for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the impression that I got.

The question that further consideration be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown: to move the third reading of a Bill to authorise Edward Parker Edghill to construct a groyne with or without seawalls at "Rostrevor", St. Lawrence.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, that Bill should really be in my name. A Select Committee has been appointed which has not yet met. We hope to do it this coming week, and have the Order cleared from the Order Paper by next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown: to move the passing of a Resolution relative to the amendment of the Barbados Scholarship Act, 1890.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, relative to this Resolution, if I might enquire through you, Sir, whether it is the intention of the Government that future Barbados Scholarships might be tenable at Universities in the United States, as I have just noted in the Estimates which I have received. That would throw altogether a different complexion on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. member might at least formally move the passing of the Resolution and thereby elicit some information, because unfortunately the procedure is somewhat novel for the hon. member to ask the Speaker, and the Speaker to enquire of the Hon. Minister and so on?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg formally to move the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member might mention what is agitating his mind thereby possibly obtaining clarification of the issue.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, in my view the time has now arrived when this Act of 1890 might well be changed

in the light of current events. There was recently a case where the winner of a Barbados Scholarship wanted to take up that scholarship at an American University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It is well known to every member of the House that the standard of scientific teaching in the United States of America is far above that which is obtainable in the United Kingdom.

At the time when the Bill for the Barbados Scholarships became law in the year, 1890, the position might well have been different. It is now high time that the position be revised. I did note in my Draft Estimates which I received only a few moments ago that there is one Barbados Scholar at present studying in the United States of America. If this, Sir, is an earnest of Government's intention for the future, that would then throw an altogether different complexion on the matter.

I beg therefore at this stage to move the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution of the hon. junior member for the City, it has been on the Order Paper for some time, and as he said, the standard of education, especially scientific education, in the United States of America is in many cases higher than anything in the United Kingdom. In 1890 when the Education Act was first passed by this House, things were somewhat different and College degrees in the United States were looked upon as a scrap of paper. It is not so today; we have long passed that, and I am sure that the Government is well aware and conscious of the high standard of education in America from the recent visit of the Minister of Education and the Chief Education Officer to that country, and the extensive tour which they made of all the education facilities, and they reported to the people of Barbados that the high standard is well within what we would want for our Barbados Scholars.

Mr. Speaker, the last Barbados Scholar who came top of the five is an outstanding scholar and what we would call a brilliant scholar, and he has been exempted so far from the first year course at the M.I.T. and has been set to do things of ordinary educational standard away from science. It is his ambition to study in the nuclear field, and M.I.T. is well qualified to give him that high standard of education which he seeks.
3.20 p.m.

The reports are not only from that one boy, but I do know that the association between Barbadians and Americans is getting closer and closer, and there are many other students, not being Barbados Scholars, who are now being educated at other colleges in America, and as time goes on there are going to be more and more. Because of that, we feel this is an occasion to amend the Education Act so as to permit future Barbados Scholars to go to Universities in the U.S.A. subject to the approval of the Education Department. There are many Universities in America which we might still say are beneath the standards set by our Education Department, but with that reservation I am sure that the changing of the Education Act to this end would be of great benefit to many future Barbados Scholars.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I believe that both the Hon. Mover and the Hon. Seconder of this Resolution will appreciate that it raises questions and issues of far-reaching importance. I believe also that they will not think that this Government will refuse to consider these issues, and to arrive at a conclusion best in the interest of the scholars themselves and in maintaining good relations between this country and other territories. However, I did not anticipate that this point in the Order Paper would have been reached at this session, and I did not prepare myself to speak on this matter on behalf of the Government and my Ministry.

I am, therefore, moving that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed, not only that I may be able to join in the debate, but also to give Government's point of view.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the view for further postponement of the debate. Although it is commendable in a general way for a scholar to have the freedom to choose wherever he would like to study and to be able to do so — as well as the idea of this Resolution to extend it to the U.S.A. — I feel that the whole discussion about Barbados providing a scholarship for people is something which we should be able to discuss in the light of the present circumstances. I am one who believes that a country emerging towards independence must put on clothes to suit its present needs, and it should not be guided by the Act of 1890 when there was no University of the West Indies and when we in Barbados had to look for closer relationship to institutions in the United Kingdom and in more recent times to those in Canada.

I believe the postponement of this debate would give hon. members a good opportunity to discuss this matter in a broader light and particularly those of us who hold strong views about scholarship awards would be able to express our view on the matter. Many countries in many parts of the world have their own methods of awarding scholarships to suit their own needs, and they put their own stipulations and wherever public money is spent, it is a question of one deciding on what is best and what conditions you are going to attach to these prizes which are offered.

I feel Barbados at the present stage without limiting too rigidly these things must also bear in mind the situation around such matters. I feel, without narrowing the scope of scholarships and the scope of scholars, that it would be unwise if we did not try to cut our cloth to suit our present requirements and not to believe that we can have scholarships given without any sort of limitations.

I used to be a member urging the complete freedom of the scholar many years ago: but the growing interest of the West Indies has forced me to change my view in the light that scholars in the West Indies should have to bear closer relationships to their territory and we should do what the Africans are forced to do in Africa.

For that reason, I think the time has come when public money which is being spent on education should be spent in such a way that you give the public some more guarantees for the usefulness of the scholars and students to their country. For that reason I feel that we should discuss this matter very broadly, and we can discuss it broadly because it is not a partisan subject. We have to examine this matter in keeping with the needs of the community.

The Hon. Introducer of the Resolution stated that if a boy wants to go to Massachusetts to continue his studies in technology, no one should deny him the privilege and that you would not like to restrict a scholar into a field of study of lesser quality so far as his mind permits him to go, but at the same time, by and large, the majority of scholars usually from Barbados take the Barbados Scholarship awards, and I would like to see the day when they can be rooted in their own Universities with their own background, and delving in their own history because even in this House of Assembly the members who have University education know more about Greek — and they even venture to speak in Latin — than they know of the constitutional history of the West Indies to which we are aspiring. Very few know anything of Montserrat or St. Kitts; we can pontificate about the Greeks and Romans, but we do not know anything about St. Lucia or even Castries in St. Lucia. We should see to it that we get people with their roots in their country; and while I am not in any way trying to belittle anyone's knowledge of the vastness and regions of the countries outside, I am saying that at the same time they should know something of their own lands and the aspirations of the people whom they intend to serve.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason I am one hundred per cent in agreement with voting more of the country's money to students going to the University of the West Indies and to our own Liberal Arts College. I know the difficulty and the snobbery of the West Indies. I know when the University College of the West Indies was started that there were sons and daughters of this Island who did not regard that

University as rich enough for their children. However, I think that the University of the West Indies has now established itself and is giving standards appropriate to standards of reputable Universities overseas.
3.30 p.m.

Without in any way going into the details of the Resolution, I would say that I agree with the Hon. Minister in order that we may have an opportunity on a future occasion to debate this question in its widest sense — the award of a scholarship under the old Act — so that we will be able to have an up-to-date debate and an intelligent exercise on a matter which deserves our really serious thinking. I am sure that the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution would not object to that treatment being given to his Resolution.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I can associate myself with the postponement of this Resolution. I deem that any scholar, having been awarded a scholarship in this island, should have the freedom to choose for himself the field in which he would like to develop his career. He should be able to do that in any area as far as the Commonwealth is extended, apart from the Communist bloc, and as far as money would help him to go. A scholar should have free access to go into the field of his choice so that he would be able to develop his profession. I must say again that when any scholar goes out from Barbados and he has been sent out with the taxpayers' money, that scholar, I deem it, whoever he may be, should think it fit to come back to this country and give us some of his time here. I think that by so doing he would be justifying the expenditure of the taxpayers' money on him. He should come back here and give us some of his time; he should give to his own country some of the benefits which the country has rendered to him.

That is one of the things which I would like to see. The scholar must be free to choose the field in which he wants to go. I do not think he would choose the Communist bloc, because we would not spend our money to send him to that field. Whether he be a doctor, architect or engineer, I think that whenever he has finished his education, he should always remember whence he came and that is from Barbados. He should remember his people who have rendered him the benefit which he has received. I hope that when the time comes, the Minister will be in full gear to render his full support to this Resolution. I will wholeheartedly vote for it when the time comes because, whether taxation goes up or remains as it is, if we have good engineers in this country or good technicians or any kind of educationists who can take charge of departments after they have been educated, we would not have to send overseas, to England or to the United States of America or anywhere else to try and get people to render the various services in our country. I feel satisfied to vote money for anyone who will render his services to this country. When this country can produce the necessary fruit of which the people are in need, that is a consolation to the people of this Island. If, for instance, we wanted an engineer for the Deep Water Harbour and we can have one locally, that would save expenses; similarly with the Director of Education. If we wanted any kind of engineer or technician and we can have one here, that will help us. That is something which we should have had obtaining long ago because, as I say, it would save us from going overseas for these people. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the time will come when we will be able to produce the necessary fruit which we need. I am willing therefore to agree to the postponement of the further consideration of this Resolution.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip: To move the passing of a Resolution re allocation of funds to the Southern District Council in the 1963-64 Estimates for repairs to tenantry roads.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to deal with this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of a Resolution *re* the reply to Oral Question No. 13/1962. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

The next Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church:—To move the second reading of a Bill to incorporate the Home for Elderly Gentlemen in Straitened Circumstances.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to go on with this Bill.

RESOLUTION *re* CLOSING HOURS UNDER THE SHOPS ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the passing of a Resolution *re* the closing hours under the Shops Act, 1945.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with an amendment to the Shops Act, 1945, and it is a very simple Resolution.

It reads as follows:—

WHEREAS many small shopkeepers through the Island are experiencing much difficulty in carrying on their business profitably, due to the early closing hours prescribed by the Shops Act, 1945;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Shops Act, 1945 be so amended as to make it possible for shops to be kept open to a much later hour than at present.

I feel that all hon. members of this Chamber are in whole-hearted agreement with the few points which I intend to draw to their attention. This is largely due to the fact that small shopkeepers..... (Pause).

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. BATSON: Yes, Sir, I was saying that this Resolution is a very simple one. It is a fact that there may be some misapprehensions in the minds of some shop assistants in that some people may be inclined to feel that this amendment, which I have proposed in this Resolution, would tend to disrupt their proper working hours according to the law. This Resolution was only brought to this Chamber in view of the fact that there are several small shopkeepers in this island and most of them are people who are unable to employ any shop assistants.
3.40 p.m.

I should like from the outset to eradicate from the minds of the shop assistants that this Resolution tends to prejudice their normal working hours, that is, forty-eight hours a week. This has nothing to do whatsoever with any shop assistants. This Resolution was purely brought in view of the fact that the small shopkeepers had to close their shops at a similar time as the large business places.

