

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th 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*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. R. STC. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; 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 for the two meetings of last week, I am afraid, are not yet ready.

I should like to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th April, 1962. Also, the Financial Report of the same officer for the month ended 31st May, 1962.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled 'The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1963'.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly view with great concern the statement made by a Councillor at a meeting of the Northern District Council on the 14th March, 1963; and the alleged irregularities that are existing therein,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government be asked to appoint a committee to investigate the entire running of the Northern District Council.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 82/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on 23rd October, 1962, is now ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 88/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew on 20th November, 1962, is now ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 97/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on 15th January, 1963 is now ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 106/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on 19th February, 1963, is now ready.
2.50 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the request of the Hon. Premier, in order to deal today with Order No. 8 standing in his name, I am asking leave for the suspension of Standing Order No. 40.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that this Bill has not yet been printed.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Standing Order No. 40 be suspended for the remainder of today's Session.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: This is now Question Time and the Oral Reply to Question No. 82/1962, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is ready. That is on Page Five at the bottom left hand corner.

Mr. SMITH: Before we proceed with this question, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have nothing in front of me by way of an Order Paper. It has just been presented here to me by the Marshal and I have not yet had the chance to see what is happening. I ask that you give me a chance to open it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that due to the meeting on Friday last, the printing of the Order Paper was delayed.

Would the hon. member care to put his questions at the next meeting of the House?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question to which Oral Replies are ready is No. 88/1962. That hon. member is not in his place and accordingly, I will allow those questions to stand over until the next meeting.

MASS POLIO VACCINATION CAMPAIGN

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question, No. 97/1962, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, it is in the right hand corner on Page Six.

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

Is Government aware that poliomyelitis is very rampant in British Guiana?

2. Would Government embark immediately on a mass polio vaccination campaign in all schools and Health Centres throughout the Island?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The reply is as follows:-

"The Government is aware that there was a threatened outbreak of poliomyelitis in British Guiana, but this outbreak is said to have passed its peak.

"Research discloses that young children in Barbados are in the greatest need of protection against polio. For the past three and a half years, the Department of Medical Services has concentrated on the vaccination of children under two years with the result that by 1962, a fair proportion of the children between nine months and five years have been vaccinated.

"It is considered that this is a more satisfactory method of protection in our circumstances than the embarking on a mass vaccination campaign. This service will continue to be given free by all Health Centres."

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary question. Is the Minister aware that this disease has now spread to Trinidad and they, too, have pursued the necessary precautionary methods?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am aware of that, but it poses no serious threat to Barbados. As I have said before, the Government of Barbados did not wait until 1962 to start a vaccination campaign against this disease. We have started three and a half years ago and, as the hon. member would have noticed, even in the last Estimates we made provision for even going further afield with oral vaccine.

POSSIBILITY OF INDUSTRIES IN ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 106/1962 also standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

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

Will Government in their negotiations explore the possibility of having at least two industries located in the parish of St. Thomas, in view of the fact that it is the Government's intention to have as many new industries as possible established in the Island?

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

"1. Yes."

"2. The Government will bear in mind the hon. member's wish. It should be however pointed out that economic considerations and the wishes of the industrialists themselves are usually the besetting factors as to where an industry should be located."

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more replies to Oral Questions; we come to Private Members' Business.

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. 3.00 p.m.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: 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 authorize the sale of certain lands at St. George's Rectory, St. George.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Select Committee which has been appointed to consider and report on this Bill has not yet met; therefore, I am unable to go on with this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it that the Committee has not met at all, or it has not yet completed its labours?

Mr. LOWE: The Committee has not met at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:- To move the third reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, as I have already explained to this House, I will withdraw this Bill in view of the fact that the Government proposes to introduce a Bill of this nature; however, I do not intend to withdraw this Bill until such time as the proposed Bill is in draft form to come here. You can very well understand that this section has already been passed in this Chamber, but I do not want to withdraw anything until I make sure that what I am withdrawing is taking place in the same structure of the Bill. Until that time comes, I will allow this Bill to remain on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:- To move the third reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee which has been appointed to consider and report on this Bill has not yet reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George whose seat, I observe, is vacant.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church:- 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, we are not yet ready to go on with this Bill. Like all of these Private Members' Bills, this Bill is being held up in order that it might first be looked at by the Executive Committee or the Cabinet. There are about four or five Bills in the same position. I am very worried about that, because we are told that the Government may soon be proroguing the House and that may mean that these Bills will be wiped off the Order Paper and we will have to bring them back here again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that this matter is receiving very urgent attention and will probably be considered by the Cabinet in the very near future. The hon. member can therefore rest assured that in another week or two the matter will be dealt with.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, I can give the assurance that I will take up the en-

tire question of Private Members' Bills before the Cabinet and have the matter expedited as soon as possible.

HOME FOR ELDERLY GENTLEMEN IN STRAITENED CIRCUMSTANCES BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also 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 Straited Circumstances.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity of moving the second reading of this Bill. This is a Bill to incorporate the Home for Elderly Gentlemen in Straited Circumstances. The purpose of this Bill is to secure perpetuity of this Home and, like all Bills, the matter has to come to this House for incorporation. This Home has been established for many years and the parties concerned now want it to be incorporated for the purposes of perpetuity. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SEALEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection in a general way to a Bill like this, but the hon. mover did not explain what the Home for Elderly Gentlemen in Straited Circumstances is. It is true that this Bill must have had a Preamble and notice must have been given to this House already; but I would be glad if the hon. mover would give us some idea of what the Home for Elderly Gentlemen in Straited Circumstances happens to be. In this age when we use the words "Gentlemen" and "Elderly Gentlemen," it gives me the feeling as if you are incorporating a sector of the community in our laws. I feel that the days are over when you can enshrine our laws with anything which would savour of discrimination, class or racial prejudice. If this is anything like that, then I would be objecting to it. If any sector is looking for protection, then it should be looking for protection in a private way and nobody can interfere with that; but if you want to have anything savouring of racial discrimination or any of the other old bogus things at which our predecessors were quite prepared to shrug their shoulders, I am not prepared to do that. I would be very glad if the hon. member would let us know what this Home for Elderly Gentlemen in Straited Circumstances is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to speak on this Bill before the hon. mover exercises his right of reply? *(After a pause).*

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the last speaker, I would like to say that, as far as I know, there are ten old gentlemen in that home. It is a modest home; it is a house which has been turned into a home, and I do believe that there are gentlemen of colour there, not only today but they have been there for some time. (Mr. WALCOTT: What do you mean by gentlemen of colour?) They are not of all European descent. I do not know of them sufficiently and I do not want to call any names; but this is of a private nature. Somebody knows somebody who is on the Committee and people are admitted to the Home in that way; but, as I have already said, there are one or two gentlemen in this Home who are not entirely of European descent.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is customary for such a Bill to be referred to a Select Committee for consideration and I am therefore asking the following hon. members to serve on a Committee to consider this Bill:—The hon. junior member for Christ Church; (Mr. Goddard); the hon. senior member for St. Michael, (Mr. Sealey); the hon. senior member for St. Peter, (Mr. Walcott); the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, (Hon. A. DaC. Edwards) and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, (Mr. Batson).
3.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and that has been deferred having regard to and still awaiting the report of the Farley Commission on the price of canes. The next Order of

the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George whom I observe is not in his place, and after that is an Order in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John who is not in his place. Likewise, that applies to the next Order and the following Orders until we arrive at Order No. 14 which 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 before the House, the Hon. Minister of Social Services moved, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Education, that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed. Does the Hon. Minister of Social Services desire now to resume discussion?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when I asked for further consideration of this Resolution to be postponed, I thought that it should have been discussed in the presence of the Hon. Minister of Finance who is responsible for it, and it was on those grounds that I asked to have it postponed. The Minister of Finance is not in his seat at present, and therefore I have no intention of going into this Resolution right now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister asking for it to be further postponed again?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member realises the Rules of this House in a debate. It is not his motion and he only moved that the debate be postponed on the last occasion. Now today when the debate is to be resumed, he loses his opportunity to speak. He cannot now in resuming the debate start off by making a motion that he be allowed not to continue with this question because the Minister of Finance is not in his place, since some other member may be willing to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister whose motion was carried on the last occasion did not lose his right to speak. He availed himself of it, he has spoken and he has again moved that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. WALCOTT: But, Mr. Speaker, no member can make two motions of that kind on the same debate. A member could not get up and speak and make a motion that the debate be postponed, and then when the debate is to be resumed, he speaks again and asks that the debate be further postponed, because if he goes on at that rate, he can go on *ad infinitum* postponing the Resolution whenever the debate arises. If he does not want to continue today, my submission is therefore that he loses his right to speak because it is now his right to speak, and if he says he is not going to speak, he cannot have it both ways. He cannot ask for the debate to be postponed before other members speak, because I will speak now on the postponement. I just want the hon. member to know that it is not being postponed in the way he thinks the debate is going to be postponed, because if the question is put today for the debate to be postponed, and a decision is taken in which members are in favour of the substantive motion, whether or not the Minister of Finance is here, that is the end of the matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the House seconding the motion for postponement?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I took it, Mr. Speaker, that ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Or is the hon. member speaking on the substantive motion?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rose on a point of order to say that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, so far as I know, did not make a speech today at all. You recalled the fact that on the last occasion when this matter was before the House, the hon. member had spoken and proposed that, in view of the absence of the Minister of Finance under

(a) a Medical Aid Scheme to contributors and/or their dependants,

(b) a Scheme further to assist contributors and/or their dependants in the construction or purchase of homes,"

You could debate that without committing yourself to say "Yes, we will agree" or "We will not agree", or "We think that this is something that you should go into." This is nothing which should be left for the Hon. Minister of Finance to decide. He has the Stockman Report—and I will go further; I will let this House know that the hon. member's Ministry, the Ministry of Trade, has sent out to the Union informing them that in view of this Report dealing with these matters which are of a far-reaching nature in relation to the Provident Fund for the sugar industry workers, the Ministry has invited the Union not to proceed to deal with that as was originally suggested until we have dealt with the question....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. What we are discussing is the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme which is applicable to members of the Public Service; therefore I am submitting that what the hon. member has said has nothing to do with, or cannot be regarded in the same category as, Social Security Scheme or the Provident Fund for agricultural workers. That is a different thing entirely.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is pitiable to note that those hon. members have sent out a Report which they have not read. If they had read this Report, they could not have been making these statements. I would invite them to go and read pages 10, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 21 of this Report before they begin to talk these things. In this Report which I have here, specific mention is made of the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme and the Government's Pension Scheme, and a recommendation is also contained in the Report where it says that if you are thinking of any scheme which is going to embrace a wider scope for those people outside, the Government must pay attention to drawing these people into the scheme.
3.40 p.m.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Ministers had read the Report as I have done, and digested what is in it, they could have debated it as I am going to debate it, and I will say to the hon. member that in the light of Stockman Report and the information in it, the indications are that you should examine the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, although an examination was not carried out on the Widows' and Orphans' Fund in the same detail. Mr. Stockman mentioned the 4% that is being paid by people, and specific mention is made of it in this Report pointing out that it is a complicated system, how your widows get it, what the contributions are, where it starts and that some people pay up to 35 years; so the Report does make mention of Widows and orphans.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I say that is because I read the Report yesterday; so the hon. member will know that I am no earlier than they from one stage to the other, because my organisation has to reply to this matter; therefore it is no point the hon. member saying that this has nothing to do with the hon. member's Resolution. This is a public document and it makes reference to the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund. One of the things we should know in Barbados, and this is what the Report says, is that 4% is taken out of everybody's money in the Public Service; so it is a high proportion of money from which nobody knows what are the benefits accruing. A point we will have to analyse is that in one breath you say that Civil Servants' Pensions are non-contributory, but the Widows' and Orphans' Fund is not applicable to everybody although a deduction is made from all members with the exception of the members of the Police Force. I am not a Minister, and if I can debate this matter, why is it that the Minister of Social Services cannot debate it even off the cuff? He should have sufficient resourcefulness to discuss this off the cuff; but he does not have to debate it off the cuff, because he can debate it from the Report. The Minister should either ask the hon. member not to proceed to have a decision taken on

this Resolution, in view of the information in the Report and the wider scheme which the Government is examining, or to have the Resolution so amended so as to exclude (a) and (b) of the Resolution which specified a Medical Aid Scheme to contributors and/or their dependants, and a Scheme further to assist contributors and/or their dependants in the construction or purchase of homes. People in the Civil Service in Barbados are entitled to medical services not being paid for by the Government, but the Hospital services do not in any way exclude a Civil Servant who is contributing to Widows' and Orphans' from getting medical service at the Hospital. That is a generalisation. Anybody is entitled to get medical service, but the hon. member's Resolution, I believe, is to give a person paid medical services in direct form where he went to a private doctor as distinct from having medical treatment. These are things that you can discuss when you read the implications of the Report on a Social Security Scheme. Medical aid is an aspect of social security, and it is a scheme for which the hon. member was asking for a specific amount of money under the Widows and Orphans' Fund to be used.

My point at this stage in the debate and in our thinking on a national security scheme is that I would not agree to the exclusion of a particular fund for a particular group in the thinking that is now going on. I would say that this is something which the Government should give study to in view of the decisions that have been made. The reason why I say that to the hon. member and the analogy I was drawing is that the sugar industry has workers for whom money has been put up, and it had been recommended three or four years ago that a fund equivalent to \$2 1/2 million should be started in order to provide a Provident Fund for the workers in the sugar industry. The Ministry of Labour sent out to a private organisation, the Union, asking it to wait, in view of the fact that the Government is engaging in a study of a Social Security Scheme of a more comprehensive nature. Moreover the Minister subsequently sent to the Union—and we will give him a reply in due course—saying that they intended to introduce a Workmen's Compensation amendment which does not include the point we made in the Union that Workmen's Compensation today should be a state fund and that they should not be sending money out of Barbados anymore. Even on that we have to await a further study because the Government has not made up its mind as to what the position is, although the Minister of Labour himself was a strong proponent of the Ontario Scheme nearly 20 years ago. We still have to await for a study based on this Report; so my submission is that the Minister of Social Services was more than well armed to come today and enter into the debate as any competent Minister or member of the House should be able to do with this Report. If members take these Reports to adorn their libraries and not read them, then our debates will always fall flat on these involved and intricate matters, because when the leaders should be exercising their minds on them, they do not, but come here and read a paper which a Civil Servant has written as a memo on these Reports. My task is to read these things, and the Minister has no excuse for postponing the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance must hear the debate—for by all means it will be recorded—and from the nature of the debate he can make up his mind. I feel that the Widows' and Orphans' Scheme is one which should be examined if it has not been minutely examined by Mr. Stockman. I would say that fundamentally it is a Whitley Council and Civil Service Association matter, and I would say that the Civil Servants who are the persons concerned should of necessity be pressing these claims, and I would say quite frankly to the hon. senior member for St. Michael that it is just like something to deal with the Union. I would feel I was not in a better position to know the specific needs of its members as compared with the members of the House of Assembly, because there are 24 members in the House of Assembly as compared with thousands, but the Civil Service has formed an Association of thousands of members outside and they would know at various stages what they want. If they say that the Widows' and Orphans' Fund should be investigated, you should investigate it, and from that investigation you can reach a decision as to what is the best scheme. They have stated in their memorandum that they

want to see the Widows' and Orphans' Funds so amended as to give better awards.

Mr. Speaker, the Widows' and Orphans' Fund in itself is not a bad thing. I do not subscribe to the view that the Widows' and Orphans' fund as such and in itself is a pernicious thing, because if you think about Social Security, you must think of widows and orphans. Those are natural things that are going to happen. The bread-winner is going to die and leave a widow or orphans, therefore this is going to take care of them, and I do not find that any public scheme or state scheme which makes provision for widows and orphans is in itself a bad thing.

3.50 p.m.

It is by examination of the Widows' and Orphans' Scheme that we have to know if the maximum benefits are derived by the contributors to this scheme. This is where I say that you cannot have subscribers to a scheme and some of them are not participants in the scheme like the Widows' and Orphans' Fund which the Government is pursuing. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you can see very well that these Civil Servants are participants to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund for which the structural arrangement should be the topic of an intelligent exercise.

Sir in this Report, Mr. Stockman made recommendations for which the Hon. Minister has rightly said that these are things which you would hear about. It is my intention to deal with this matter. I know that the Ministers on the other side are sometimes extremely touchy on these things. I am not in politics for any favour. I am in public life because I must talk as I see things. I am not a politician who is going to pester any Ministry for any personal favour. No Minister can offer me anything. I do not go in for those things. So far as the Hon. Minister of Social Services is concerned, I find him to be co-operative and a genial person. But as regards this question of postponing the debate, I say that the Minister must be competent to deal with matters which come before the House and he should not be saying that the Minister of Finance is not in the House, and therefore, let us postpone the matter.

If the debate is not completed, you do not have to wind it up. If the hon. senior member for St. Michael says anything which brings any Government Minister in dispute, under the present Rules of the House, the Minister has more power now than at any time, because the Minister can open a debate and close a debate. If you read these debates, you will see that there are more points of order by Ministers than the debate itself on the matter. You will find, every time that we debate a matter, Hon. Ministers getting up on points of order. However, you cannot do that to an old stager like myself. I am not going to allow you to stop me debating a matter. I am going to see that you do not stop me when you rise on a point of order because I am going to sit down and let you make your points of order, and then get up again.

My reason for entering this debate is because I have the right. The people of Barbados pay for the public services, not the people in St. Michael alone. There are 240,000 people in the Island, and the Public Service is the Public Service of Barbados; therefore when an hon. member is dealing with this Resolution, he is dealing with a Resolution which has national significance. It may be true that there may be more public servants in St. Michael owing to the density of the population in St. Michael, and in the Hon. Mover of the Resolution asking the question, he may be asking it for the greater number of public servants because the greater number resides in the hon. member's constituency. That must be so when it is borne in mind that we have 8,000 people residing in the parish of St. Michael. I am sure when you add up the aggregate of the other parishes in which Civil Servants reside, you will find that the parish of St. Michael may have more than they.

The hon. member's Resolution is not a Resolution which should be postponed in this way. It should be debated and at the end of the debate, the Hon. Mover should determine if he is going to put it to the vote. If he is satisfied that the Government is going to take action on it, he may not ask that it be put to the vote; but to say that you are postponing it without members discussing it is not in the best interest.

The Resolution which has been submitted in its broad form is that Government take steps to carry out a thorough

investigation into the operation of the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme. If the hon. mover has no objection, my feeling is that his request of having the Widows' and Orphans' Pensions Scheme investigated should be set out without specifying how it should be utilised because that is always a question that further debate should be made about.

I would say that this is something which other hon. members should debate and I am sure that hon. members would take the opportunity to do so; I hope that they will read the Report by Mr. Stockman on Social Security first, and then I think they will be in a better position to express their views as to what should take place with the Widows' and Orphans' Fund in the light of what has been stated in Mr. Stockman's recommendation. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a Resolution which hon. members should debate and hon. members should be able to debate on the broadest grounds. No man can say with any certainty how much he should get from the Fund because no rates are laid down that if you work for twenty or twenty-five years that you will get a certain amount from the fund.

Mr. Stockman made recommendations on scales and he put them down into six categories of wages and then he says that a person in number seven group should get a pension of \$10.00 a week. He has written in his Report and pointed out that the Widows' and Orphans' Fund was a very complicated system for which he was not in a position to say how the computations or the benefits were derived. There is a specific reference in this Report as regards that, Mr. Stockman also made a criticism of the Old Age Pensions and said that he would say that his terms of reference would have included those things. His terms of reference was to undertake a general survey of the existing Social Security methods (contributory and non-contributory) including Friendly Societies.

He said that in view of the fact that his terms of reference were so wide he also looked into the position of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund. That is why I said today that the Hon. Minister of Social Services was in the very excellent position of having this Report to study — I bought twenty-five copies at \$1.50 each from his Ministry — so as to debate this matter and at least let the hon. member know the position as regards this question of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund.

4.00 p.m.