Now I noticed in the Act, Mr. Speaker, that "urban" refers to shops within the radius of two miles from Trafalgar Square, Bridgetown, and "country" refers to other shops which do not fall within that radius. I feel, Sir, that the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. for these shops are a bit too early in that most people who work are normally relieved from their work at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and when some of them reach home, they have to get their food. Some of them work by the day and get paid by the day, and it is only when they leave home in the morning and return in the afternoon that they are able to supply the home with any money to buy their food, and surprisingly at times we find that they are unable to purchase their commodities due in large measure to the fact that the shops are closed. These small shopkeepers are unable

to compete with the law in that on several occasions several of them were brought to the Law Courts and prosecuted, and had large fines imposed on them which they have found much difficulty in coping with, and as a result some of them have approached me and that in large measure has prompted me to table this Resolution in this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, such shops like First Aids also have to encounter much difficulty in trying to pay their taxes. Some of them only exist when the large stores are closed, and it is very difficult for them to make ends meet when they have to compete with the larger stores throughout the Island. I was very glad to see the announcement that the Government had set up a Committee to go into the *pros* and *cons* of the Shop Closing Act and to make recommendations thereto, and after reading that announcement I felt somewhat relieved, and no doubt most of these small shopkeepers are relieved after having read that announcement.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, and so as not to prejudice the deliberations of that Committee, I beg leave now formally to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, that is a peculiar way of withdrawing the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am seconding the motion to speak on it. The hon. member is a member of the Party that introduced this Committee, and I was going to ask what sort of Party arrangements they have where one of their members would introduce a Resolution on the same day that a pronouncement was made. I thought they had to have Party caucuses. At least they should have told him last night when they met.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I should merely like to explain to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas tabled this Resolution on the 15th January, 1963. The announcement that a Committee had been set up to consider the working of the Shops Act was released to the Press a few days ago. Neither of these two things had anything one to do with the other. It is purely a coincidence that on the date when the newspaper felt like releasing the Press statement, this date coincided with the date when also purely by accident and the absence of a number of hon. members in the House, the House got down to deal with this Resolution which is nearly at the bottom of the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. The two circumstances are not related at all and there is no design on the part of the Party to create this situation. Furthermore.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still on a point of order?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am merely explaining.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am merely explaining that there is no connection between the two.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, your latitude on a point of order is abounding, because this is a Private Members' motion and I cannot see how the Hon. Minister could get up defending the Government's position as if he did not have the right to speak. He has not spoken yet and he has the right to speak; but I cannot see him rising on a point of order when he has not spoken, nor could I understand what point of order he was raising, because all I said was that this motion by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas seemed somewhat strange if he is still pursuing to introduce a Resolution. He is the opposite to the hon. junior

member for Bridgetown. You will remember that you had to prod the hon. junior member for Bridgetown to say something on his Resolution, because he wanted to deal with it in such a summary fashion that he said that since something seemed to be apparent in the Estimates, he accepted that as an explanation. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas did not do that, but went a step further and said he was going to introduce the Resolution. You said to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that you did not want that novel way of having him ask you to ask the Minister, but we have another novel manner in which the hon. senior member for St. Thomas introduces a Resolution in which he proclaims the needs of these poor shopkeepers, and then elected to say that in view of the fact that the Government has set up a Committee, he does not want to prejudice their work, and asks to withdraw the Resolution. I am saying that it is a bit strange to me that a member of a Party would do that, and what the Hon. Minister has got up and said has only opened the gates a little wider, because the Minister will very well realise that if he was thinking of setting up a Committee to deal with this matter, at least he could have told one of his loyal backbenchers not to introduce a Resolution like this, because the Government proposes to deal with this matter in a somewhat direct form which would nullify his dealing with it.

The Minister must be aware that it came from his Ministry, and the idea of setting up a Committee to deal with this matter is not anything that was dealt with last week. It was something dealt with some time ago by the Ministry, I believe, not stemming from the hon. member's Resolution, but stemming from a former Bill which the hon. member introduced in connection with tourists and having things done on a Bank Holiday; but we will discuss that. I would like to say to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that I happen to be a member of that Committee, but I would ignore completely such pleas. It is true he would be able to come to the Committee and submit his views, but I have been in this before I came to the House, and we have spent many years on this question of shop closing and this House has had long debates on the matter. I do not think that these things will come into being by any sudden rush of blood or without taking everything into consideration.
3.50 p.m.

I think the hon. member has to bear in mind this idea as regards the small shopkeeper or the small businessman who goes into business as a means of getting a living. It is difficult to have your laws geared to every idiosyncrasy. If that were so, you will have each individual making laws to suit themselves, and because we cannot have that, there must be some collection to which everybody can comply.

I can tell the hon. member that that was mooted all the way back in 1944 or 1945. One of the things which we told small shopkeepers was that we are making them close because we have to protect them from death, from working behind a counter all the time. We told the small shopkeeper; "Go home and rest: go home and bathe your skin; go home and do not make yourself a slave."

As Socrates has said, you have to protect people from themselves. Some people in business have to be protected from themselves; if not, they would open 24 hours a day. You have to protect them; if not, they will become liabilities to the State. When we talk about small business people, we have to bear in mind that they are charges to the community. This Shops Act came into being not to penalise anybody, but to inject humanitarianism in commercialism for which the people knew nothing before. The object was to have opening and closing hours, and even to tell the independent businessman that we are not going to allow you to kill yourself in business. Under the State Laws you do not allow a man to kill himself although you cannot prevent him from killing himself; but if he fails, there is a charge against him — attempted suicide.

This is a matter which has been rightly put at the stage at which it should be put, that is, to put it in the hands of a committee so that members of the public can come be-

fore the committee and express their views. Do not think we should go too heavily on this idea that the small shopkeeper in the rural district needs this. It depends on what shops we are talking about. By and large, these things were not done to penalise the individual; they were more or less done to protect the individual.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has just introduced, and in no time he is willing and ready to withdraw it. I cannot quite understand how the present Government is doing their business with their backbenchers because I feel that a Resolution like this must have been or should have been discussed with the Minister in charge even before the hon. member introduced it. If you have no Party rules or discipline or anything of that sort, well.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to confine himself so far as possible to the subject matter of the Resolution which has been proposed and seconded.

Mr. SMITH: I am going to do that, Mr. Speaker, but you must remember that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is a member of the ruling Party, and I can clearly see that the hon. member was within his rights. But what has aroused the Government to take action into this thing? As the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said, the newspapers release information handed them whenever they like, and that makes me believe that it was ready long ago, but the newspapers kept it back. I want to know if the Government or the hon. senior member for St. Philip employs a newspaper. You have things released by the Government Information Officer or somebody like that, and very often, they are things which are released right away by the Government Information Officer over the radio, even before the matter comes to this House in some cases.

Why did not the Hon. Minister inform the Information Officer to release it over the radio before, and not to wait until the newspaper brought the contents of the matter? That makes me feel a bit funny, and it makes me believe that it was done to take the wind out of the sails of what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas wanted to discuss today. If they wanted to inform the public, if they wanted to do something about it, the Information Officer should have released it long ago. They always wait until the last moment to stop somebody from speaking; but it is not I this time, it is one of their own members. However, the hon. member has still put his point because he does not want to be accused, when the broom begins to sweep again, of being a muzzled man. He does not want to have that title. He wants to do his part and let the people of the Island know what is in him. He is nothing to do with whatever Government there is in power.

Mr. Speaker, as regards the small shopkeeper, the hon. senior member for St. Peter made the point that it was discussed long ago and it was only to protect people from themselves because some shopkeepers would only want to rest between dispatching hours. However, I would say that these small business people, especially those in the country areas, have nothing whatsoever to do during mid-day because the majority of people to whom they are catering have to go to work around 7.00 o'clock and 7.30 o'clock and they do not return home until around 4.00 o'clock or 5.00 o'clock in the evening.
4.00 p.m.

The majority of people to whom these shopkeepers are catering, the majority of people who are doing business with these shopkeepers, have to go to work at 7 o'clock or 7.30 o'clock in the morning and do not return home until about 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. During the day that type of shopkeeper can close his shop and get a rest, but it is from 5 o'clock onwards that the people who do business with these shopkeepers come in from their work and then they go to get the necessary supplies for next morning. The majority of these working people do not have any larder so as to put away anything, and when they leave the sugar at home the ants may carry it away, let alone if they have children, who will eat it. In the circumstances,

it is better for these people to buy what is to be used next morning and let nothing remain for the ants. On the next afternoon they will do the same thing, and that is where the hon. senior member for St. Thomas wanted to point out that if these small shopkeepers were allowed to open their shops a little later, that would enable them to do more business and help the workers as well. If they have to close their shops at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock in the afternoon, they will be shutting out business or they will be inconveniencing the worker who has to get home and obtain supplies for the next day.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been muzzled this time and he could not make his points as he would have liked to make them. You could see how long the hon. member took when he was listening to the Hon. Minister of Trade. I thought that he was going to kiss the Minister. (Laughter). The hon. member was being told to go slowly and not to do much attacking.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that a breach of the Standing Orders would not be committed by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member began to make a good point, but, poor fellow, he was muzzled this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas should be referred to as "poor fellow".

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is the typical Barbadian reference.

Mr. SPEAKER: Outside of Parliament.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, one will make a slip like that. I do not mean that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is poor financially because you know that the Principals of these schools are not poor today. Anyhow, Sir, it is the people in the country whose business starts from 5 o'clock and 6 o'clock in the afternoon owing to the type of people to whom they are catering that matter a great deal; that is the type of people who should be given foremost consideration. During the midday their shops can be closed. They may leave them open because they do not have anywhere to go and the public may step in and "fire one". You do not get much of that during the day because it is too hot at that time; but during the night when the wind is blowing coldly, then you will get these people going and "firing one". Therefore, as it stands now, as soon as the business starts, these people have to close their shops. I am in favour of this Resolution and I am not in any doubt that the hon. member's constituents would have drawn this matter to his attention. I hope that this particular Committee which is being set up will go into the matter thoroughly and the Government will take into consideration the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

I feel that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas should call a conference and put forward his points and let them know how he feels about this matter. If the Committee were to think along the same lines as one hon. member who has spoken, then the Resolution would fall to the ground, because he is not prepared to let people work so late. As I say, I am thinking more about the workers who have to be always out on their work and they do not always get to the shop. The husbands have to go out and look after their stock and the wives who are working have to get meals for the children and then go to the shop. Those are the people of whom I am thinking. I do not know if the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is thinking of the shopkeepers only, but I am thinking of the people who have to go to the shops. When the shopkeeper gives an order to close the doors of the shop, there are many people inside the shop, and when the policeman goes in and sees these people in there, the shopkeeper can be reported. I am submitting that at least another hour should be added to the hours for closing and that would help these people.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the remarks which have been made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on the postponement of this

Resolution. I notice that the hon. member has referred to the hon. introducer of the Resolution as a poor fellow but the hon. member was neither rich nor poor when his Government was in power. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the shopkeepers today are more affected than the people. The majority of the people from the country district go to town in order to buy their groceries on Saturdays because the factory and the estate people pay out money on Friday afternoons and there is no working day on Saturday. I repeat that it is the shopkeepers who are more affected than the people. I do not know if the people who go to town to buy their groceries get better weight or better material by going to town for them or what, but I do know that they go to town to buy their requirements.

4.10 p.m.

I believe these people come to town for some reason because they pay 60 cents every week to come from St. Andrew to Bridgetown to buy their groceries, thus by-passing the shops in the country. One man told me that he saw a shopkeeper open a tin of butter and he bought a quarter pound to butter his bread. The butter which he bought on that morning was mellow and sweet, and next day he went back and purchased another quarter of a pound, but the butter was so salt that he thought it was in the sea. He asked the man what had happened, and said that he could no longer buy things in the country but would come to town because fresh butter was opened every day. If the shopkeepers in the country did justice to the people, they would not have to come to town, because if people got the material they paid for, and with the same substance, they would not have to come to Bridgetown. On Friday nights, Mr. Speaker, you formerly saw the shops crowded with people, but now on Saturday mornings they come to Bridgetown. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would come out as I am coming out, it would benefit him.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, the hon. member said if I would come out as he is coming out, it would benefit me; but, Sir, I cannot come out as he is coming out, because the shopkeepers in St. Joseph are honest shopkeepers. They do not put more salt in the butter than is necessary; so when he refers to the St. Andrew shopkeepers making it difficult for the people in St. Andrew to buy their goods, that is his business. St. Joseph shopkeepers are honest; so let the hon. member say how dishonest the St. Andrew shopkeepers are.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph rose to speak, because he has said that the people in St. Joseph do not put in more salt than is necessary. (Laughter) Well, they do add salt to the butter in St. Joseph, but the shopkeepers in St. Andrew do not add any.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not know what butter the hon. member is referring to now when he says that the St. Joseph people add salt to it. When you are making fresh butter, you do have to put salt in it. When the hon. member in his remarks said that a particular man bought butter just as the shopkeeper opened it which he ate with bread, and the next morning he went back and bought more from the same butter skillet which he could not eat because it had too much salt, what is his reference?