I must say that the Hon. Minister of Trade, the Deputy Premier, was a little bit off the beat, and in these debates, when you are a little bit off the beat, you are not playing the right tune. I know that the Hon. Minister is a very busy man but he must have read the Stockman Report. I would advise him that in this Report there is the question of the Widows and Orphans' Scheme with which this Resolution deals, and it deals with the matter in a form in which you can debate it. This is a Fund which deserves an up-to-date investigation as to the accretions, how the money is being utilised, how much benefit you pay out annually, so that you will know whether four per cent taken from the people is the right amount or not, or if half per cent or half on one per cent is the right amount to take. That should be done and you should not say that you have to wait until the Minister of Finance comes to do that. It sounds childish to say that. In England do you believe that the Minister of Health or of Social Services would say that he has to wait until the Chancellor of the Exchequer comes in to debate anything. You are playing a bad game; that is to say, that only the Minister of Finance is capable of entering a debate which has financial implications. In that way, the Hon. Minister of Education would say that he could not deal with compulsory education because the Minister of Finance is not here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. member has given the impression that the Widows' and Orphans' Fund comes under my portfolio, but it does not come under my portfolio.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is difficult to separate these things in your thinking. If this matter did not come under the portfolio of the Minister of Social Services, then why was he pleading for a postponement of the debate? I thought that the Hon. Minister was entering the debate in order to deal

with the Ministry of Social Services which would involve medical care and things of that sort. The Minister does not have to enter the debate, but I thought he was entering the debate to speak on behalf of the Government. The Minister cannot act in a Cabinet as how the members of the Opposition would act. The Minister should not say that he is not the Minister concerned, therefore he has to sit down and wait until the Minister of Finance comes. I may say, Sir, that very rarely do you find the Hon. Minister of Finance coming in here between 2.30 p.m. and 4 p.m. of the clock unless he wants to introduce something; but the debate should never be dealt with in this manner.

It is true that the hon. senior member for St. Michael may agree with the Government in their attitude, but I do not agree with them. Must I sit down and wait until the Hon. Minister of Finance comes in? If he never comes in, then you never start the debate. What are the number of occasions on which the Hon. Minister of Finance came in here between 2.30 p.m., and 4.30 p.m., of the clock unless he is making a Statement which takes him an hour or two? There is no point in bringing in the Hon. Minister of Finance as any sort of escape. It all appears to me to be a question of incompetence. You should not get into something which you do not understand, but the Hon. Minister of Social Services is entering the debate and asking for a postponement. The Minister of Finance was absent on the last occasion and he is absent again today so that next Tuesday or so the House will be prorogued; but the matter is left to the hon. senior member for St. Michael. I cannot sit in this Chamber and have this sort of hotch-potch scheme taking place; I am not allied to any group which feels that you must be allied to foolishness. You should be able to say something without any Minister of Finance telling you how to operate. Any Minister could express his view as to how a matter like this should be dealt with; more than that, this matter has been on the Order Paper long enough that it should be taken up to the Cabinet. Your business is as much a matter as anybody else's; you should be able to have your Secretaries in here or you should make notes of debates and report them to the proper sources. Efficiency must start at the top. There is too much ragged-trousers affairs going on with Government business. I know that the hon. member does not mean to be discourteous, but this looseness creates discourtesy. There are things on the Order Paper which have not been reached; you will find that you come into the House to debate one thing and you do not get down to debate it from the Government's point of view. I hope that at some time or other they will deal with the amendment to the Bank Holidays Act. The Hon. Minister must bear in mind that if he is going to debate this matter, he should debate it; but he should not enter the debate and make an excuse that he cannot debate it because he is awaiting the arrival of the Hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said at some stage of the debate that I was off the beat; well, Sir, I hope to show, before I sit down, that if I were off the beat then he has not even begun to tune up. Rather than tuning up, he does not understand the key in which we are playing. To begin with, Sir, he says that the Ministers have not yet read the Report and they have not paid any attention to it. The Minister of Social Services can defend himself, but the hon. member says that he has not paid any attention to the report.
4.10 p.m.

Now quite fortuitously, Sir, I brought the Report with me to the House both last Tuesday and today, for the simple reason that the Minister of Social Services not only read the Report but sent me one directing my attention to it, and asking for my comments; and naturally, Sir, with people who are involved in as many things as we are, we snatch every moment that we can to do something and I brought my Report here last Tuesday and again this Tuesday, and I have actually begun to make comments on it, because the Minister has asked me to return it to him by a certain date. So let not the hon. member delude himself that the Ministers are not devoting appropriate attention to the Stockman Report. Let him not make the slanderous statement that merely because.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, even in the House, although it is privileged, you would not permit an hon. mem-

ber to make a slanderous statement, and I object to the hon. member saying that I made a slanderous statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course the hon. member said; "Let him not make the slanderous statement." I wonder if he possibly anticipated that such a statement would have been made.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would say that by implication if he puts in the negative form, it would give the impression that my statement could be interpreted to be a slanderous statement, and I hope he does not mean that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member cognisant of the point raised by the hon. member?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is slander and slander, and certainly some insinuations against Ministers verge on the slanderous in so far as the Minister's responsibility is concerned. If you come here and say that the Minister actually had a Report submitted to him which concerns his Ministry, that he has not read it and knows nothing about it,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I never said that the Minister has not read it. But I go further and say that this Report came out from the Minister and he should be well armed to enter the debate. I would say that if my statements are harsh, they are not slanderous. There is a difference between a harsh statement, for which I make no apology, and a slanderous statement. We are in politics and have to speak firmly to each other. As regards slander against a person's personality, I would say that I have no intention of damaging a person's personality in any way.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Only the character of a Minister, because if a Minister is incompetent, he has no character as a Minister, and should not be a Minister. I say, Sir, at the beginning that the Minister of Social Services has read the Report and has sent it to his fellow Ministers for their comments. But he would not be in a position to come here and state dogmatically what is Government's policy on the Report until such time as the Ministers in Cabinet have discussed it and come to some decision on it. Furthermore, I want to say this: the absence of the Premier from the beginning of sessions, generally speaking, is motivated not by any indifference to Private Members' Business or any indifference to Question Time or anything like that; it is motivated entirely by pressure of other activities. Whenever we come here, Sir, all of us leave a lot of things undone which are pressing and crying to be done, and therefore, Sir, I do not want the impression created that any Tuesday the Premier is not here for the opening of Government Business, it is merely because Private Members' Time coincides with the opening and he is indifferent to what goes on. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who said so?) I am not saying that the hon. member said so, but that may be a deduction on the part of those persons who read the statement, and I want to make it emphatically clear that I am sure nothing would give him greater pleasure than to be able to be here; when he is not here, you can go to the Ministry any time and find him buried up to his shoulders in work that requires immediate attention there.

Now I am not quite sure in my mind, Sir, if the hon. senior member for St. Peter has really had time to digest thoroughly the Stockman Report. He said he read it yesterday. Now merely because Mr. Stockman makes a passing reference to the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund is no reason why any member of this House at all should confuse the Widows' and Orphans' Fund with the Social Security Scheme he proposed in his recommendations. I challenge the hon. senior member for St. Peter to give me one single line in the entire recommendations in this Report, of which he professes to be such an authority, in which Mr. Stockman links the Widows' and Orphans' Fund and his recommendations for social security. On page 18 of the Report Mr. Stockman refers to the scheme purely *en passant*. He says: "Under the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Act, 1928, a contributory widows' and orphans' pension scheme was set up for male public servants under which 4 per cent is deducted from the salaries of contributors and credited to general revenue out of which the pensions are paid. Persons who do

not pass a medical examination of fitness are not allowed to be contributors.

The method of calculating the rates of pension payable on the death of the contributor is very involved and seems unduly complicated.

Persons who have paid contributions for 33 years, or until they reach the age of 65 if that occurs first, are not required to pay any more contributions; but if, at that point, such a person is a bachelor or a widower without children of pensionable age, he receives a refund of one-half of his contributions and thereafter ceases to have any rights under the Act.

The Act contains no requirement that there should be periodical reviews of the operation of the scheme, and no information is available as to how far the sums paid into general revenue are expended in the provisions of the pensions. It seems possible that the 4 per cent deduction is more than sufficient for the purpose."

In other words, Sir, all he does is to make a passing reference to the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund merely for the sake of chronicling the provident funds or pensions funds which are already in existence in the community, but it is not mentioned to be used as a basis for any of his further recommendations in the Report.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the more the hon. member quotes, the more he brings out the point I was making. I do not think he was aware when he challenged me and told me that the Stockman Report had nothing to do with the Widows' and Orphans' Fund. It did have something to do with the Widows' and Orphans' Fund because he made a statement on it, and further in the Report I will show that Mr. Stockman suggested that when you come to deal with the Social Security scheme, the Government should be contributors also; so it would include those persons, and this is nothing I have written.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When you talk about a Report, what do you mean? You mean the recommendations of the Report. The Report is not the actual evidence collected, so to speak, entirely alone.
4.20 p.m.

When you talk about the Beveridge Report, you do not necessarily mean all the evidence collected by the late Lord Beveridge or you do not mean the information collected along the way which assisted him in arriving at his conclusions; what you mean are the main recommendations of the Report. What I meant was that no where in the recommendations will you find one single allusion to the fact that the existence of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund assisted Mr. Stockman in coming to the conclusion which he did. In actual fact, all that Mr. Stockman's recommendations represent is an employment relief scheme and that is what I actually said in my comments to the Hon. Minister of Social Services because Mr. Stockman's recommendations do not apply to anybody unemployed. Therefore, I am saying that the total analysis of what Mr. Stockman actually gave us is a Report providing certain security benefits for employed persons.

In the context of the Resolution before the House, the Minister of Social Services would have been stretching it very far indeed to have attempted a debate in referring to the Stockman Report in discussing this matter. What is the matter before the House? The hon. senior member for St. Michael in this Resolution has stated:-

Allow me a little time to find a copy of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the meantime, I will read it aloud:

"WHEREAS grave dissatisfaction exists among Civil Servants over the operation of the Widows & Orphans Pension Scheme and the meagre benefits derived therefrom;

"BE IT RESOLVED that Government take steps to carry out a thorough investigation into the operation of the said Scheme and if possible have its scope of operation extended to include:-

(a) a Medical Aid Scheme to contributors and/or their dependants;

(b) a Scheme further to assist contributors and/or their dependants in the construction or purchase of homes."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In other words, this Resolution is purely a Resolution in respect of Civil Servants. Its mover is concerned purely with offering more benefits to Civil Servants. He wants the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme extended to provide medical aid to contributors and/or their dependants and a Scheme further to assist them in the construction or purchase of homes. Mr. Stockman has not made any recommendation for Civil Servants and in no way does he recommend a medical scheme for the entire working population. As a matter of fact, one of my own personal objections to the Stockman Report is that there is no provision for medical assistance of any sort, and Mr. Stockman himself explains this by saying somewhere in the Report that we already have a fairly good health service and therefore no recommendation has been included in the Report for the provisions of medical care as far as a Social Insurance Scheme.

Mr. Stockman in his Report has said:

"In view of the fact that Barbados already has in operation a fairly comprehensive public medical service, which is available to the whole population, and is taking steps to increase its efficiency by means of additional hospitals and out-patient clinics and by increasing the number of doctors, with a view to providing what in time may become a general health service, no recommendation has been included in the report for the provision of medical care as part of a social insurance scheme."

Therefore, for the hon. senior member for St. Peter to suggest as he has done that it should have been appropriate for the Hon. Minister of Social Services to discuss this Resolution, a purely Civil Service Resolution, along with the terms of the Stockman Report.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never said so, and would never have said so. I would be a first class idiot if I had said so. I said that he could have entered into a discussion on this Resolution and the Hon. Leader of the House has supported and galvanized all that I have said because he is now entering on a discussion on this Resolution when the Hon. Minister of Social Services asked that it be postponed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I entered the debate purely to show that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was off the key. The Hon. Minister of Social Services was quite right. This is a matter which concerns the Minister of Finance who is in charge of the Civil Service and that is what the Minister of Social Services has said. He said that the Public Service falls within the portfolio of the Minister of Finance and, therefore, a Resolution dealing with an extension of the provisions of a scheme applying specifically to Civil Servants, who else should deal with it but the Minister in charge of the Civil Service? (A VOICE: Or you.) This is no absence *in perpetuo* on the part of the Hon. Premier; it is temporary absence and therefore

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, it now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, we revert to Government Business, wherein the first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the passing of a Resolution to sanction an agreement made on 19th October, 1962, between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Barbados Union Oil Company Limited.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, No. 1 on the Order Paper under Government Business is not yet ready. As a matter of fact, only yesterday, we had a discussion on it with some of the people involved.

THE EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8, be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8, stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. It is a short Bill which seeks to continue into force for the further period of a year certain expiring laws which were limited to expire on the 31st March, this year. 4.30 p.m.

All of these Acts are set out in the Schedule to this Bill; they are as follows:-

The Vagancy Act, 1897, Section 11
The Emigration Act, 1904, Section 2 (12)
The Volunteer Act, 1909
The Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937, Section 18
The Exports and Imports (Restriction) Act, 1939
The Aliens Restriction Act, 1939
The Revenue in Aid Act, 1941
The Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943 Section 17 (2)
The Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1943
The Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1946, Sections 1 and 3
The Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act, 1955

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

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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 on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Preamble was postponed.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (LEAVE PASSAGES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

The question that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1963".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution in connection with Leave Passages for Public Officers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Minister is asking leave to take charge of this Order since it stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I apologize, Sir. That was my intention. I am asking leave to deal with this Order standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier. If there be no objection, leave will be granted. (After a pause). Hearing no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister to take charge of this Order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am grateful, Sir. This Resolution is in connection with Leave Passages for Public Officers. As this House is, I think aware, the general question of Leave Passages is now under consideration by the Whitley Council. The Government has already expressed on the floor of this House the fact that it intends to make basic modifications of the existing structure of Leave Passages. In view of the recent recommendations in the salaries revision for the Public Servants, it has become necessary to restrict the grades of Officers, who are entitled to this facility, to the level at which it existed before the salaries revision. This Resolution, which seeks to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1963", therefore seeks to give effect to the Order which raises the qualifying salary for leave passages for Public Officers from \$2,250 to \$3,384 with effect from the 1st April, 1961; I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I am an opponent to Leave Passages; and no matter how heavy the Civil Service will become with voters, I am of the opinion that, as a condition of employment, the payment of Leave Passages can no longer be justified. I have said that even when we were debating the matter on the last occasion when the hon. member's motion was made, and after the debate I will show the Hon. Minister of Labour, the Hon. Deputy Premier, the remarks which have been made on page 26 of this present document which brings in the same matter. Dealing with the question of leave passages, this is what it says:-

"The question will no doubt be raised as to whether the scheme should be applied to employed persons for whom adequate pension rights, sick pay benefits and security of tenure are already provided as part of their conditions of employment, or whether they should be excepted as a group from the provisions of the scheme. This question applies primarily in the case of public servants, but there is no obvious ground for distinguishing their case from that of other employees who enjoy similar prospects of continuity

of employment and are provided directly or through commercial insurance with comparable standards of benefits by their employers."

4.40 p.m.

This is only a complement to the statement I propose to make now for the benefit of the Civil Servants generally. I am going to speak to them, I believe, on Saturday, and this is without in any way spurning their invitation. Every country and every nation and more so nations evolving towards independence must create a character of its own to suit the circumstances prevailing within the economy it has to operate; and if the Civil Service being one of the pillars of stability and democracy cannot understand that, they are not capable of holding the position they hold. I know that Civil Servants regard leave passages as a condition of employment. It is a condition of employment, because the Government has accepted that as a condition of employment; but I am pleased to hear the Hon. Leader of the House say that the Whitley Council is reviewing this matter. I have spoken to the top men in the Civil Service and I have told them that in the circumstances that prevail in Barbados there can be no justification for making a privileged class out of recruitment of a member in the Civil Service as distinct from the recruitment of a member in any of the other services in this country. You will get, maybe, people from some of the Statutory Boards having the idea that as long as you are working for public funds, you should be entitled to this treatment; but there is absolutely no justification for a man, who is recruited in Barbados to do a job in Barbados, to be given as a condition of that employment the right to go for a holiday in England. You did it for ex-patriate officers and the argument was used that you are paying him more than the man who worked with him, because he has an opportunity of having his passage paid for him to go back to the place from which he came, though in actual cost to the man it did not mean the same thing, but it meant that hitherto he would have to pay to go back, but now he does not have to pay. With the savings he made, you gave him leave passage if he wanted to go back home. They could use that as a bargaining point.

Mr. Speaker, I do bargaining all the days of my life. No employer in Barbados at any point would agree with the Trade Union that as a condition of employment he should pay my bus fares as an employee or give me a holiday and give me money to go on a holiday too. He agrees to give you holiday but not to pay for you; so it is your business to spend your holiday as you please. They do not give money to go to Bathsheba though they may pay you your money in advance. I am a believer, Mr. Speaker, in the Government reaching agreement with the Whitley Council. I say this purely as a matter of public policy. I do not say this is a matter of negotiations, and I hope what I say is put in the right context, because unfortunately the publication in newspapers of things we say in the House of Assembly is so abridged that sometimes you are sorry that as a public person you have to buy a newspaper with the abridged statements that you make, because in some instances they put in part of what you say and leave the meat out. I do not say that as any apology to the Civil Servants through my general idea about leave passages, but I say that it is my view that a member of the House of Assembly has no right as such to really determine the terms and conditions of employment in the Service.

I am sorry the Hon. Premier is not in his place, but I hope the Hon. Leader of the House will pass this information on. I am of the firm opinion that the Government of Barbados with the power it now possesses should set up a structural arrangement in the Civil Service for dealing with Civil Service matters, and the Government should be prepared to accept that formula as is done in the United Kingdom so as to relieve us in Parliament. We would only therefore have to vote money just as we do for other matters. We have voted money for the Government to buy land wherever it chooses and with whatever terms and conditions it likes. Let us vote money in the Estimates and arrive at terms and conditions through the Treasury with the people you have to meet. The terms and conditions of employment should be settled on the basis of the employer and the worker, that is to say, the Civil Service Association, the Whitley Council and the corresponding representatives

of the Government. I am saying that as the question of public policy, so that members of Parliament can discuss public policy of the highest nature and leave out the details, like the principle of leave passages and how they should be given, and whether it should be given from \$3,000 a year. Those are the things that should be worked out because those are the ones who know the details, and Parliament should be relieved of this job of determining whether it should be \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year. We should be voting the money and the people to negotiate should be competent enough to represent Parliament's decisions, because we agree to the payment, but how much we pay should be worked out at the lower level.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, so that you will see that I have no objection to the Civil Service Association making demands and claims on the Government for maximum conditions and excellent conditions of employment. They have a right to do so. But at the same time I admonish the Government that it should treat them just as all other workers are treated. You should set up a functional organisation within the public service to deal with these matters and not regard even the Cabinet as the determining factor in negotiating these matters. There should be so much money you are going to spend, and you should be able to reach agreement on that. There are other Civil Service arrangements to which this Government has been a Party, but I know that in years to come it is going to give heartaches when other members of the Civil Service begin to hear that there are other officers in Government working alongside them getting a different salary for the job, because if he is a person born outside of Barbados, through some overseas arrangement, there is something which the United Kingdom Government is going to pay out from some pool. It does not cost us anything, but it causes an anomaly, because you will pay a person who is born in Trinidad a higher salary in Barbados, and I do not know if it is not going to cost you something when finally you have his pension and pensionable emoluments to work out.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter for the Civil Service to fight that issue, but fundamentally I would say I am opposed to it under these changed circumstances, and I use the words "changed circumstances" because there was a time when it was a sort of *force majeure* situation in which we were landed with these teachers and ex-patriates who put us against the wall. We have contributed to the University of the West Indies; we have contributed to the higher learning of our people; and speaking now as a nationalist, if my Barbadian fellow-citizens are expecting the Exchequer and poor people in this Island who will never, ever enjoy any of these facilities to make these substantial contributions, I would say that a man is not only disloyal but a traitor to his country and his nation if he expects that as a condition of working for his country, it must provide him with a passage every three years to go to the United Kingdom despite the fact that we aim at giving him a good salary.

4.50 p.m.

I am not subscribing to that. I know a lot of Civil Servants and a lot of them are good friends of mine. I do have some friends in the Civil Service; but it does not interfere with our friendship when I tell them that I would not give them any leave passages. If I were the Government, as I have told them, last year would have been your last year getting it, so you are fortunate. The Government is still discussing the matter but I am saying that it is time that these things should have been dealt with.

Some people hold on to every little thing that is a condition of employment; but a condition of employment should be reviewed from time to time. That is why I am pleased to hear the Hon. Leader of the House say that the matter is under review and I quite frankly say that if I were running the Government as long as you were running it, leave passages would have been a memory by now. These things would have been over and that money would be devoted to training Civil Servants to hold higher posts.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on this matter when it was first brought up, we were at loggerheads; but I think today we are in full agreement. Although we can-

not oppose this Resolution as it stands by reason of the amount which Civil Servants should get to qualify for leave passages, I wish to say that, I was among those who said at the time when leave passages were discussed, although I saw the necessity for voting for it at the time, that leave passages should either be for all or none receiving the salary within the particular bracket.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall because of your service in this House, which is much longer than any of us, that on that occasion because we were prepared to hold up the passing of the Resolution then, we were criticised by the then Government and even by the expatriates, some of whom were forging their qualifications, some of whom were masquerading as masters and even professors.