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to let the hon. member know that the shopkeepers do not sell fresh butter. They sell butter that comes directly from the manufacturers; therefore he is trying to change his remarks. They do not sell 'cow' butter at the shops. I do not know if this hon. member has a shop or whether anyone belonging to him does, but I want it to be clearly understood that the shopkeepers in St. Joseph do not put in more salt than is necessary. Those were his words.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is dwelling so much on St. Joseph. Suppose I even said that the shopkeepers put in more salt than necessary he has already implied that the St. Andrew people put in so much that the man could not use it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enlighten the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that it is a man from

St. Joseph who spoke those words to me. (*Laughter*) It is better, therefore, for the hon. member to hold his peace and let it be his wisdom, because we as men cannot reason with uncomfortable words, neither can we fill our bellies with these things, I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are crying out are not the people who work in the fields, because it would profit the people in the fields to stay in the country and buy their goods rather than come to town, but they find that they get better facilities in the City than they get in the country, apart from getting their groceries. There are at present shop closing hours in force and I am certain that fewer people get reported nowadays than in former days, because the shops used to be open until 1 a.m. and 2 a.m. If the hon. member for St. Thomas is postponing further consideration of the Resolution, he has his reason, and I am agreeing to further postponement so that he can make some adjustment to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. senior member for St. Andrew want to propose that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed?

Mr. CORBIN: I am in agreement for further consideration to be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution has been moved and seconded, and I was enquiring whether the hon. member for St. Andrew was moving that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to withdraw this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas craves leave of the House now to withdraw this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, did the hon. member give any reasons for the withdrawal? I have not too long entered the Chamber, and intended to speak on it, but I heard the hint that it would be withdrawn. I would like to know if there is any reason behind the withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has asked leave to withdraw this Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Is there any objection to the withdrawal of this Resolution?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I must say there is, because it precludes me from being able to speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is objection raised. The hon. junior member for St. Peter may speak, 4.20 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I am at a bit of a disadvantage in that I have not heard the speech of the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution, but nevertheless, that cannot be remedied at this stage; so I intend to proceed and make a few remarks.

The purpose of this Resolution is to try and induce hon. members of this House to see if they are willing to give this House their support in order that the present shop closing hours be extended as far as rural shops, I take it, are concerned. I, myself, happen to live in a rural area and that is somewhat affected by the present legislation. I live in a small part of the Island known as Speightstown.

I remember as a boy that the Saturday trade was quite sound until the wee hours on Sunday morning whereas, nowadays, soon after 9.00 p.m. on Saturday, Speightstown is practically an empty town. Time and time again, people who do retail business have complained that the Shops Closing Act has interfered or tended to reduce their income. I think that the benefit of transportation has had

more effect on the business in Speightstown than just the earlier shop closing time.

However, there is something behind the Shops Closing Act for people who work in shops. Shops are run by proprietors who engage assistance, and what was behind the then legislation of shop closing is that you had to consider the people who worked in shops. The public had to be served, but those who performed the service had in some way to be cared for.

Now, Sir, I do not know if in the country districts of the Island, shopkeepers are making a grave complaint at this time. Nowadays, it is the habit to pay people weekly on Fridays, and even before 4.00 o'clock, and a large amount of business takes place on Friday nights now in Barbados not only in the town, but in the country districts as far as retail shops are concerned. I am wondering if apart from the liquor trade there is inconvenience to the buying public by the Shops Closing Act. Personally, I do not think so. I do not think that anyone is beset with any disadvantage as far as buying food is concerned because retail shops now close at 8.00 p.m. on nights from Monday to Friday and at 9.00 p.m. on Saturday nights. I do not believe anybody suffers for getting foodstuffs.

I told hon. members of the House specifically how the buying public are being handicapped by this earlier closing time. I believe those who like to engage themselves in pursuits which are in no way connected with food probably prefer to have this Shops' closing hour extended. If that is so, the complaint is being made by those who deal in the retail of liquor, and I suppose some consideration might be given to them because I think the rum trade in Barbados has recently been affected by other things which I need not mention now. This might be some way of making up for their loss of profits by being able to serve that particular section of the buying public for longer periods.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 o'clock p.m. when the House automatically proceeds to Government Business.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63, No. 41

HEAD 6 - LEGAL

Head 6 - Legal - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 6 - Legal - stand part.

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

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

HEAD 18 - POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 18 - Police - stand part.

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

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

HEAD 22 — PREMIER — CABINET AND GENERAL

Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 22 — Premier — Cabinet and General — stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 23 — BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head 23 — Barbados Regiment — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 23 — Barbados Regiment — stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, as regards Item 30, Grant, Cadet Corps, the Note reads as follows:-

"Shirts for the Cadet Corps were ordered through the Crown Agents during the 1961-62 financial year but were not received by the end of that year. Consequently, the amount which was allocated from the grant to pay for them lapsed. The shirts have been received since then and this amount is therefore now required to pay for them."

What I would like to enquire is this. We have Shirt Factories here now. Can they now supply shirts to the Regiment? Are the shirts which the Cadet Corps wear of a special type which requires that they must come from overseas?
4.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member has raised a point which the shirt manufacturers themselves have not thought it worthwhile to raise. We will go into the matter and see what can be done about it.

The question that Head 23 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took his seat.

HEAD 27 — PUBLIC WORKS

Head 27 — Public Works — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 27 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, under this item "Unestablished Staff" I feel that the Government should get down to some scientific basis to determine what they mean by "Unestablished Staff". I ran into difficulties some days ago when dealing with a Statutory Board, and we are in the unfortunate position to find that a Cabinet decision determines the conditions of the remuneration of people with which the Salaries Commissioner did not deal. You have masons and carpenters employed by the Housing Authority, for instance, and you will find a ridiculous situation in which Mr. Jacobs said that he is nothing to do with it, but there is a Government decision or a Cabinet decision which determines how this Statutory Authority should deal with the matter. When we deal with this matter we find ourselves in a difficult position. The Unestablished Staff is working under conditions whereby the mass of workers cannot be represented directly through their agents who cannot deal with certain matters with which the Cabinet has dealt, and it is inappropriate to deal with the conditions of employment on a day-to-day basis. I sincerely hope that the time will come when we will have a complete revision of

this sort of thing, and we will have some sort of authority set up at a proper level so that we can deal with these people throughout the island.

The structural arrangement is unscientific. A carpenter, for instance, is paid at the rate of 54 cents to 60 cents an hour, and those conditions relate to the salary which you pay the Chief Justice of this island. You ask a man to wait for seven years in order to reach the figure of 60 cents an hour, and the position is that you will have to pay different rates. You should fix a rate; you should put all categories of people on a fixed rate and not on an incremental basis, because you do not get any more production by giving a man a penny an hour more. I do hope that the time will come when the Government will deal with the Unestablished Staff in such a way that people will be able to get proper representation. I am not begging for increased membership of the Union; it is a question of having a scientific approach in dealing with matters in the Civil Service which have been left on the basis of a Colonial Government. The same structure you had some 50 years ago you are perpetuating in 1963, a structure which has no real meaning for the people who are employed in this branch of the Service.

The question that Head 27 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 30 — WATERWORKS

Head 30 — Waterworks — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 30 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 41, "Delivery of Water by Lorry". I am wondering if the Government would find it possible to try and stop this old-time practice which now exists, by installing some booster pumps at strategic points. They can build some small reservoirs; they can have two pumps, one to take the water into the reservoir and the other to take out the water and feed it into places where it will be best served. I remember now that in the parish of St. Lucy some years ago, a fight took place at one of these water lorries and as a result, a woman got one of her ears cut off and eventually she died. (A MEMBER: Not in St. Lucy). Well, was it in St. Peter? I think that the Hon. Premier will remember that incident. At Codrington Hill there is provision where the water is taken from the Bow Road and fed into the Grazettes area. You do not need to put anybody to maintain these pumps; you can use electrical pumps or diesel pumps, and by this means I think we will be able to alleviate the pressure of the people who now have to wait on these lorries and sometimes have to go to sleep without having any water.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking as if the delivery of water by lorries is something which has been going on for such a long time that it has now become an ancient practice, but this practice is only about 15 or 16 years old. It began around the year 1946 in consequence of a very low pressure of water in certain areas in St. Philip, St. Peter and St. Lucy at certain times of the year. The shortage of water was so serious that I, as a member of the Executive Committee at that time, proposed that we should equip lorries with tanks so as to supply water to people in the stricken areas. The incident to which the hon. member has referred happened at a time when there was only one lorry in operation and the struggle to get water was so great that a fight ensued and, as a result a woman was injured as the hon. member has said.

With regard to the technical proposal of the hon. member, I must say that I am not competent to say whether or not that proposal will improve the situation in the way in which the hon. member has suggested. (Mr. BOXILL: I am.) I do know that this service which the lorries render has greatly been appreciated in areas where there is no running water available. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to foresee when or where a main or a pipe will burst.

However, as I say, I am not competent to endorse the proposals of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; I will say that unless you are going to propose some practical alternative to the continuance of the service rendered by these lorries in the stricken areas, the service by lorries has to be maintained.

The question that Head 30 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.40 p.m.

Head 33 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 33 - Civil Aviation - stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, speaking on item 18, I see in the notes the question of the laundering of Roller Towels used at the Airport. Surely, Sir, it is time that this ancient and reprehensible practice be stopped - the use of Roller Towels, which are laundered under what conditions we are not aware of. It is hardly likely that those who launder them would bring the water to the particular boiling point which would destroy the types of germs which may well be left on these Roller Towels. I have had the privilege of visiting quite a few airports, and the modern and scientific method is to use paper towels or serviettes which can be disposed of, and not a long expanse of Roller Towels replete with germs and washed in the back premises of some maid.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the comments made by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown are the sort of statements which would certainly edify the amusement columns of the Sunday newspaper, but they do not bear any resemblance to the facts, because there are no towels which are washed in the backyard of any maid. Some of our shirts maybe, but certainly not the towels at Seawell.

The position, Sir, is that these towels were introduced into the public lavatories because there was a tremendous amount of pilferage of paper from the premises. It is true that when the Roller Towels were first introduced - and they are frequently changed because as they are used they go up and are replaced by a fresh length of towelling all the time - some bright soul decided to take a scissors into Seawell Airport and cut off a length; but since then I do not think we have had any substantial loss, if any loss at all. This is now recognised to be a much more convenient method of allowing people to get their hands and faces dried than the paper napkins which are rather untidy and capable of being carried away. I do not think, therefore, that there is any justification for the comment made by the hon. member, especially due to the fact that these towels are laundered by one of the largest laundries in the Island. I hope that satisfies the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the Hon. Premier that what my colleague has said would edify the columns of a Sunday paper. As a matter of fact, those of us who have had an opportunity of travelling, and those of us who have been able to read a little bit, realise that today in highly civilised countries - and I believe the hon. member has travelled to quite a number of places and has seen it because I myself have seen it - instead of using Roller Towels in lavatories, the practice is to use and discard paper towels. Whatever might be said about people taking away the paper towels, it is more sanitary. This is the case in the neighbouring Airport of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, people from all over the world and suffering from all sorts of possible diseases go into these places and wipe their hands on the Roller Towels. Sometimes you look for a dry spot which you may not find, and you have to use your handkerchief. It should not be argued that what my colleague has said is fit for the amusement columns of the Press, and I think you should adopt the method of using paper napkins at the Airport. I have adopted that very practice in my own home, because if you have a family with grown people - not to speak of the children - you find it is better to use paper napkins, because the Roller

Towel is only used in the kitchen nowadays to dry dishes. Hundreds of people pass through an Airport and go to the lavatory, and they may be suffering from some infectious skin disease and go to the Gents or Ladies room where they wipe their hands in the Roller Towel, and then somebody else has to wipe in the same towel. We say that the practice of using paper napkins should be adopted. The type of thing that the Hon. Premier is speaking of is the sort of dirty looking things you get in the House of Assembly which should be thrown through the window. There is a standard Roller Towel made of paper from which you can tear off what you want. I would like to see the people who would carry that away, because you cannot wrap anything with it.

We feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Government should adopt this practice at Seawell Airport, and I am absolutely certain that if this matter was taken up with the Medical Officers, they would tell you that this is what is recommended today in countries which observe Public Health standards in the way they should be observed. From the Public Health point of view, it is definitely recommended that you should not use Roller Towels for one person after the other to wipe in. In all the big hospital which I have had the misfortune to go into, and at all the big public places I have had the fortune to go into, I have found that they are now using paper towels. There is a roll of paper towel from which you pull off a piece to wipe your hands and drop it. It is true it keeps the place untidy, but you do have lavatory maids at these places who every half an hour come with a broom and dust-pan and take them up. I am supporting my colleague on this matter. I agree it is going to be more expensive, but surely people landing in Barbados and having to use the Ladies or Gents room at Seawell would much prefer to use their handkerchief rather than use a towel which somebody who may just have passed through from a hospital has used.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am amused at this debate. It is the sort of thing you get the Government to do. It seems to me that you only get a reply to a question here with that sort of phrase coming forth from that side, because it does not seem that whenever questions are asked they are on the straight line where you can easily elicit a reply in a proper parliamentary manner, but you get this damned insolence. I would say that I cannot agree with my hon. friend, and the Government could even have replied without descending to the Sunday newspaper type of thing by saying to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that really and truly the Roller Towel is not an ancient thing. I believe I have been to as many Airports throughout the world as any hon. member in this House, and although I do not subscribe to the view that it is the most up-to-date method, it is not as insanitary a method as has been suggested, because it is not a bath-room. We have not yet been provided with bath towels out of paper, and when you go to a hotel, you do not know if the towels are washed in the maids' backyards. 4.50 p.m.

Some hotels to which I have been, the maids have washed them in their back rooms. I would say from what I have seen, even at the new Idlewild Airport - and I am sure hon. members who have been to Idlewild will also know if they had gone to the Men's room - that they are using towels also. They have a steel rail on which they put fresh towels as soon as one is used. I do not think that Idlewild Airport stands behind any airport in the world today. Of course, there is another method which is too expensive for us. They use the hot-air drying method.

The Government has a very easy reply to make to this. The hon. member raised this from the point of view of his opinion. I have been to many airports and I have seen Roller linen Towels being used and I have seen Roller paper Towels being used. As regards the Roller paper Towels, you will find that the more elegant airports do not use them because they regard them as a cheapening of the service. They either use Roller linen Towels or laundered towels because that appears best to people of the higher class. From the point of view of economy, you will find that some airports use Roller paper Towels.

I do not think it is insanitary to have these Roller laundered Towels or laundered towels. If you say that for an airport, where you are using your things, then you have to introduce something to take the place of towels for bathing your skin and the other intimate things which you use. However, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that it took this sort of thing to elicit a reply from the Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, hon. members have thrown a lot of light on misunderstandings of the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown. This is the type of towel which is used at Seawell Airport. It is not a five foot towel; it is a towel fifty yards long which is put in a machine; that is to say it is 150 feet length of towel, and when you use one length and pull the second, the length which you use is taken up in the machine and is not used again. These towels are changed frequently and are not used again, and they are changed even before they reach the end of the roller. It is not somebody coming along and using a towel and somebody else using that part over and over again.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, I would like to thank the Hon. Premier for his inadequate explanation, but I must make the point that the modern method is to use disposable bits of cloth or paper. When it comes to a man pulling down a roll of paper.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Did the hon. member say the Modern High School method or the modern method?

Mr. LYNCH: That is the kind of adolescent humour which you get, but I will not let it disturb me. However, the last time I came in from Idlewild Airport, I noticed that they are using the hot-air method.

It is so much better to lose \$500,000 than to have even one case of skin disease. People pass through Seawell Airport from various parts of the world and they go in the lavatories; if they are in a hurry, they might not pull down the requisite length of towel and, as a result, anyone entering afterwards, not being in the habit of using Roller Towels, might well use the end appearing and there the danger lies. It is not a matter of elegance; it is a matter of sanitation. It is not a matter of convenience; it is a matter of hygiene. I would like to ask the hon. members opposite to think of it more seriously. They should think seriously of introducing modern hygienic methods for the cleaning of the hands of people who happen to go into that room.

The question that Head 33 - Civil Aviation - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1) GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$630 is required for electricity and water. The note says:

"Supplementary provision of \$630 is required to meet expenditure brought forward from the preceeding financial year and an increase of \$375.12 above the estimated provision due to increased consumption of Water and Electricity."

Will the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution say whether this is at Headquarters?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Headquarters.

The question that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL

Head 38 - Medical - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Head 38 has very many sub-heads.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (2) GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head 38 - Medical (2) General Hospital - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 38 - Medical (2) General Hospital - stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure that this Resolution being a money Resolution, it is most timely for me to acquaint the Hon. Minister of Social Services as to what has been worrying the people in this island. As a matter of fact, I have got this directly out of the mouths of three medical men themselves when it was discovered that their only Surgeon Specialist was out of the island on holiday. These medical people are entitled to a holiday, but I have heard one man say: "I hope that nothing will happen to me, with the Surgeon Specialist out of the island." Mr. Chairman, I have always been in agreement with the necessity for having more than one Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital, and I believe that everybody will realise that I am not singing my own tune. The necessity for having more than one Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital is so apparent that it cannot be answered. I would like to know what arrangement has been made as to the person who is acting in the place of the Surgeon Specialist having similar qualifications. I would like to know what is the Government's intention in the immediate future or at present when the Surgeon Specialist goes on holiday.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not answering on behalf of the Government, but I would not like what the hon. senior member for the City has said to go unnoticed. The General Hospital is part of the institutions of the country. When some members of the public speak about the public service, they sometimes regard the Hospital as the only service because it is an essential service. When you talk about Education, it is as though you should spend all the money on Education, and when you talk about industry it is as if you should spend all the money in industry. If you are nationalising the Surgeon Specialists, then all the doctors will come under your control. I do not think you could say that as soon as a man wants to have an operation he must have the services of the Surgeon Specialist, because it is only a comparative few of the total population who will get the service of only one man who is a Specialist. As soon as you say that you want two Surgeon Specialists, then you will have to talk about getting two Physician Specialists, two Anaesthetists and so on, (Mr. MOTTLEY: Why not?) Because you will have to spend all the money on the General Hospital. We are spending the sum of \$225,000 on drugs and dressings at the Hospital and we are now being asked to vote another \$41,000 for these items. We are spending \$1/4 million in a total budget of \$21 million for these items at the Hospital. When you reach these figures, when you are spending \$1/4 million for drugs and dressings at the General Hospital out of a total budget of \$21 million, you could really relate this expenditure to the American Budget and you could well ask President Kennedy how much he spends on dressings in the Hospital in that country and you will see that he will be spending more than all of these islands put together.

Mr. Chairman, if you have medical services, your medical services must be so integrated in the community that the Hospital service which you have has to utilise some person within the medical service to act as *locum tenens* for the substantive holder of a post. You cannot say that you want two Surgeon Specialists because you will soon be

saying that you want two Chief Justices and so forth. The pre-eminence of one man in a field does not mean that you have three in the other places like him. You have to get the closest you can get to that man and make out with that. Brains are not shared out like that; even in budgeting you do not get the brains shared out like that. You would not like to think that the Hospital is without the services of a person of the calibre of the Surgeon Specialist, but you do not begin to dream too early that you can have two Surgeon Specialists unless you are going to nationalise the Medical profession. This Hospital bill has been going up faster than the economic growth of the country, and the economic growth of the country has to supply the social services. If you believe that the social services will supply the economic growth of the country well then you can go on dreaming. If the economic growth is not fast, that will determine the sort of social services which you have. I do not subscribe to the idea that you must have two Surgeon Specialists on the staff of the Hospital unless you know that you can afford it. The medical service of a community is conditioned by what you can afford, and I maintain that the social services of any community must be conditioned by what the community can afford. As soon as you start on the basis as suggested by the hon. senior member for the City, then you are talking foolishness; in that way you will have all the people living in almshouses very soon. The sick people cease to work when they are sick; it is the people who are well who are providing these services. I warn the hon. member, but if the Government can be pressurised into that, it should not be pressurised into it.

5.10 p.m.

If you have your Surgeon Specialist going on leave, you should get somebody who is as good as he is, but I do not see Barbados being able to carry two Surgeon Specialists with our economy. As soon as you support this, the Radiologist will want a second and the Anaesthetist will want a second, and when you add that bill up it is not going to be funny, with all the implements required. I hope the hon. junior member realises that this costs money. This is a \$21 million bogus little place here, and the people in Barbados have nothing to quarrel about in the medical services with which they are being provided. If they have been making a lot of political capital of the service Barbados provides *per capita* of the population, look at the Barbados Hospital services in relation to our economy, and see that it has the highest *per capita* figure in the whole West Indies, from Jamaica to Trinidad.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want anybody in Barbados to get the idea that the Hospital services are inexpensive. There is no part of the world, except where there is a completely free service, where you pay anything like 5/- a day for Hospital services. I want people to stop beating the Hospital, and beat some of the private clinics. A person goes into a private clinic and pays \$7 a day for the same service they would get for \$1.20 at the public Hospital, but only because of snobbery they do not go there. You should beat some of those private people into doing something. My idea is that this country is spending a lot of money on the Hospital, and I say that the people in Barbados have nothing to complain about in their Hospital services and what is provided for them. Any man can go to the Hospital tomorrow, but those of us in a better position pay \$4.00 or \$4.80 a day which is infinitesimal. Where in the world could you get that privileged treatment for \$4.00 a day? You could not begin to pay for it; and when you realise the things that are being done, you should not encourage people into believing that something is wrong with the medical services they are getting in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, if you read the Stockman Report, you will see that this country is well provided for in its Hospital services in relation to our economy, and I hope with the introduction of the new Hospital that there will be no man opening his mouth and talking about the Barbados Hospital services, because I would say he is a fool and is not facing reality. I would say that the Hospital which we are putting down at \$8 million is a strain on the economy of this country for its size. What type of Hospital do you think New York or London would put down for \$8 million? Barbadians have this fancy idea that you can have as elaborate

an institution as somebody who has ten times the income. Trinidad has a \$100 million budget and we have a \$20 million budget, and every five minutes people open their mouths making this comparison.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the budget of Trinidad is \$257 million.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is wrong with my hon. friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but I suppose he had some steam to blow off, and he had to blow it off this way. You will observe that I never speak on everything in this House, but the things I speak on I think I know something about. I am entitled to my opinion, and I can express it in the same way as the hon. member. In a community of 240,000 people, there is one Hospital; and if the hon. member knew what he was talking about, he would know that in all civilised communities where you have 100,000 people, there are two General Hospitals. I would like the hon. member to read what he has said today. I asked a simple question, and the hon. member strayed to point out that we do not have two Chief Justices. You have men who study law, and anybody can be a Chief Justice after some experience. You have men who specialise in surgery, and for that matter every man who qualifies as a doctor knows something about surgery. There is no Surgeon Specialist in St. Lucia, neither is there any income tax in Bermuda or the Bahamas. Why did the hon. member not argue that? The views I am expressing here do not interfere with the Party to which I belong. There are in this country hundreds of people who will at some time or other need the service of a Surgeon Specialist. There is a difference between a Surgeon and a Surgeon Specialist, and it is not merely the F.R.C.S. The qualification must be worth something, and if it is not worth anything, then do not have him. You can take every boy who has qualified at the University of the West Indies, because he would have stood over a human being and seen an operation performed. There are those of us in this country who are in a position to go somewhere for a diagnosis and get an operation by a Specialist in a certain field. I am not talking about somebody doing operations for appendicitis; and when the hon. member as a Socialist gets up in this House and talks about the spending of money and that he does not subscribe to the idea of having two Surgeon Specialists.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I can defend myself. I said so, but the hon. member does not realise that what I say in the House of Assembly I can say outside in a public debate. I will say again, if the hon. member wants me to repeat it, that the social services of any country must be conditioned by the economy, and I do not care who you are and how many things you want, you have to condition it to that, and I am not subscribing to the view that you can have two Surgeon Specialist, because that is not all you want at the Hospital. He is not the only person who controls the Hospital. Everybody does not need the services of a Surgeon Specialist; they need other people too. (Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is making another speech.) I do not have to make another speech because this is a Resolution of the House and nobody can prevent me from talking on this, and when you sit down I am going to talk again. I will talk eighteen times.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And I will talk eighty-nine times.

Mr. WALCOTT: And I will talk one hundred and ten times.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How could you call that a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has misquoted me by saying that we do not need two people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never said that. Sit down. I heard the hon. member say that he does not subscribe to the idea of having two Surgeon Specialists.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot get up and take my speech out of the context.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let both hon. members sit.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think you will have to call the Speaker to get some order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Call the Speaker for what? Is somebody abusing anyone?