At the time we had a sort of nationalist feeling and we felt that the time had come when we should force the Government in power to look to our own doorsteps for people who could go out to be trained to fill these posts which were held by expatriates or that we should fill them by our people who were qualified. I am still among those who feel that if there are jobs a-going in this place, if you cannot find people who are yet qualified, you must import people from away, and if you import people from their homes to come here to fill the jobs, you must look for some arrangement to give them leave passages. The whole arrangement of leave passages was for expatriates who had left their homes to come here to do a job which you did not have people at the time qualified to do. With the advancement of education and the qualifying of persons within these areas, we are not unmindful of the fact that there are still persons whom we may have to import to these shores and who are specialists in their own right and because of that, we would have to give them leave passages. But I am appealing to the present Government to do something as regards ceasing to provide leave passages for our people who are qualified because I cannot see you going on with it when there are so many necessary social reforms which you plan to carry out — although I may say that some of them we agree with but some we are somewhat doubtful that they can be carried out. Leave passages would be history by now because it is costing us quite a tidy sum.

I wonder if I can speak as a Socialist would attempt to speak. I wonder, if leave passages were brought in by a Conservative Government, if you would hear the Socialists today saying, as Mr. Alder has said, that leave passages should go right down the line to the cantonier. Unfortunately, the present day Socialists still have their heads on and realise that some things are not practicable and to say that is just a matter of stupidity.

As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, although we are not against this Resolution, we are hoping that the Government would review the whole matter. It should not be given because people happen to be in a particular bracket. Some people who have been in the Service for a tremendous length of time and drawing the particular salary to enable them to get leave passage cannot afford to accept it for the reason that they have children whom they have to educate; and while leave passages is one thing which they can get, I suppose they have to say to get money to spend while they are on holiday is another thing.

While we will vote for the Resolution today, I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The Government would not be living up to the promises which it made when it said that it would not indulge in any extravagance to the detriment of social reform and remuneration to the people at bottom who put them into power. While I will vote for this Resolution today, I hope the Government will in the not too distant future review this question of leave passages and come here with something saying that only where it is absolutely necessary to bring somebody here because you cannot find somebody here or in these parts to do the job, they will give leave passages to such persons. Where it is necessary that you must have somebody from abroad, I would be among those to say: "Yes; you must pay that person leave passage." We would benefit if we have to do it. But it should not be for Civil Servants over here. We have the idea of some of our own Civil Servants telling you that I

am taking leave passage and I am going home. I wonder which home, they mean.
5.00 p.m.

When you say that they are going home, home where? Scotland or where? All of this nonsense must be stopped. I will therefore vote for this Resolution. Before the term of office of this Government expires, I do hope they will see that this money is put to a very much better use. I could name several items on which you could use this money and that would secure the Government in the position in which it is today.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the two hon. members who have last spoken on this Resolution have taken the wind out of my sails. I was never in favour of the payment of these Leave Passages. I may say that the only thing which has brought me to my feet is to allow this House to know how some of the Civil Servants feel about these Leave Passages. I was talking with one Civil Servant not so long ago, a Civil Servant who was dissatisfied with the working of certain things in the Government, and this is what he said: "I do not care what happens so long as they do not stop my Leave Passages." That Civil Servant does not care whether the Government goes up or goes down so long as they did not stop his Leave Passages.

The Hon. Minister of Trade has said that the matter is under review and a Committee is going into the matter; well, I sincerely hope that this Committee will take their duties very seriously and do not recommend fantastic things in their recommendation relative to this matter of the payment of Leave Passages. It is only when you have a specialised field and you cannot get a person to fill a post from the entire West Indies, that we should bring in somebody from outside and pay him these Leave Passages; but so long as we can put our hands on a particular person from the West Indies to do the job, we should not agree to pay anybody any Leave Passages. I am saying, Sir, that first things should come first. We have people who are working for very small salaries and they are doing a very good job; as a matter of fact, they have rendered yeoman service to this Government, and they have not been considered even for the payment of a decent pension, far more that they should enjoy the facility of Leave Passages. I am appealing to this Government to do the right thing at the right moment and to consider those who are in dire need of this same money which they will be giving away or voting away for the payment of Leave Passages. I hope that the Government will consider those people, especially the poor pensioners. Mr. Speaker, there are some pensioners today who are existing off a pension of \$10.00 a month, but they are other people who are working for handsome salaries and still they are enjoying the facility of Leave Passages whereas these pensioners, as I have said, have to exist on a pension of \$10.00 per month. This is a matter which the Government should not lose sight of; first things must come first.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier, this matter has only come before the Legislature because of the recent salaries revision. Obviously, it is imperative for us to change the structure and the principle on which leave passages are paid until such time as the Committee which is dealing with this matter has finalised its consideration. However, Sir, it is a source of gratification to me personally to have remained in this House long enough to witness the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City come to realise the error of their ways when they supported the introduction of Leave Passages in this House. Both of those hon. members were in this Chamber when the facility of Leave Passages was introduced. My voice was the only one in opposition to it — I am sorry, Sir; I should say that my voice was one of the few voices in opposition to Leave Passages because I recall that Your Honour's voice was also one of them. We fought this matter for a long time and we pointed out the evils which were likely to ensue and the injustices which were likely to be created by the payment of Leave Passages; and if we had had the authority and the weight of voices like those of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City, I am sure that this measure could never have become law. As a matter of fact, it was to me a source of the utmost dissatisfaction that all the old

Conservative Governments had resisted completely all the efforts of the Colonial Office to impose Leave Passages in Barbados and it was left to a so-called Labour Government under the leadership of Sir Grantley Adams to institute this scheme in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I contended then, and I still contend now, that it was not necessary for expatriate officers to have Leave Passages for the simple reason that Leave Passages in their original context were instituted in order to serve colonies in the middle of Africa, in the Indian Ocean and places like British Guiana where climatic conditions made it imperative for European Officers to get home as fast as they could, and the level of salaries were not as high in many cases as to enable them to pay the comparatively high cost of steamship passages in those days; but with our climate there was absolutely no justification at all for saying that Civil Servants, be they expatriates or otherwise, should be entitled every four years to almost \$2,000 — which was the original sum, as far as I can remember — to assist in paying the passages of themselves and a number of their children back to England on vacation.

5.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown have with a full turn of the circle come around to sharing this point of view. With regard to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I have come to the conclusion that he must have been the happiest man in Barbados when his Party lost the election. It must be absolutely impossible for any other man in this Island to be as happy as he. There is not a single thing they did with which he agreed as far as I can see. Tuesday after Tuesday we are regaled by the hon. member with the knowledge of how many things they did to which he objected most strongly, and you can only come to the conclusion — and I should not at all be surprised if he got gloriously drunk — I am not saying that he gets drunk, Sir

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, if the hon. senior member for St. Philip is or was drunk, I was never drunk; but I was in the same position that he is in now, with the Premier doing wrong and with him encouraging it for too long without saying anything about it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would be good enough as to point out to me the instances in which he thinks or knows that the present Premier is doing wrong, I shall be glad to discuss it with him at any place he chooses, and I am sure with his strength and logic he should be able to convince me as to where the Premier is going wrong, and I promise him that if he could so convince me, I would be the first to join with him in denouncing those wrong doings; but up to now I really must join issue with him when he accuses the Premier of wrong-doing. If he fails to agree with what we are doing, then he is perfectly at liberty and he is expected to as a member of the Opposition; but certainly, speaking on behalf of my colleagues and myself, we are not prepared to admit for the moment that there is any measure brought down to this House or any action on the part of the Premier with which we are not in agreement. If he is referring to statements, certainly we are at liberty to express what we think. This is a free country, and the democratic right and privilege and freedom to express one's mind is part, I am sure, of what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy would call our national heritage.

Anyhow, Sir, to refer to the matter before the House, I do not want to detain the House with reference to the debates on leave passages when the matter first came before this Legislature, nor do I want to refresh the hon. senior member for Bridgetown or the hon. senior member for St. Peter with what they said in support of the measure at that time. I merely want in passing to record my deep sense of satisfaction that there is complete unanimity now in 1963 in a Chamber, if I may quote the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, completely free of and untrammelled by the presence and power of the former Leader of his Party; and now that it is so free, it is minded to agree with the contention that the finances of this colony never should have been encumbered by this matter, and in the best interest of the Island, its removal from our Statute Books, either partially or entirely, is a matter which will be proceeded with the utmost expeditiousness.

As I said earlier, the Whitley Council is considering this matter. I have taken more than due notice of the expressions of opinion emanating from all sides of the Chamber on this matter, and I am sure that the action of the Government in due course will be completely satisfactory to all members of the House.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, and I am asking for leave to deal with it. It is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1963".

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is craving the indulgence of the House that he may proceed with the next Order of the Day which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier, and if there is no objection to leave being granted, it will be granted. Hearing no objection, leave is granted and the hon. member may proceed with Order No. 3.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 3) ORDER, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This Order, Sir, has already been laid in the Legislature as hon. members are aware, and in some instances code numbers are used to indicate the emoluments attached to posts of Civil Servants under Schedule "A" of the Civil Establishment Order, 1956. What we are doing here now is to recommend that Article 4 of the principal Orders should be simply amended by Article 2 of this Order, and the Order also provides for two additional posts.

5.20 p.m.

Order No. 3, deals with the replacement of the two posts of Staff Officer, Local Forces and Adjutant, and Warrant Officer Instructor, Barbados Regiment by posts of Adjutant at a salary of \$6,600 — \$7,080 and Warrant Officer at a salary of \$4,200 — \$5,592.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will recall that during his speech on the Appropriation Bill last week, the Hon. Premier drew attention to the fact that it was hoped to fill these two posts by local personnel. As far as I recall, the Hon. Premier intimated that he had instituted action in this connection and it has been decided now to fill the two new posts of Adjutant and Warrant Officer by domestic officers at present serving in the Regiment.

The Addendum points out that normally the posts were filled by officers on secondment from the British Army who were paid regular Army rates applicable to service in the United Kingdom as well as other allowances as compensation for being seconded overseas. Well now, it has been decided, as I have said, as a result of the action initiated by the Hon. Premier, to discontinue the existing policy on the termination of the contracts of the present holders of these offices and these are the new salary rates to pay the proposed persons who fill the two posts.

Hon. members, I am sure, will be gratified to learn that for the first time in our history these posts will now be filled by local personnel and not by expatriate personnel.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Resolution, which is hoping to introduce a change in this Establishment, I would say at once that I do not have a military background; but dealing with the post of Adjutant, as I see it and from my way of thinking, I regard an Adjutant to a Regiment as the sort of officer who will keep the Regiment on its toes so as to bring it into line and up-to-date with military practices that are observed in the United Kingdom.

I do not think that traditionally in the West Indies, independence or no independence, we can boast of being original

when it comes to military practices, and I do not share the view that because we are looking towards Federation and because we hope to advance local personnel wherever possible, that we can do so in this field. When it comes to military practices, I think we are going a bit too far because you are now making these offices sort of whole-time offices with salaries compensatory to the duties which have to be performed, and the holder if he is a Barbadian actually stagnating, unless provision is made for that officer to travel periodically to the United Kingdom or some other country where military practices are up-to-date and modern. I think just for the sake of having a Barbadian filling the post of Adjutant and preparing to advance the term 'local personnel', when it comes to the post of Adjutant, something is lost.

I am not a soldier; but primarily, as we used to do it before of having an Adjutant on short contracts and he would be succeeded after a short while by someone coming out from the United Kingdom who would come fresh and informed and knowledgeable and up-to-date with the modern prevailing practices, I think that is more in keeping with the duties and responsibilities of what an Adjutant should be.

When you make these offices to be held by a Barbadian and you do not offer facilities for the officer to, as it were, refurbish his knowledge in modern military technique, I do not think that is a progressive course. I would be glad if the Hon. Premier who is the introducer of this Resolution technically, would inform the House if facilities are available to the local holder or the one proposed to this office to make it possible that this officer find it possible to visit one of the metropolitan countries, particularly the United Kingdom, so that he will bring periodically, fresh, new, up-to-date and modern experiences and practices to the Regiment.
5.30 p.m.

I think that I have said all I would have to say on this matter. I believe that what was behind the old practice of having an adjutant on a short contract is that you should never have a stalemate, that is, that adjutant should grow so old in the job that he was not familiar with the technique; but because a man may be a good Barbadian Officer and he may have a good experience, you appoint him. A war which was fought in 1943, for instance, would not engage in the technique which would be required for a War which was fought in 1945. My point is that we have an officer who is home based and who may not have the facilities to go abroad and refurbish his knowledge of existing military practice, and in that case I think the Resolution might defeat itself. I would welcome some information from the Hon. Premier who has some association with War, although not a soldier but in the Air Force, and who would have a close association with Officers of the Regiment who would inform him as to the correctness of bringing this Resolution before the House.

As I said at the beginning, I have no military tradition behind me except when I was a school-boy and that is not very military. I see that the Hon. Deputy Premier is smiling and I am very glad to see that he is in that mood. I am well aware of what was behind the appointment of an Adjutant who remained with us just for a sort while and was succeeded by an Adjutant who came fresh from the English Regiment and there was no likelihood of his stagnating. If you have a wholetime officer who will be home-based and is likely to suffer from stagnation if he is not granted the facilities to return either to the United States of America or to the United Kingdom or wherever else it is thought advisable for him to go so that he can refresh the knowledge of his profession, I cannot yet be convinced of the advisability of voting for this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot share completely all the views which have been expressed by my colleague but, in a general way, what he has said is sound. If we were a member of N.A.T.O., I would say that it would be very essential that we should within the ambit of all the military techniques, and the movement of people should be very swift just as a General's work. I am not a man of military experience because I do not believe in it.

If human beings are so stupid as to destroy each other, well, let them go ahead and do it. That is my belief.

Speaking as a politician and as a man who has a responsibility other than his own, I would say that these things form some protective measures, and in Barbados and in the West Indies generally there have been what I would regard as little mock armies, what I would call glorified land-ships, with all due respect to these people. These people have a parade which I like. As a boy, I liked to go to the Garrison and witness the parades; I like to see the Policemen on parade because, although they were out of step and out of line, the colour of their uniform used to intrigue me. But apart from that, these things were forgotten until the next year following. If we had the resources, I would compel every boy to do military training, as a matter of training boys in discipline of mind and body so that they can have respect for other people. Therefore, I have no objection generally to this type of training which is given to the young people, but I agree with and commend the Government for looking inward.

I feel that the points which have been raised by my colleague could be met in that we are not a member of N.A.T.O., so that our Local Forces do not go up to the training of these other armies. My view is that the expenditure which the island has to undergo in order to have a small force is out of proportion to the requirements. I am still of the opinion that we can have an excellent Boys' Scout movement. (Laughter). Mr. Speaker, what I have just said seems to have brought laughter to the hon. members, but I am serious in what I am saying. The occasions for which you will have to use the military would be occasions of Civil disturbance and you have protective measures where you can call out people to deal with these disturbances. Therefore, when an emergency takes place in the community and people get out of hand, you want these resources to be at your disposal to be used as protective measures quickly. As we are not living in a perfect society where the behaviour of people will be excellent, you need these protective measures. My colleague has used an argument which was used originally, but I think we are too wedded, in Barbados generally and particularly, to this idea of having traditions which are positively not in consonance with what is taking place in our time, and we do not like to have changes. The powers-that-be wanted a transfusion and the injection of new blood. Many of these people came out here and many people were looking for husbands for their daughters. Incidentally, that is one of the things which kept up this movement of the Military for so long. I think it would be or was a good thing for society - I mean those who do not have the opportunity of mixing with people - that they had that point of view; but I do not think we should wed ourselves to the point of view that a person must be from this place and he must be going to that place. As I said earlier, I feel this is the sort of money which you should spend, not as Leave Passages, but on Officers who have to go out for training and for refresher courses so as to keep themselves in touch with what is going on. They should not appoint a man who is very near to the age of retirement. It is true that we have this old Barbadian concept that a person has been with us for a long time and therefore we will give him some consideration. On the other hand, our needs are not the same as in the United Kingdom, and if people are looking forward to creating nationalist theories, that is very good. This attitude of making a Barbadian feel that he can rise to the position of Warrant Officer is a good thing for those who like the Army.

5.40 p.m.

I feel that we should create the atmosphere in Barbados in every field and in every endeavour in which people have to participate that they can reach the top without any difficulties, and the difficulties will only be hardwork, discipline and application. For that reason, I think it is a very good move and I congratulate the Government, and I would like in anticipation to congratulate whoever the holder is, provided the holder is an efficient officer and someone who can enhance the position of a local man holding a position like this for the first time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of explanation, I hope I have not been misunderstood in that I said providing the

facilities are available for the proposed local officer to have access to metropolitan countries where he can bring back new techniques.' I included that proviso, and I hope that is not lost sight of.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in August last during the sixtieth anniversary celebrations of the Barbados Regiment formerly known as the Barbados Volunteer Force - and I should just like to inform the hon. junior member for St. Peter that I also had the unquestionable distinction of being a member of the Barbados Volunteer Force as well, and as he would know my grandfather was a Warrant Officer in the West Indian Regiment; so I come from a long line of belligerent and bellicose people; - I was invited to the dinner held by the Officers of the Barbados Regiment and to the dinners of the Sergeants and Corporals as well, but unfortunately I was not in the Island during the course of these festivities. I took the opportunity to speak to the Officers of the Barbados Regiment the Senior Naval officer of the West Indian Station who is really the Commander-in-Chief of West Indian Forces and other persons, addressing them in the context of a country on the verge of independence, pointing out that the time had come in my personal opinion, although I had no opportunity of discussing this with the members of the Cabinet, when we ought seriously to examine the possibility of doing away with the system of having people seconded from British Regiments, and we should now be training our own people to take over these posts of responsibility. The posts to which I alluded were the posts of Staff Officer of Local Forces and Adjutant of the Regiment, and the Warrant Officer, Training and Drill Inspector of the Local Forces, and I will explain their duties in a moment.

Shortly after that, Mr. Speaker, I received information that the War Office was drawing to the attention of this Government that the period of secondment of the two personnel - I say "personnel" advisedly; one was a Warrant Officer and the other was a Major from the Royal Leicestershire Regiment - was coming to a close and that with the advent of the new officers we would have to pay certain rates and allowances which they insisted must be agreed upon before they seconded anybody to these posts. I must say that the Press in Barbados did not appear to agree with my sentiments because there was a remarkable conspiracy of silence over the fact that I telegraphed in advance my thinking on this matter, and that is part of the silent revolution which will continue apace despite the conspiracies of silence or otherwise of the Press or the Opposition. I only digressed to mention that.

When I received this information, I made some calculations and to those to whom I could not appeal on the grounds of national pride and integrity, I thought I could appeal on the grounds of arithmetic, and my calculations disclosed that if we recruited seconded personnel from 1st April, we would have to pay to the Staff Officer, Local Forces, emoluments totalling \$17,728.14 per annum and to the Warrant Officer, Control Instructor the princely sum of \$14,330.88. Now you understand the meaning of colonialism and imperialism, because here is a country which is always parading its virtues to those who do not travel by night, to the rest of mankind - and when I say "night", I am using it purely in a metaphorical sense - in the United Nations how they are helping these countries to emerge towards independence and economic viability, which is a term they bandy about. You would be surprised to know, Sir, that the British Army point-blank refused to sell any third-hand or fourth-hand weapons or lend any weapons, even P.14 rifles to any of these Regiments anywhere in the area, and they insisted that we buy all our materials new from British armament factories. That is the first point we have to know. These are the same people who resisted the Americans telling them that they have to do away with Sky Bolt and go in for a more modern and certainly sensible form of destructive weapon - I am not taking sides in this dispute; I am only expressing an opinion - like that Polaris Missile instead of Sky Bolt which was, so to speak, susceptible to enemy attack. These same people would not assist the Barbados Regiment to get modern weapons. I have broached the matter in the United Kingdom and have asked for modern weapons. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that as long as we have Lewis guns and the Vickers

sub-machine guns, a few Sten guns and then .303 rifles that we really look more like a glorified landship than anything else. I thought if we were going to retain a force as a defence force, perhaps I could persuade the British Government to send down some equipment which they had finished with. We do not want the very latest guided missiles or anything like that, but certainly some equipment which would be more consistent with the theories of modern war. Their attitude was that if we wanted them we would have to buy them, and what they did not want they would dump because they were not sending them outside the United Kingdom. This is how the whole system operates, but what they are prepared to send us would be some English gentlemen and what the Army refers to as the lesser breeds without the law or they would send us some example of them, provided we paid their salaries on these scales.

Now I am speaking as a Barbadian and West Indian. The allowances are like this: a marriage allowance; a secondment credit; Barbados allowance; additional pay; local overseas allowance; ration allowance; cost of living addition; overseas family allowance and clothing allowance; one free, single passage to U.K. of children who attain the age of eighteen years during the period of the tour as well as family passages; then you have third party indemnity; a disturbance allowance; - I do not know if that is for Rediffusion; removal allowance; storage charges; tropical kit allowance; loans for furniture and for the purchase of a car; national insurance contributions; non-effective benefits; medical expenses; contributions to the Dilfor Scheme admissible under British Army rules to school children's visits to the Island.