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member cannot take my speech out of the context and say that I said you do not want two Surgeon Specialists.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Again I must say that I have not said so. He said he did not subscribe to the idea of having two Surgeon Specialists.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not what I said either. He cannot say I said that. He must repeat what I said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown give the hon. senior member for St. Peter an opportunity to make his point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: He can make his point of order, but he is repeating his speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. senior member for St. Peter on his point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that I said that I did not subscribe to having two Surgeon Specialists, but the hon. member cannot take it like that, because I was making a speech: and when it came to the point about two Surgeon Specialists, what I said was in connection with the general economy of the Island and the general structure of the Hospital. It is not a question that if you were voting for two Surgeon Specialists, I said you only wanted one. That is where the hon. member has to use the context in which I made the remarks and quote me in the way in which I said it.
5.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will repeat what he said. He said that he does not subscribe to the suggestion of two Surgeon Specialists at the Hospital, bearing in mind the economy of the Island. The hon. member seems to want to generate some heat and I do not know why he has chosen to generate heat on this matter because I simply asked the Hon. Minister of Social Services if they had had another Surgeon Specialist acting, since the present Surgeon Specialist is on holiday.

Sir, I want to draw the attention of the hon. member to the following facts. The idea of having another Surgeon Specialist is something which I have said on the floor of this House on more than one occasion because I have found out that while I subscribe to the idea of Visiting Surgeons at the Hospital and giving to others the opportunity to do some practice, there were some operations to be done at the Hospital which needed people who were highly skilled to perform them. As you know, Sir, all the people who want certain operations to be done cannot find the money to go abroad, and therefore, they will have to submit themselves to people who are not as skilled in the performance of those operations as people who are Specialists.

I do not agree to one Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital which is one Hospital in a community with 240,000 people. What you have to bear in mind is the number of people in the Island - not necessarily the economy of the Island. You do not measure the people's health by dollars and cents. You have 240,000 people here and what is against the idea of the Hospital, which is the one Hospital in the Island of 240,000 people, carrying two Surgeon Specialists? I subscribe to the idea. As a matter of fact, it gives our young doctors coming out the opportunity to be able to learn something.

I am not blowing my own trumpet; what I am saying is this. It is causing some people some concern. This is no criticism of the Hospital. As a matter of fact, I have said

of the new Hospital that I have noticed something which is very expensive.

The hon. member referred to the fact that if you have two Surgeon Specialists, you would want two Radiologists. I make no apology for that. I got that out of a Surgeon's mouth. All of us want to hold on to life for as long as we can. I merely ask the Minister whether he would say if any arrangements had been made as regards a Surgeon-Specialist at the Hospital now that the Surgeon Specialist is on holiday. I take it that the Government would be able to say if they have made any arrangements to secure the services of a Surgeon Specialist.

Do you know why I am making this point? But for the grace of God, I would be in the position of somebody else who could not find the money to go to Trinidad or to bring somebody from outside. Human life for the pauper is as sweet as human life for the Queen. I make no apologies for saying it. I would rather pay to have another Surgeon Specialist and another Radiologist than to pay for some of those posts which you have in the Administration. For months and months, over the last three years, you did not have anybody to administer treatment for diphtheria, and as a result you have dozens and dozens of women who have died from it. A very able and distinguished physician told us that if they had somebody here to do that, those people's lives could have been extended. One of those people could have been my wife. One of them could have been your wife. It is not a question that I may be in the fortunate position to get somebody to come out and render me this service or that I may be able to go out to get this service; you have to think of those who cannot go out and those are the people who sent me here. You have to think of the position which they are in now. As I have said, this is a country with 240,000 people. Can this country do with one Surgeon Specialist? I will bow to the hon. senior member for St. Peter in things which I know nothing about and which he is very knowledgeable about. (Mr. WALCOTT: *(sotto voce)* Has the hon. member ever gone to Alabama?) Yes, I have got out of a boat and I went to Alabama.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, Sir. I was replying to the hon. member who seems not to recognise that you are in the Chair.

I believe the Hon. Minister himself must have had these enquiries. Quite recently the matter has worried a tremendous lot of people. If you respect education, you must admit that there are people who are qualified and people who are not qualified. You may be a doctor, but every doctor does not know everything about surgery. Every doctor does not know everything about the eyes.

Anyway, Sir, these are brutal facts and I am not appealing to you or anybody else. What analogy can you make about this as regards having a Chief Justice and then having a second Chief Justice? I have never heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter so illogical on the floor of the House. Have you ever seen what it is with a sick father in a room, and a wife and some children sitting around and crying and waiting for the doctor to come? Everybody in that room is waiting and waiting in despair. The entrance of the doctor brings some hope in the human heart although he cannot as soon as he enters decide by any magic that the person would live.

As I have said, this is no criticism of the General Hospital. I have said over and over again that this is my idea.
5.30 p.m.

I challenge any hon. member of this House to say that if anything should happen to him and he wanted to have an operation, he would not prefer to have the services of a Surgeon Specialist rather than those of a person who came out only last week. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to use the figures which I have in my possession today, but I do say that I will support any Government who will spend money on a Hospital and who will provide specialised ser-

vices in this manner. When it comes to comparing the expenditure of money here with that in Trinidad — well, Sir, I feel very proud to hear the hon. member refer to the services which can be obtained at the Hospital. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for the City cease to pay any attention to the hon. senior member for St. Peter?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, will you ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to keep quiet?

Mr. WALCOTT: You are apologising to the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not have to apologise to the Minister because I do not sleep with him at night. Anyhow, if we have to pay somebody to fill in this appointment during the absence from the colony of the Surgeon Specialist, then we should pay this money. I should like to say that a few days ago a case was brought before me in which a physician suspected that a person was suffering from cancer of the breast. It was not a person who could pay for medical services. How would any of us like to have his wife or his daughter put on a waiting list for a long period of time? I can never measure the health of the people in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is getting confused. I am not dealing with his point about any acting Surgeon Specialist. You can get about 89 Surgeon Specialists to act. I was dealing with the Establishment of the Hospital, although having two Specialists would mean that you have to deal with these matters according to the economy of the country. I am not arguing about any acting Surgeon Specialist.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member; he is not confused any more. I have merely asked, if you have only one Surgeon Specialist, what was the Government doing to have that Surgeon Specialist replaced while he is on holiday. I want to say that two Surgeon Specialists are necessary for the services at the Hospital. As a matter of fact, you have two Physician Specialists now. I have never changed my views that with a population of 240,000 people in Barbados you will need the services of two Surgeon Specialists.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for the City has made a query of the Hon. Minister in charge of this matter which is now engaging our attention, and I think it was when the hon. member referred to the appointment of another Surgeon Specialist that that brought the curtain down. My colleague spoke at some length and really brought us down to Mother Earth in that he referred to the economy of the island. I share the views which have been expressed by both hon. members. I quite agree that you cannot do more than you can do, but, on the other hand, on the question of the health of 240,000 people many of whom are of the poorest class, you have to think of the health services to the community; that is where I feel that another Surgeon Specialist should be appointed. However, I would not ask the Minister now whether or not he considers it advisable to tell us whether he would appoint another Surgeon Specialist next year.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I have never asked the Hon. Minister to say when he would appoint another Surgeon Specialist.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, every hon. member of this House could make a terrific speech on the question as to whether or not it is necessary to appoint another Surgeon Specialist. We could take the whole night in dealing with that matter, and I can assure you, Sir, that I would not be the last to enter the debate; but the Minister has nothing to answer at this stage. If a Resolution had been forthcoming from my colleague or from any other hon. member, I would repudiate the idea of suggesting at this stage that we appoint another Surgeon Specialist, and I would go all out in repudiating it too. My colleague is referring to the matter of economy merely; that is to say, that if you only have four cents you cannot spend ten cents. I do not see how we can go beyond the resources of the colony. How-

ever if somebody gets ill in your family and you need to take an operation, the money comes for the payment of the operation in some form or fashion. The money comes from somewhere.
5.40 p.m.

We feel that there are so many thousands in that state, that enough is not done to satisfy the entire community. My colleague made a hint about national services, and if it came to that, one may not be enough. I believe if I had spoken before the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the debate may not have dragged on so long because it is entirely academic, but at this particular stage it is good to hear hon. members express their views, though there have not been two divergent views at all. One member said you have to have the wherewithal, and what he said is true. The poor section of our community is as well hospitalised as in many other up-to-date countries. There is no stratum of society which, although they do not pay the bill, get off so lightly when it comes to an occasion when they or their relatives are sick and have to seek medical attention at the Hospital. The Hospital, as we know, is entirely a Government institution; taxpayers pay for its upkeep and maintenance and what not, but I do not want to go on any longer.

Mr. WALCOTT: I must thank my colleague, and I would like to say that I do not pontificate on Hospital matters. But I would like the hon. senior member for the City to know that as a politician, as I said last week, public affairs are my profession. I would let him know that in Trinidad where you have a population that is getting seriously near to one million, there are two Hospitals — the Port-of-Spain General Hospital and the San Fernando General Hospital, which when you divide them is one to every five hundred thousand persons. I would like him to know that even the number of nurses *per capita* of the population in Barbados is higher than in some other places which are more developed than Barbados. If you look at the L.L.O. record for nurses, being a poor community you will find that more people run into the nursing profession in Barbados, and therefore you have more nurses per head of population than in larger countries. When the hon. member talks about having Surgeon Specialists, I know that he has this emotionalism about this part of the social services, but I was not dealing with it from the emotional point at all for him to tell me something about if I had somebody dying. I had death in my family; so you do not think I could regard death as something which is going out of fashion; it is going to happen every day. But I am a realistic man and if I went home and found my wife sick.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not say 'if the hon. member has somebody dying'; I said 'if any of us had somebody dying'.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I am a part of that. I am one who takes a realistic view of these things, because those are things I have passed through. All of us have our feelings about death, but we are talking about the social services that are being provided. I am saying to the hon. member that I do not care how much I feel about a man who is going to die tomorrow, as a politician, I can only agree to medical service that comes within the economy we can afford. Now the hon. member asked whether you were going to have a Surgeon Specialist as a *locum tenens* for Dr. Leacock. I agree that you should get one if you can, but the hon. member says I am opposed, as if I am opposed to the Minister getting a Surgeon Specialist to act for the Surgeon Specialist. That could not be in my thinking at all. But I was dealing with the point where the hon. member said that his views and mine clashed, and not that you should not have ten Surgeon Specialists if you could afford them.

Mr. Chairman, I would not like to be too futuristic, but Barbados with its economy will always be behind countries in medical facilities in view of the fact that Barbados might be about 50 light years behind the United States of America. There are some specialists in the United States on diseases which Barbados because of its size and economy could not really provide with the scope for maintaining a service; so some of the people here will die from a skin disease which they would not die from if they

were in the United States of America. There are certain things for which you will have to send people outside. What I would say to the hon. member is that no matter how we feel about medical services generally, or whether it is education or whatever it is, all these things have to be conditioned by the economy, and I want everybody to get the idea that you cannot have a better medical service than the economy can afford, and I would be prepared to repeat that.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support what has been said by my colleague. It is true that one's desires should be affected by one's particular economy, but in the case of health you will find that in the microcosm of the home people will find money when one of their loved ones fall ill; and so in the microcosm of the state provision ought to be made for the maintenance of the health of the citizens. I would like to make the point that one Surgeon Specialist is not enough for a population of 240,000 forward-looking people. We are told that when this Surgeon Specialist goes off on his six months' holiday, there will be someone acting for him.

Now, Sir, it has always been a very difficult thing for Socialists to appreciate the idea of quality. They tell you — and it is a fallacious argument — that if you have two Surgeon Specialists you would also need two Attorneys General, but that ought to be exposed because there must be thousands of Attorneys General all over the civilised earth, while they are very few men who can open the heart cavity and massage a heart, which has ceased to function, back to life. You see, therefore, Sir, the necessity for a Surgeon Specialist in a community. There are very few Surgeons all over the earth who can perform a kidney graft operation. It does not mean that every doctor who graduates immediately becomes a good surgeon. It is the fool's beard which reaches the young barber his trade, but it is the patient's life which teaches the doctor his trade. We are told that the difference between a good haircut and a bad one is two weeks; but the difference between a good surgeon and a bad one is a coffin. The two things are not to be compared. Whenever Socialists get hold of the medical services of a state or nation, we know what happens. Many of us will remember what happened in Saskatchewan not so long ago when they tried to nationalise the social services. Doctors had to run from all over the world to Saskatchewan to clear up the mess made by the Socialists. Those are the points which we are trying to make, and we are the Party, as you will remember, to which Mr. Beveridge belonged which introduced the system which the Socialists copied in Great Britain.