Now what are we coming to? There is a popular misconception that the Adjutant of the Regiment is automatically Aide-de-camp to the Governor of Barbados. This is not so. The Adjutant of the Regiment hitherto had very little to do apparently, and had time to go and act as Aide-de-Camp to the Officer administering the Government of this country and still draw what we set out in the Estimates as a salary for doing that as well.

5.50 p.m.

Now, you cannot be doing two jobs at one time; one would have to suffer. The result today is that we have a Barbadian A.D. C. who is a retired A.D.C. and a retired head of the Regiment, and we would have a Civil Servant who would be seconded as Adjutant; and since he is recruited here there is no question of paying his passage from and to the United Kingdom and giving him all those fancy allowances which were attached to these offices. I am not criticising any individual; I am criticising the mental outlook. This is the essence of colonialism. I went to all the people who would be affected, the Financial Secretary and so on, the Chief Personnel Officer and I discussed the problem, and I would say that there was not much resistance to the idea and we managed to canvass the whole question in our minds and come to the conclusion that the time had arrived for something to be done about it, something which I said in August last year, for us to have a Barbadian in charge of these posts.

As regards the post of Warrant Officer Instructor, you will notice in the Estimates that there is the post of Sergeant Major and Drill Instructor, who is already a Barbadian. His job is quite a busy one, because this Warrant Officer has to attend all the parades of the Regiment and train the people of the Regiment both in weapons and drill. He also has to carry out duties at the Regional Training School, and in addition to that he has to train in weapons and drill the recruits of the Cadet Corps and the Barbados Regiment. Whether the Volunteer Force is a glorified landship or not, it is essential that we have a Drill Instructor for the Police Force if the Police Force retains its quasi-military structure; and if we are emerging towards independence, it is necessary that we have a Police Force which should strictly act primarily as a civilian force, but at the same time be in the position of being able to defend this territory against commotion or any case of emergency; therefore, one should have a Warrant Officer Instructor who would be in the position of training the members of that Force in weapons.

There are plenty of people who have the potential in the Barbados Regiment; therefore, I have been instructed by a Colonel who is Secretary to the West Indian Committee, and

a recently retired officer in the British Army, and a professional soldier; and one who has the advantage of seeing people, a number of Barbadians, in the person of Mr. Anthony Murray who is the owner of a substantial sugar holding in Barbados and we have sort of appointed and asked Mr. Anthony Murray and Colonel Max Robinson who has recently retired from the British Army and who is a very vigorous man at that in the discharge of his duties as Secretary to the West Indian Committee and who also have the advantage of acting as agents to all the Secondary schools in this island, to look around for an ex-Guardsman to come here as Drill Instructor and who has to retire by law at the age of 45 years. We have asked them to recruit a man between the age of 45 years and 48 years, one who is already drawing a pension and who is a qualified drill instructor. Therefore, if we get one who has just retired or retired within the past two years, we will be getting one who is up-to-date in modern military techniques.

We have invited Colonel Max Robinson and Mr. Anthony Murray to recruit someone for us to come down here on a limited contract on the salary which we have set out here instead of the old salary of \$11,040. The salary which we have in mind is \$4,200 — \$5,592 which is just under \$5,600 and we feel in this way we will have a wide range to choose from. We are not restricting ourselves to a single Regiment. I served with the Second Battalion, Grenadier Guards, which is now in British Guiana and I know the quality of the Guards Regiment. I lived in the same camp as they and have had a lot to do with their administration. We feel if we get a guardsman as Drill Instructor that he probably would be superior to anything which we can get from any of the other Regiments, and this man would be coming out to Barbados at the end of his service in the Army; therefore, he would be coming out with ideas and in the prime of his manhood and he would be in the position to train some of the local Barbadians so that at the end of his two year period we would have three or four people who would be qualified to carry on as Warrant Officer and Weapon Drill Instructor.

We cannot overnight find somebody; so we are recruiting at this salary a person who has the necessary qualifications and we have given a job description of the man we want to the West Indian Committee, and I understand that they are working actively on the problem of recruiting a suitable officer to take over the job.

We have already appointed the Adjutant and if I may read an extract of a letter which went to Colonel Max Robinson, D. S. O., it is this:

"The duties of the post include instruction in all aspects of foot, arms and ceremonial drill as required by the Barbados Regiment, a voluntary force, roughly equivalent to a British Territorial Battalion of three Rifle companies, and of the Regional Police Training School which trains constables and recruits for the forces of the Eastern Caribbean. He may also be required to prepare in all aspects duties which have as a possible annual requirement the ceremony of Trooping the Colour."

"Up to now we have been recruiting such a soldier on secondment from the British Army, but the secondment terms have got so far as to be out of line with local conditions so that any Sergeant would now find himself in the most enviable position of receiving more substantive pay than the Chief Justice. We are therefore falling back on the device of getting a recently retired man who would already be in receipt of a pension and who would therefore be attracted by the conditions which we offer."

6.00 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter also raised the point about being up to date. That is no problem with this Government because we feel that all Civil Servants and people, especially those who have to train other people, should always be up to date; and we have a very substantial training fund by means of which we send people out for training. I forget how many officers there are now in the United Kingdom taking courses periodically and taking refresher courses and courses *ab initio* in some branch of study. I understand that earlier today there was quite an extensive discussion on the question of Leave Passages; this Order is purely a temporary one in order to up-grade

the minimum qualification for entitlement, which term may seem rather involved, but, in other words, after the Jacobs' recommendation what we are doing is to make sure that we have not debased the qualification for Leave Passages entitlement.

What we are working on is the substitution for Leave Passages of periods of training after ten years in the Civil Service. We expect that people will go up periodically to do training or refresher courses. When I say that, I do not necessarily mean that these people will be going to the United Kingdom; it may mean that they will be going to Jamaica, Trinidad, Puerto Rico or the United States of America. Also it does not mean going to Glendairy or anywhere like that (*Laughter*) although some hon. members feel that they are too well treated up there. (*Laughter*). It does not necessarily mean the view which is shared around the Table. I have just mentioned that in passing, and I say that I do not like to pontificate in matters of which I have no experience. I leave that to the more qualified.

If I may return to my subject, Mr. Speaker, the parallel of this new development, the substitution of training and refresher courses for Leave Passages, we have the institution of Arts and Sciences and we are going to make liberal provisions for any Civil Servant to get training in the Liverpool Arts College. Some of them can start at Evening Classes and we will release some to do a two-year or three-year course. We will also make provision for those who are doing a four-year course. Very soon the qualification will be a degree in Arts and Science for entering the Civil Service. It is part of the technological practice in other countries that we are witnessing in this country today, although we find that a lot of people are still slumbering and not realising the revolution in the educational standards which is obtaining in 1963.

I think I have answered the question which has been raised by the hon. members for St. Peter, but I assure hon. members that the financial consideration here was not the sole factor which has assisted the Government to come to the conclusion to which we have come, but there are also very deep philosophical factors involved; the whole outlook of the community is beginning to change. We are not concerned about whose daughter is married and whose daughter is not; we do not realise marriage as the be-all and the end-all of the achievements which a woman has to her credit. A woman is expected to make her contribution to the community independent of being married. We have approached the whole problem of recruiting local personnel from the point of view of national integrity; and unless it is impossible for us to find a Barbadian to do a job for historical or other reasons — we may have to kidnap some Germans to help us with the atomic research as the Americans and the Russians do. In that case, we will open the door for expatriates; but where we have a Barbadian to do a job, we will come in here and put the facts before the House, or if the law does not allow of any alternative, we will make an appointment and advise that the appointment has been made along the lines of our political, social and economic advancement.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ORDER."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

The question that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:— To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1963."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Order which is entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amend-

ment) No. 2 Order provides for the creation of an additional post of Electrical Assistant in the Department of Electrical Inspection — I think it is the Electrical Engineers Department — certain adjustments to the establishment of the Port Department and a change in the nomenclature of certain posts at the General Hospital.
6.10 p.m.

The necessity for the additional post of Electrical Assistant is that we should have a man permanently on duty at the Mental Hospital in Black Rock, because the requirements of that Institution demand the presence of somebody on the spot nearly all the time; so we feel it is better to have someone attached more or less on a permanent basis down there.

In the Port Department, we have found, since the Port has been in operation for more than eighteen months, nearly two years now, that additional staff has been taken on on a temporary basis, and now that we have been able to assess more accurately the requirements of the Port Department, it is considered advisable that these temporary posts should be put on the Establishment, and other posts should be re-created and re-designated. The cost of the additional staff, Sir, will be offset by the annual cost of employing the present temporary staff which is estimated at \$21,000, so that in truth and in fact there is no anticipated additional cost either on the finances of the Port Department or the general finances of the Island.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 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.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) (No. 4) ORDER, 1963

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Addendum is self-explanatory and there is not much really that I can say. I think that this arrangement has met with the agreement of certain members of the Staff of the Barbados General Hospital, and it is necessary for us to bring down this amendment to make it clear that the Medical Superintendent at the Hospital, if he has specialist qualifications, will be entitled to consulting practice. If we do not do that, Sir, it may mean some dislocation in the Hospital services. I would not like there to be any dislocation in the Hospital services as a result of failure to do these things which the Staff has already agreed amongst themselves that they have no objection to.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I really do not like this.

Now this Order, as the Hon. Premier said, seeks to provide an improvement in the conditions of service for the Medical Superintendent, Barbados General Hospital, permitting the holder of the post, where he holds specialist qualifications, to engage in consulting practice under the same conditions applicable to other specialists at the Hospital.

During the debate on the Estimates last week, Sir, I tried to elicit information from the Hon. Minister of Social Services on the question of specialists at the Hospital, and much to the annoyance not of hon. members of this House, but of certain medical practitioners, I expressed a view, and I will continue to express it whether or not they like it, because if I had to depend on certain specialists, I would

not be here. I see the necessity in a community of 200,000 people for not less than two any such specialists as has been set out under the Head of General Hospital. I asked the question of the Hon. Minister last week as to what was the position of the Medical Superintendent at the Hospital and the difference between himself and the Physician Specialist. It is not that people deliberately come to me, but I do hear of the bickerings and dissatisfaction up there; and when there is dissatisfaction among the medical and surgical staff employed at any institution, naturally it is the people who must suffer, more especially those people who cannot afford to seek medical aid otherwise, even locally. I do not favour this situation at the Hospital, and I am expressing my view. If others in this House feel differently and do not want to express their view, that is their business.