The point we are trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that one Surgeon Specialist, when it comes to life, is dangerous and causes concern in the heart and minds of the inhabitants of the country. People cannot consult the holiday time table of a Surgeon Specialist to find out when they will have their surgery. If a loved one becomes ill suddenly and you find out that the Surgeon Specialist is away on six months' holiday and his place is taken by a callow youth who has left the University a few weeks ago, what can you do? If you are in a particular economic position, you will perhaps leave for the Mayo Clinic or the Harkness Pavilion, but there are so many of us who cannot afford the ministrations of the most skilled doctors who are to be found in the United States of America.

5.50 p.m.

We, who sit around this Table, therefore, must find it incumbent upon us to see to it that we make provision for the poor inhabitants of the country and that there is at all times available a Surgeon Specialist whose skill is in no way suspect. I am making no criticism in derogation of the skill of those who may be placed to act for him, but these things take time. A doctor who has left a University three years ago cannot have the same skill as a doctor who has behind him thirty years' practice of major operations. That is the point which we wanted to intimate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member will forgive me. I am in here as a Socialist, and I cannot allow him to get away with that unnecessary indictment against Socialists. I do not know where his history has led

him to think that Mr. William Beveridge is responsible for the introduction of the Socialist scheme in the United Kingdom. May be, he has started to read late. May be, he started reading matters about politics late. Sir, you will know that before Mr. William Beveridge drew up the plan, the Socialists after they got into power, started to liberalise all these things. It was Sir William Beveridge who went into this thing and it was his name which was put to it because he was the Chairman of the Committee. You will also know that this scheme was in Germany long before anything took place in the United Kingdom. It was talked of long before it was talked of in the United Kingdom.

It is not a question of our population being 240,000 people; and when the hon. member talked about Socialists, I think he had this grouse against Socialists, that we are willing to come out openly and say what we stand for. I do not think the hon. member can say that the political philosophy which he stands for is what a Socialist stands for.

The point which I made about two Attorneys General and two Chief Justices was as regards the Establishment; but what I will contend is that we were not talking about a *locum tenens* to the Surgeon Specialist. As a matter of fact, the present Surgeon Specialist does not have thirty years' experience because he is not far from thirty years of age.

When you talk of our having one Surgeon Specialist, may I ask how many are there in British Guiana? How many do you have in Trinidad? In Trinidad there is Mr. Pierre at the San Fernando Hospital. When I hear the hon. member talk about having the F.R.C.S., he is not talking as a man knowledgeable; he is talking as a man in the street. When you talk of having one Surgeon Specialist, do not parade to the public as if, with everything that is wrong with your body, Mr. Leacock is an expert on it. It is not fair to the community to give that impression. Do not say that when anything is wrong with you which needs surgery, that Mr. Leacock can do it, because you know as well as I do that every ailment which requires surgery cannot be done in Barbados. There are some heart ailments which cannot be done in Barbados. Do not parade to the public as if Mr. Leacock is God, and if you have two or three Surgeon Specialists, you will be able to fulfil all the surgical needs of the colony. Do not let us get down the sentimental alley. I can refer you to Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica and call the number of Surgeon Specialists which we have in those Islands, and I can add them up on my ten fingers and you cannot get past those ten fingers. We do not have anybody in plastic surgery who is doing it as a specialist. You may have a doctor who may come and do a little about it. That is not an indictment on the medical profession. Because a man does not hold a degree as a Surgeon Specialist, do not get away with the idea that a man practising surgery might not be up to the standard to which the young specialist with degrees is. There are doctors who by reason of their practice have performed their surgery in such a way that it is excellent. Therefore, this idea of telling me that I am a Socialist is nothing. I am a man who has never yet excused my politics.

It seems to me that Barbadians are becoming too easily concerned about its people and they believe that the world rotates around Barbados. They believe that Barbados is a planet. They believe it is something in the air, and therefore the world is spinning around it, and when you have a sputnik in the air it goes around Barbados.

I am not concerned with what the Hon. Minister answers and says. I am concerned with basic commonsense. Whether you put an F.R.C.S. or a fool, you must not give the impression that the Surgeon Specialist is a medical magician, and when anything goes wrong with somebody that he is the only person that can remedy it.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I never put out any such belief. As a matter of fact, I never even mentioned the name of Mr. Leacock or anybody. I would not expect a doctor, if he performed abdominal operations, to perform operations on the lungs, or that because he is able to perform operations on the

lungs, he is able to perform operations on the eyes, I would not expect a plastic surgeon to operate on the hon. member if he has something wrong with him in another part of his abdomen.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear. We are not talking of two Surgeon Specialists. The hon. member knows that Mr. Leacock is a Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital. We also have a doctor with the F.R.C.S. for the eyes. I know Dr. Richardson of Trinidad is a Surgeon Specialist, and I also know that Dr. Pierre is a Physician Specialist because he does not practice surgery. Do not talk as if because a man is an F.R.C.S., any man who has not the F.R.C.S. cannot perform surgical operations as well as one who has the F.R.C.S. Dr. St. John was as equipped as any man in operations on the eyes, but he did not have any F.R.C.S. degree from any college. You have Dr. Stuart at the University of the West Indies and he is a Physician Specialist.

I only want to say that the hon. member was not speaking only of the *locum tenens* but that you wanted two Surgeon Specialists at the Hospital. I was not dealing with the question that you want two Surgeon Specialists; that is why I say that so far as putting someone to act, that is a question for the Administration.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When the hon. member says that it is a matter for the Administration, I will say that every time you spend money it is a matter for the members of this House. It is a matter for the members of this House whether we ask questions or not.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The person who is to act is a matter for the Administration and not for the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We, of all people in here, are not associated with idiots. At least when we talk about Surgeon Specialists, we know that you have specialists in heart operations, in brain operations, and so on. The hon. member should know that when we mention Surgeon Specialists we know what we mean. The hon. member seems to have forgotten that when the idea was mooted in this House some time ago that we should do away with Visiting Surgeons at the Hospital, I said that we should continue to have these Visiting Surgeons because of the good works which they had been doing; but as time went on, people appreciated educational standards and we say that we need another Surgeon Specialist. The hon. member should not try to be a schoolmaster in telling us what we already know, as if we were trying to create the impression that a Surgeon Specialist could perform heart operations, brain operations and plastic operations are in their particular fields. A man is a doctor first and then he branches out in these fields. When we talk about a Surgeon Specialist, we mean a Surgeon Specialist. We are merely asking the Hon. Minister if he could tell us if, as a result of the fact that people had been led to feel that a Surgeon Specialist is somebody to whom you pay more money because he possesses certain qualifications and because he is on holiday — we are asking whether the Minister could tell us if he has been able to get anybody to act in the place of the Surgeon Specialist for the time being. When the hon. member says that you would have to have two of each in other fields, I am not surprised at that; I remember standing in the Lower Green one night and listening to the Leader of the Socialist Party speaking to about 15,000 people and he said: "God help the people of Barbados if they did not have Dr. Cummins." (A MEMBER: Who was that?) It was Sir Grantley.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is that to do with the debate? That is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anyhow, Sir, I have made my point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a lot this afternoon and I am going to be very brief in my reply. When the Surgeon Specialist left the General Hospital on vacation, the Personnel Department had to be satisfied that suitable arrangements were made for the continuation of the duties which are carried on by the Surgeon Specialist.

If the Personnel Department were not satisfied with the arrangements which were made, then permission would not have been granted to the Surgeon Specialist to leave the Island at that time. The provision which was made was that the Registrar, who had six years' experience in Surgery and who performs most of the operations at the Hospital, was left in charge of the public wards, and the Visiting Surgeons — there are four of them — were left in charge of the private wards. We have had an incident in Barbados a couple of days ago in which a patient was carried to the Hospital, and there was the feeling that that patient thought that the Registrar could not look after such a patient satisfactorily. It so happened that the patient was carried to another clinic; but what people were worried about does not concern the Hospital at all. They were worried about the fact that a surgeon had to be asked in from outside. He was asked in, not by the Barbados Government, but by a private concern.

I may say, Sir, that that is nothing new in Barbados. I remember just a few months ago that Mr. Contractor, the Indian Cricket Captain, was injured here and we had to ask a surgeon to come to Barbados in order to look after that gentleman. Some three years ago when the same Surgeon Specialist went on vacation leave, his Registrar, Dr. Morris at the time, was left in charge of the work. Nobody raised any row at that time, and most of the people who are raising a row now — Mr. Chairman, I like to be brutally frank, I want to say that I am not casting any reflection on the hon. senior member for the City because I know that the hon. member does not share this view; but people are raising this row because of the pigmentation of the man who has been left in charge of the work (Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, No, No.) Mr. Chairman, I said that I am not casting any reflection on the hon. senior member for the City. When Dr. Morris was left in charge of the work, he was Registrar to the Surgeon Specialist and nobody said one word against that. (ASIDES) I do hope that the hon. senior member for the City will listen to what I am saying now. It was only today that three cables were sent to America and Jamaica in order to see if we could get a Surgeon Specialist to come here and hold on for us on a temporary basis.
6.10 p.m.

That emanated from the fact that these rumours were going around; but I just want to make it clear that the Surgeon Specialist at the Hospital or in Government service who holds a very important job would not have been given leave had the Personnel Department not been satisfied that suitable arrangements were made. The officer got leave because the Personnel Department was satisfied. Of course the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would know that personnel matters are separate and distinct from Ministerial matters, and the Personnel Department was quite satisfied that adequate arrangements were made for the carrying on of the duties of the Surgeon Specialist at the Hospital.

There is one point I would like to clarify. There was much talk about there being one Surgeon Specialist, but I think hon. members would remember that only two or three months ago a Civil Establishment Order was introduced in this Chamber in which another Surgeon Specialist was added to the Establishment of the General Hospital, bringing the number to three. Some members seem to have the misunderstanding that there is only one on the Establishment, but there are three Surgeon Specialists, one for the eyes and two for general, including obstetrics. The most recent Surgeon Specialist is supposed to be one who is more versed in obstetrics than in general surgery. I hope that satisfies the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must confess it does not satisfy me. I have been in here a long time and I do not waste time in this House. First of all I should like the Minister to know that when he comes here and says that the Personnel Department has to be satisfied, I do not accept that. You have Cabinet Government today, and you must be satisfied; so do not tell me that the Personnel Department must be satisfied. If the Minister said he was satisfied, I would bow.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I would like to let the hon. senior member for Bridgetown know that

when a post is filled in any Government Department, the Minister is not supposed to know when it is filled or who applied for the post. People run away with the idea that the Minister knows these things, but I do not know when a doctor applies for employment at the Hospital, it is a matter for the Personnel Department, and not for the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I agree with the hon. member, but he said that the Personnel Department was satisfied. I think the hon. member knows that he is not lecturing to a novice in this House; so he must not be like that. I would defend him outside on a platform tomorrow by saying that it is not the Minister to make an appointment or anything of the sort, but he should not come here and say that the Personnel Department was satisfied that proper arrangements were made. He should tell us that his Ministry was satisfied that suitable arrangements were made, and I would sit down.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to make this point clear to the hon. member. The procedure is that the necessary correspondence comes from the Medical Superintendent through the Director of Medical Services to the Personnel Department directly, as it concerns them, and indirectly to the Ministry. The Ministry does not have any authority to make a decision on personnel matters here or there. The question of the terms of employment is a personnel matter and concerns the personnel section of the Government which is supposed to be non-political; but we get indirect knowledge of it. We cannot say in the Ministry that John Jones and Sydney Harris applied for a post at the Hospital and that Sydney Harris must have it, or that the Surgeon Specialist must or must not have vacation leave. Those are matters for the Personnel Department.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, again I look at the hon. member as a good schoolmaster, but he should not start lecturing to me. As soon as I came into politics, I made myself acquainted with every change. If the Minister can stand there and tell me and the public of Barbados that it is not incumbent upon him to be satisfied in his Ministry that the Personnel Department had made the necessary and proper arrangements to satisfy him that somebody would be looking after the health of the people, then I say he would have to be a full-fledged idiot. The Minister must be satisfied; and all the Minister need to have told me was that, because I never raised the question as to what you should do in the future. Let me put it this way: you are telling me about the correspondence that comes down. Doctor Bailey has just come back from the University of the West Indies. Are you telling me that if the Personnel Department told you that Doctor Bailey had applied and they were satisfied, you would be satisfied also? You would have to see the necessary documentary evidence and commit yourself to satisfy you; and if you tell me that is not so you are not running a Cabinet Government, because there are some things which must come to your Ministry. I am sure the hon. member next to you would tell you that is correct. The newspapers had it to say that Doctor Edghill did so well and did this and that. If the Personnel Department decided that Dr. Edghill did so well at the University and put him up to you — it is true you are young but you are knowledgeable — would you say that you are satisfied?

Mr. Chairman, the question I must defend here is that the Minister must be satisfied that the Personnel Department had done the correct thing. The hon. member knows that I would not take this opportunity through the pigment of somebody's skin to raise this noise. I deal with people everyday and it is something I like. I have had the courage of my convictions all my life; so do you believe that anybody could come and tell me that nonsense? If you take a person like Henry Pierre, you could not mistake the pigment of his skin even if you looked in a glass. Do you think, therefore, that somebody would raise a question of pigment?

The people who make use of the General Hospital and who must have the service of a Physician Specialist or a Surgeon Specialist are the poor people of the Island. As a matter of fact, I have already raised in this House that all is not well at the Institution, but that is none of your fault, I

raised in this House before that where people are allowed to practice at our Hospital with our nurses and with our instruments and tools, that the practice is to do two-thirds of the service free and to be paid for the other one-third. I have seen statistics that are to the contrary. However, I would say that you are to be satisfied that the Personnel Department has done the right thing. I could not imagine you as Minister of Social Services and with the interest you showed immediately you took over the Ministry in the running of the Hospital saying that the Personnel Department has to be satisfied.
6.20 p.m.

I know what the Hon. Minister would like to tell me. Of course, you have a young man who has been studying for his F.R.C.S. who has a tremendous lot of experience; but you cannot prevent people from saying that in Barbados you do not have a specialist. There are those of us who pay taxes who would be very well satisfied if you spent a couple of thousand dollars to have a specialist for the six months. What you are saying is that they are satisfied about the Registrar and you are saying that during the period when the Surgeon Specialist was away, there was somebody acting. Qualifications are qualifications and it does not matter what is the colour of the man's skin. We did not call Mr. Leacock's name over here. You cannot say that because the Personnel Department is satisfied, you are satisfied. Qualifications are the things which we are looking at. As a matter of fact, I have heard but not officially that the appointments made in the acting capacity are very good appointments; but, nevertheless, I must draw to the Hon. Minister's attention that there is some anxiety outside. Do not think that I am talking about what happened recently with Dr. Weatherhead's wife. I am not interested in that; I am interested in the hundreds of people who go to the Hospital every week for operations. That is all I am saying; and if the Hon. Minister tells me that the Personnel Department is satisfied and because of that his Ministry must be satisfied, that is not all. I know that you do not know who applies; but surely what you do know, and it is your duty to know, is that the necessary and proper arrangements are made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I have already said that only today, three cables were sent overseas with the hope as a result of those cables that we would have someone to hold on for the period of the absence of the Surgeon Specialist.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister. That information could have been given to me at the beginning. You told me that the Personnel Department was satisfied. I am something to do with the fact that you were satisfied. That is the answer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that, and when I was saying that, I was waiting on the hon. junior member for the City who was engaged in some other conversation.

The question that Head 38 — Medical (2) General Hospital — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (3) MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head 38 — Medical (3) Mental Hospital — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 38 — Medical (3) Mental Hospital — stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 38 - MEDICAL (5) DISTRICT HOSPITAL SERVICES

Head 38 — Medical (5) District Hospital Services — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 38 — Medical (5) District Hospital Services — stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 47 — SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I now beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$149,091 do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day.....

Mr. SMITH: Before you call the next Order of the Day, am I in order to make a personal explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it in respect of something which happened in the House or in Committee?

Mr. SMITH: I would have to say that it happened when we were in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member give me an intimation through the Clerk of the point which the hon. member wants to make?

Under Standing Order 68 which is a question of privilege, it is stated that a motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business. Is it that what the hon. member wants to rise on?

Mr. SMITH: If I am in order to raise it under a question of privilege, I will raise it under privilege, but I was raising it under Standing Order No. 17, Personal Explanation. If I am in order to raise it on a point of privilege, I will do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought it was a matter which has suddenly arisen which involves the privileges of the House.

Mr. SMITH: It has suddenly arisen.

Mr. SPEAKER: As it now appears to me, that would seem probably to involve a motion: so I think the hon. member will be quite in order to make a personal explanation.

The hon. member is seeking the indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation. It is clearly known that no controversial matter may be brought forward nor may any debate arise upon the explanation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give me the opportunity, what I would say is that the point which the hon. member wants to make and what he is complaining about looks to me as if there should be a motion; therefore, he should raise it under a point of privilege. 6.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am seeking a little further information with regard to the matter. *(After a pause)* From the information which is at my disposal I gather that it is more a matter of privilege than a simple matter of personal explanation. Under Standing Order 68, let the hon. member make a motion based on the matter which has suddenly arisen, and which appears to me to be a matter involving the privileges of the House, and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before that is done.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion on a point of privilege in connection with the behaviour to me, as a member of this General Assembly, by the Marshal of this House. Sir, fans are put off in this Chamber and that makes climatic conditions for me and other members of the House very uneasy. The members at the lower end of the Chamber called on the Clerk to have the fans put on. The Clerk instructed the Marshal to do so and I then called on the Clerk to have this fan over here put into action. The Clerk told the Marshal to put the fan on and the Marshal refused to do so. The Marshal then came up to me and said: "Mr. Mottley says not to put it on". *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intimation as to who Mr. Mottley is. There are several of them in this island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I have risen on a point of order to say that in the circumstances under which the point of order is raised, this is something which could be more appropriately dealt with by Your Honour in Chambers. There would be an unsavoury debate to have a thing like this put in the records of this House. I would therefore appeal to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to avoid a discussion on something affecting a servant of this House and to allow Your Honour to deal with the matter in Chambers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the assurance, that if the facts are brought to my knowledge, I will take whatever steps seem to me to be necessary to meet the ends of justice in this matter. I will do that if the facts are brought to my knowledge in Chambers. However, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has permission to proceed with his point of privilege.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber when this matter began; but if it is a matter which concerns the Officers of the House referring to their demeanour and their attitude while serving in the House, I would suggest to Your Honour that you either take up the matter privately as my colleague has suggested, or, on the other hand, ask strangers to leave the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already intimated that I am quite prepared to deal with this matter privately. Has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph decided to allow me to take up the matter privately with him and see if I can assure him that he receives entire satisfaction?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you have intimated that you will take up the matter privately, and hon. members are not in favour of my going any further with this matter. I will therefore leave it to Your Honour to investigate and let me know your findings. However, I am not at all satisfied, not for one moment, about this matter; I want the House and the public to understand that I am not at all satisfied with the treatment which has been meted out to me by the Marshal of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I assure the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I will go into the matter carefully and let him know my findings. The next Order of the Day stands in the name of.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before that Order is called.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to inform the hon. member that that point of privilege which was being raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been automatically withdrawn. It has been left to me to decide; by clear intimation, the hon. member has left the matter in my hands. There is now no matter of privilege before the House.

ORDER WITHDRAWN

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the grant by the Executive Committee of a tenancy to the Savannah Club of a parcel of land situate at the Garrison in the parish of Saint Michael, described in the Schedule thereto.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw this Order, as I have no intention of proceeding with it.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Communications has asked leave to withdraw Order No. 2 standing in his name, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted the hon. member to withdraw that Order standing in his name.

May I just say that, as this was the Resolution in respect of which my attention was drawn on 31st January, I think, by the Hon. and Learned Premier, and I promised that I would investigate, so far as the officers and members of the staff are concerned, *apropos* to the purported signature of myself, not to speak of the President of the other Chamber and Her Majesty's Representative, as a result of investigation which I instituted in connection with the publication in the *Official Gazette* of 31st January, 1963, there has been absolutely no error or omission on the part of any officer or any member of the Staff of this Chamber which in any way whatsoever contributed to this exceedingly unfortunate and no doubt unprecedented incident which may well be deemed to have constituted a breach of the privilege of this House, in that something which did not take place in this Chamber had been reported as having transpired.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION re EXPENDITURE FOR PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve under section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1962-63, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval by the Port Department to use.....

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the procedure for the remainder of the Sitting, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended.

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

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1961, for the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1962-63 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. The amounts are all set out very clearly in the Schedule and the notes are self-explanatory.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the only question I have to direct to the Hon. Minister is this: under Item 33 — Light, Power and Water — I am sure the Minister will be able to tell me, as he travels in this vicinity quite often, why it is so many of these lights are not burning and have not been given any attention. I counted as many as fourteen which have continuously been so for the past months. I understand, Sir, that the situation at the Harbour is that you take care of the maintenance — and what not — of these lights, and I have heard quite a number of people ask what is being done. With the other street lights, every opportunity is taken to keep them in order. I have spoken to the Minister privately about this and I am sure he must have gone into it.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the Minister's attention that just in front of the Customs Office there is a spot of land of about one acre where people who go to see their loved ones off or come in, park their cars. I would like the area to be paved not only for the benefit of the tourists, but for the benefit of the Island. A gentleman came in the other day from his last port of call which was Puerto Rico, and I was glad to hear him say that this was the cleanest port he had visited.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. BOXILL: I am, Sir, but I was taken by a sudden attack of hiccoughs. This gentleman said that this was the cleanest port he had seen in his travels and spoke very highly of the place. I would like, if the Government could see it possible, to have the whole compound paved, with a few trees planted around it, because it is a kind of triangle just in front of where the passengers usually come off. I should like to draw to the Minister's attention also that there is the necessity for building a shed around there for the people who sell curios and so on. It is very appalling sometimes to see them creating a little Shanty Town by putting up something to shade them from the sun, and when it starts to rain, they have to run with a bunch of hats and other articles into the Customs building and come out again when the rain stops. If we could erect a shed, it would not spoil the beauty of the place, because it would be something like the ones in the bus-stand.

I should also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a dire need for another tug as the one we have now is not enough; it is too small to do the amount of work it is called upon to do. I can tell you that quite a number of these French ships do not come alongside the Harbour because the captains are not going to take the chance of bringing the ships into this Harbour with only one tug. As you know, the pilots here are fairly young and do not want to take chances; so they are not going to come right up as they really can do.
6.50 p.m.

It is really necessary to have another tug to complement the one which we have there or we would have to get a big tug or an ocean-going tug. I would prefer that we get another tug to complement the one which we have there.

There is another thing. Some people think that you have to go to a University to have some kind of sense, but that is not so. Of all the good books written in the world, such

as Dr. Zhivago by Boris Pasternik, the first thing which the people who write them must have is commonsense. No person can write a book if that person is a fool. What I am going to say is that we have a man-made reef around the Deep Water Harbour. God knew what he was doing when he created Barbados. People seem to think that the reefs which we have around Barbados are specifically put there for fishermen to go and catch seacats. The reefs which we have around the Island are to protect it. If we are going out beyond the Reef to build a Deep Water Harbour, we should create a reef just as the one which we had there. Anybody who has been to La Guayra which is the seaport town of Caracas would know that they have enough water there just as what we have here. You should start the reef from 100 yards and go 400 yards out. You need that if you are to protect that \$30 million Deep Water Harbour. If you do not have that, you are going to wake one morning and find that the Harbour has gone to St. Lucia. You better spend another \$1 million now and drop some more stones out there. You must make a reef out there large enough to break the swells. If you do not do that, we are going to lose that \$30 million which we spent on the Harbour. I am serious about what I am saying and I hope the Hon. Minister is taking me seriously.

Another thing is this. As it is not practicable to put rails around the Harbour, I am wondering whether the time has not come that the Government will see to it to appoint someone — or may be that Police Officer whom you have at the Bridge Post and who is giving yeoman service in teaching people who work on the Deep Water Harbour to swim. This Police Officer apart from teaching people how to swim has to go on the Deep Water Harbour and do duty. I think those of us who can swim will appreciate this very much.

I feel some post ought to be created specifically to train people, specifically those who are occupied on the Deep Water Harbour, how to swim for the benefit of the tourists who come here. Swimming is as much a necessity in life as walking. The strangest thing is that every possible animal on earth can swim except man. If you throw a man in the sea, he starts shrieking: "Help! Help!"

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member feeling indisposed?

Mr. BOXILL: I was just reminiscing on the action of people who cannot swim.

I am throwing out the suggestion to the Government that now this gentleman at the Bridge Post is a fairly young man, it is a very good idea that you make him a swimming instructor. Take him away from his police duties.

I must say that the police down at the Deep Water Harbour are doing yeoman service; but if we do not give them more authority, we are wasting our time. Sometimes people from outside go to the Harbour and give the police an undue amount of trouble. All that the policemen can do is to try and get them out. I feel the time has come when you should give the police who are stationed there, not directly dictatorial powers, but allow them to have a little more latitude in dealing with people who go to the Port.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am drawing the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to the method of calculating at the Deep Water Harbour for excess storage. At the present, the Harbour authorities charge \$2.00 per ton for the first 72-hour period, \$4.00 per ton for the second 72-hour period and \$6.00 per ton for each 72-hour period and part thereafter.

Now, Sir, if one has a package there weighing ten pounds, one has to pay the same rate as that for a ton. I term that as unfair because you now work it out in tons only; but you can come from a ton to a half ton, to a quarter ton, and even to a pound.

At present, the crop season is going on and the factories are buying canes by the ton. When one sends a half ton of canes at the factory, one is not paid the price of a ton for that. I do not see why the authorities at the Deep Water Harbour should be charging a ton rate for a package of only ten pounds. I will not say that the Harbour authorities do not

know how to calculate, but surely they can work it out from a ton to a pound; therefore, why charge people the rate for a ton if the package is only ten pounds?
7.00 p.m.

I have known of a case down there in which the weight was only 28 pounds, and through no fault of the person, by rating it at the ton weight, the person had to pay more than what the whole thing was worth; in other words, he had to sell it at a loss. You cannot charge two dollars for a ton when you only have ten pounds in weight. I hope that the Hon. Minister will go into the matter and see that these people charge according to the weight of the particular package. If the package weighs half a ton, then they should charge for half a ton; if it is a quarter of a ton, they should charge for a quarter of a ton, and similarly, if the package weighs ten pounds, then they should charge for ten pounds. I know that the Minister will get up and say that they want people to get out these packages because they cannot be allowed to remain there. I would agree with him; but, at the same time, I cannot agree with this wholesale robbery in charging for one ton when you only have ten pounds in weight. Nobody will allow his goods to remain at the Harbour for a longer period than they should remain there because when a person orders goods he wants to get out those goods. Goods come down to people on a sight draft which would be c.o.d.; and if you have a lot of goods to be taken out, you may not have the wherewithal to take them all out at the same time, and you are only allowed five days' grace. You are making people pay for these goods, but you are creating a heavier burden on them now. It would be a person's fault not to bring out his goods immediately, but it is not his fault when you are robbing him. Because you have calculating machines whereby you can work out things to a finery, you should not charge these people six dollars a ton for something which weighs five pounds.

Mr. Speaker, since I have drawn this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister, I am asking him to go into the matter and see that this thing does not happen any longer. The Government or the Port or the owner of the goods would not be losing anything if you were to work out this thing proportionately. A factory would not give a man money for one ton of canes when the weight of those canes is only half a ton; why then should you make people pay for one ton at the Harbour when the weight of a package is only ten pounds? I hope that the Hon. Minister will give instructions for calculating the weights properly and making people pay proportionately.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows about Port dues and Port charges. They are not calculated in the same way as how you would be selling flour; they are calculated on so much a ton or part thereof. You do not want to utilise the Port for things which you could accommodate elsewhere. The Postal Services would accept packages up to 22 lbs in weight and you can have many 22-lb packages so as to obviate the charges which you will get; but the Port has to operate on a basis that it is not a place where goods are to remain. This is a transit shed, and the name implies that the goods can only pass through this shed. In the old days, persons who ordered goods would have to get somewhere to keep those goods. I would never agree to emasculating the Port Charges on that basis as the hon. member mentioned. With normal charges in a Port, people will have the goods cluttered up in a lot of little packages and you cannot get any room which is so much needed. If you work these things out per ton and reduce them to the amount of pounds, it does not matter if the goods remain there for ten days or twenty days. It is a fact that the Port does not look forward to be a money-making place. These charges are prohibitive charges so as to make people clear the place; it is not a question of getting money, but rather it is a question of getting space. You therefore maintain a charge so as not to have the place cluttered up with a lot of little packages.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph raised the question about a man having a sight draft. If you do not have the money to pay for these things, then that is your business. You cannot be in business and say that you do not have the

money to do it. This sort of sentimentality does not apply. If I order something, I must know if I have the money to pay for it. If you have not got the money to pay for the goods, then you should allow somebody to back you up with the money so that you can get the packages out. In all parts of the world, the Ports operate on the basis such as I have mentioned. If you were to agree with what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, then the next thing you will hear is that the hon. junior member for Christ Church will come down with a leg of meat or something like that, and you will have a lot of little packages cluttered up as I have mentioned, and then you will not get any room in the transit shed. The idea of a transit shed is that it should be kept clear. This is a transit shed and not a warehouse. That is the mistake which people make. The difference between a warehouse and a transit shed is this; a warehouse connotes some building in which you place goods and you pay for keeping them there for as many days as you want to keep them there; but a transit shed, as the name implies, is something different. It is a place which has to be cleared of goods quickly.

7.10 p.m.

I understand that the Port Manager has certain discretionary powers, and can use his discretion in circumstances brought to his attention; so the question of how much you pay might be waived, because if a person can show out to the Port Manager that something went wrong with the postal service and he did not receive his papers, he can waive the charges. These are instances in which the Port Manager would have to exercise his control to help people out, but I do not think you can have a Port rate. This would suggest having to work out things by the pound and Barbados would become unique. I do not know if the Minister wants to put a lot of work on the people there by having a five pound scale for weighing articles. That to me is for when you are selling meat.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it is really not as simple as that. To begin with, this is not a matter for the Port Manager at all. The Port Contractors are in charge of the transit sheds, and the question of the charge is under their jurisdiction. At the present moment, it is \$6.00 a ton for the first thirty-six hours, and after that it doubles and goes on like that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is wrong. These are charges which are set out in the Tariff Book which have been passed by this House of Assembly; so the Tariff Book determines what is to be charged in the transit sheds. This is nothing the Port Contractors can play about with.

Mr. GODDARD: I am saying, Sir, that this is not under the Port Manager's jurisdiction, but under the Manager of the Port Contractors; Mr. Parker is the one to use his discretionary powers. The charge is \$6.00 a ton for the first thirty-six hours, then it doubles for the next forty-eight hours; but the idea is that it is a transit shed and is to compel the merchants to move their goods out as speedily as possible, and this actually starts from the day the ships arrive. Even if the goods do not come off the first day, it is added to the second day, but the first day counts and five days are given. We have all from time to time had to pay these charges. Through a change of personnel, it escaped us and we actually had to pay on one occasion for one shipment of goods \$114. Most recently I just could not get a truck to hire, no matter where I tried, and I had to pay that amount. What the hon. member is saying is that the minimum charge is \$6.00 and I am inclined to agree with him that it is not going to affect the big merchant; it is going to affect the small person or individual who may have something sent to him from a friend in New York, a box of goods or a gift which could be left there unnoticed. The person may not know it is there or may not know how to pass the warrants to get the package; so it will be hard on the small person. I agree that the minimum charge of \$6.00 per ton could have been reduced to \$1.50 which seems to be justifiable to me. A package or a barrel in the corner of that shed would not take up any space at all, but it is a matter of where you end. If you leave it at \$6.00 it is not going to affect any merchant in Bridgetown or Roebuck Street, but it is going to affect the individual who may have something

sent to him and who may be unfamiliar with the system of getting the goods out, and most likely he will have to pay these charges.

Mr. Chairman, it does not matter whether it is changed from one ton to a quarter of a ton, but if there are any cases in which there are impositions on individuals for small packages, I will come here with a Resolution to have this amended. I do not know how many people have to pay this charge, but I can see the justice of his argument that \$6.00 per ton for a small package which may not cost \$6.00 would be unjustifiable, and you may as well abandon it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has mentioned that several of the lights in the area of the Deep Water Harbour are not burning. This is a particular type of light which draws very little current and would not affect the eyes of the captain of ships approaching the Harbour. The blue bright light has a much greater tendency to distort distances which can be very dangerous to pilots and seamen as a whole entering a Harbour at night, and that is why this particular type of light is used around the Harbour. Several of the bulbs have blown, and there is an order for spare bulbs for these particular lights which I think they must have received by now. All the spares have been used, but there is an order for replacement of those blown, and a reasonable stock to be kept for the future.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas mentioned the area outside the Customs. Provision is being made in that area for handicraft and other ventures just on the square outside to the south and east of the Customs shed. The hon. member also mentioned the necessity for another tug. For his information, I would say that that is also under consideration, because I have seen where the necessity for a second tug exists. With reference to the pilots being young and would not take any chances, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the hon. member. The younger the pilots, the more dare-devils they will be. It is experience that keeps them from doing dare-devil things, and I am pleased to know that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas considers the pilots as being young and careful, because youth and carefulness do not blend at sea; it is usually age and carefulness, or youth and recklessness.

On the other point which the hon. member raised concerning the area in front of the Harbour, I would like to inform him that right at the edge of the breakwater where the stones would be dropped, there is a depth of sixty feet of water and it would take a considerable amount of stone to make an artificial reef. With regard to the training of people around there to swim, I would say from my experience, Mr. Speaker, that good swimmers usually drown first. The people who cannot swim do not venture into the sea, and take the necessary precautions.

7.20 p.m.

It is the good swimmers who always get drowned.

As regards the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and the hon. junior member for Christ Church with respect to tonnage rates, I would go into the full figures of those tonnage rates and have the matter investigated, although I may say that we took over the Government with those figures already operating. Those rates were set by the Government of which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph happened to be a member. This Government was not responsible for laying those charges at the Port. I will do the hon. member the favour of going into them and relieving any hardships, if there are any, on the people of Barbados; but it must be borne in mind that the Deep Water Harbour cost \$32 million and it has got to be paid for. If there is anything which can be done to relieve the hardships, I will do it.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter explained, there are two warehouses there, and if you have 100 or 200 packages there of 20 pounds stored for people, they will cause a lot of room to be taken up and an amount of inconvenience. As hon. members should know, certain areas are laid out for consignees' cargoes. These small packages, if

allowed to stay there for a long time, can create a big problem. Packages of 14 pounds up to 20 pounds, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out, are the kind of packages which can be posted by parcel post. These two sheds are transit sheds and they are only for passing through cargo; otherwise, there would be a great problem there. If consignees do not take their cargo out quickly, there would be no where to put the incoming cargo. The extra fee put on is to make it prohibitive and not for getting in extra money. We require the space in the warehouses - not the money. If it were otherwise, that is to say, if it were for receiving big sums of money and to have the space occupied by consignments all the time, there would be no where to put the cargo which is landed. That is why there is a prohibitive charge after a certain amount of days.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That brings Government Business to an end for this day.

Mr. Speaker, as I told the House earlier, the Government proposes to proceed with the Draft Estimates when the house meets next Tuesday, and this would be followed by the Committee of Supply and the other matters which we gave notice of today would follow in due course on the Order Paper. As I intimated earlier, we propose to meet on Tuesday next at 12.00 noon, and then on Friday of next week to continue with the Draft Estimates for 1963-64.

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 12th March, 1963, at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

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

7.30 p. m.