I believe the Medical Superintendent must have some special qualifications to be Medical Superintendent. As I understand it today, people are either trained to be Surgeons with special qualifications or as Physician Specialists, and I understand also that England today has adopted what has been going on in the United States for some time where there are specially trained Superintendents of Hospitals who in some cases are not actually qualified medical men to the extent that they can be actually registered, but they are trained in Hospital Administration. In this case, if you cannot secure the services of a Physician Specialist, all well and good; but this looks to me, and I am expressing this view in the House, as though this is a gun pointed at the head of the Government of Barbados.
6.20 p.m.

I believe there is so much room here for a Physician Specialist in this country that the man would have to run from working for the money which he can work for. No doubt, I understand that the gentleman who holds the office of Medical Superintendent is an ably qualified Physician Specialist and there are no two ways about it. I have been told so by eminent and experienced practitioners in this country. I maintain if you are going to have a Medical Superintendent with the right to practice as this Resolution says: "To provide an improvement in the conditions of service for the Medical Superintendent" that it does not provide an improvement for the people who go to the Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, you know, this phrase "consulting practice", is a very serious matter. If in practice it was carried out as a consulting practice, it would be a different matter; but if this consulting practice is going to be that you are the Medical Superintendent, and therefore, the Physician Specialist who would normally get this practice would not get it, then it is a different thing because I consider the salary which you pay to a Physician Specialist is a small salary, and the percentage which you allow him for the private practice is the thing which causes him to take up the position. I am going very carefully into this matter because looking at it from the figures which I have here, the amount of salary which is paid out to him is \$8,880 a year out of which he pays back to the Government 30% or 40% by way of income tax.

You talk of improving conditions. This makes conditions worse at the Hospital. If the Hon. Minister of Social Services or the Government does not have their ears to the ground, I have mine. If a man is Medical Superintendent and he is in charge — the boss, so to speak — he is responsible to no man except the Director of Medical Services and to the Ministry of Health, but the other Physician Specialist who would have consulting practice is responsible to him.

I do not think this is fair, and I am saying on the floor of the House that it is not fair. This is someone holding a gun at the Government. In your Estimates you have stated: "Entitled to full fees in respect of consultations outside the Hospital and a non-pensionable allowance equal to 75% of the fees paid into the Public Treasury in respect of Specialist services rendered within the Hospital."

That is for your Senior Surgeon Specialist, your Senior Specialist Radiologist, your Senior Specialist Physician, down to those at Item 8. Why on earth this change? Are you

making changes in your Civil Establishment purely to suit a man or to suit people? What is going to be the position where a man is the boss and where what we know is going on at the Hospital? He is allowed consulting practice over the man who is to be the Physician Specialist. I am all for backing any Government which would encourage by way of scholarships, leave, or whatever the case may be, a West Indian qualified to go abroad and qualify to be a specialist to come back and serve us; I am all for giving you scholarships and leave; but I cannot see your making a position at the General Hospital to suit a man or to suit people.

We are now amending something which goes for all time. Let us forget the new holder of the office and remember that for all time what we are doing would have the effect of law. It must have an adverse effect upon the inhabitants of this Island and those who are unfortunate to go to the General Hospital for medical treatment because of what will go on and what is going on. A particular man who is qualified is the boss.

As I have said, I consider Dr. Forde is an able man. As a matter of fact, when he was about to apply for the present position which he holds, I said to him that if I had anything to do with the Civil Service, I would not appoint him as Medical Superintendent. From what I have gathered, from the people at the top, Hospital Administration now does not necessarily mean that a man must be a Medical Practitioner who holds the top post. He comes up to a certain standard in the medical profession and on knowing something about it, he then branches off in Hospital administration. There is a course which has come about now in the Universities in Canada and the United Kingdom to fit one to be a Medical Superintendent. I feel if a man is qualified, he is qualified; and if I had to consult a physician, I would prefer to have one with the present holder who is qualified than to have a consultation with some person who is not qualified.

The post of Medical Superintendent carries a bigger salary than the post of the other Specialists. They all carry the same salary and are allowed consulting practice; but the post of Medical Superintendent carries a bigger salary. And you are coming along now and saying that you are granting the Medical Superintendent consulting practice! If you feel that the office of Medical Superintendent is not adequately paid, say so. The Medical Superintendent is the man who has to look after the Drug Department and look into every possible thing. You must also bear in mind that you have a Hospital of that size, and you have only a Medical Superintendent and not an Assistant Medical Superintendent; but you are giving the Medical Superintendent who has to look into all those things the right of consulting practice.

I foresee what is going to happen. The Hon. Minister of Health has not answered me on that yet. I said on the last occasion that certain surgeons have been concentrating more on doing work for which they are getting paid than on pauper patients who cannot pay them. I would like the Hon. Minister to bring in the figures and make out what I have here to be untrue because I am prepared to come in with figures too. The Government or the Ministry of Health is in the position where we can get a Physician Specialist at the moment. This Government is giving the right to the Medical Superintendent who holds the qualification of Physician Specialist the right of consulting practice now that you are getting someone to fill that post.

Sir, I do not want any of the medical men to think I have something against them, but everybody knows what is going on at present. One of the very qualified men at the Hospital is qualified to fill the particular post; therefore, I cannot agree that the present position provides a necessity for amending the law to give this particular individual the opportunity of consulting practice. With "A", you start him at a particular salary and the job of administration calls for a wholetime man.
6.30 p.m.

We should not be hypocritical in this House and pass legislation for individuals at all. This Measure is individual legislation. I feel very strongly in the matter and I do not think that this House is doing the right thing. If the Hon. Minister would assure us that it is impossible to get a

Physician Specialist as yet, then we would say: "Yes, by all means you should allow the Medical Superintendent to act as Physician Specialist;" but a man must make up his mind. You cannot get everything. Human nature being what it is, the Medical Superintendent who is in charge of the Hospital should see that we get the best out of the Hospital and you should not say that he should get practice along side of that. The Medical Superintendent is responsible to the Director of Medical Services who, in turn, is responsible to the Minister. Mr. Speaker, the entire Staff is dissatisfied; you are putting one man in a position where you are saying: "You are the Medical Superintendent; but you are allowed, while you are getting a bigger salary than any of the other Specialists, to practice alongside with them and still you are their boss." How can you have him as Medical Superintendent as well as Physician Specialist? I really cannot vote for this Resolution, and whoever may think that this is a personal matter, that is a matter for him. As a matter of fact, if I started to reveal some things which I know about this matter, the position would be something different. You have one doctor not speaking to the other doctor; that is the type of thing which is going on and the inhabitants of this island will suffer as a result. I think that this is something which is holding a gun at the head of this Government.

If you have advertised for a Physician Specialist, which I think you have done, if you came in here and said that you cannot get a man in the West Indies, we would allow the Medical Superintendent to act as such. Sitting in my House, the Medical Superintendent told me what is said at the Hospital and that is why they are remaining shy of the Hospital. You are giving this opportunity to a man who is in charge of everybody else; he is boss up there, but he is going to compete with everybody else up there. If the Medical Superintendent is called in by Mr. "X" in St. Peter or in St. Lucy or in St. Andrew and he had to go down there, through a medical officer, of course, that is one thing; but that is not what you are doing here. You are the Medical Superintendent, but you are also the Physician Specialist; you will maintain an office here and have three hundred patients coming in, and in connection with one set of patients 75% of the fees will go to the officer and 25% will go to the Government. What you are doing here today is passing legislation which is allowing to compete with others, a gentleman who is very skilled in his knowledge as a Physician, who was the Physician Specialist, but he is upgraded to the post where he becomes the whole boss; you pay him a salary to be his own boss and he can compete with the others. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with that. It is unfair and this is purely individual legislation.

The wording of the addendum to this Resolution speaks for itself. This is what it says:

"The Order seeks to provide an improvement in the conditions of service for the Medical Superintendent, Barbados General Hospital, permitting the holder of the post, where he holds specialist qualifications, to engage in consulting practice under the same conditions applicable to other specialists at the Hospital."

It does not say that the Order seeks an improvement in the conditions of service which the people gets; it says that the Order seeks to improve the conditions of service of the Medical Superintendent. You can read the exact phraseology for yourself. In other words, the conditions of service of the Medical Superintendent are such that they need improving and the way to improve them is to say: "Skipper, you are your own boss. The others must appeal to you. You are to say what they are to do, you are to regulate things; you are to carry out the policy of the Ministry and you can do what you want to do."

Mr. Speaker, it is pathetic that this Government should see fit to bring down this Resolution with that phraseology in it. You are improving the conditions of service of the Medical Superintendent and, what is more, you are permitting the holder of the post to compete with other Specialists at the Hospital; but the other Specialists at the Hospital receive smaller salaries than the salary of the Medical Superintendent. The Government can pass this Resolution because they have the numbers, but I am warning them.
6.40 p.m.

You are providing for a clash and a breakdown in the running of the Hospital; you are near to it now, and if you are saying that the only way to satisfy one man is to do this, it is a joke. This is to allow the Medical Superintendent to continue to practice up there. You have set out in the Estimates \$59,000 to be paid out. That is all well and good because I do not grudge anybody working for his money. I do not grudge the particular doctor because I feel he could make more money working outside. We cannot have this situation at the Hospital where a doctor uses our nurses and out instruments which are provided for people who cannot afford to go to America, to the Bayley Clinic or the Clinic in Belleville. Now you are going to allow this man to hold a position in which he is boss and can continue in the same office. I have the highest respect for the man as a physician.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot vote for this. It has always been difficult in this Chamber for people in dealing with medical practitioners to get up and express a view which might offend them. There are a few of us who have never bothered about that, and I think I can put myself among those few. I want to assure you that there is absolutely no malice or anything like that, but I honestly do not feel that what you are doing here is in the interest of the people of this colony. I will sit down, Sir, knowing that it is going to pass, but I am prepared to come here on an occasion not far from now and prove to this House that I am right; and if hon. members over there including my friend the Minister have not heard yet, he will hear that he is further disrupting the harmony and the feelings of the youngsters at the Hospital who feel that they are being shunted into positions because manoeuvres are being made in this direction. Do not think, Sir, that this Resolution is any news to me. Medical men in the Service have discussed this with me, and they are perfectly disgusted about the whole situation. This is one of those things which would not redound to the credit of the Ministry or of the Government, and I can assure you that this will have its repercussions in the public. One can discuss and criticise anybody without saying things against him professionally, because I repeat, from what I have been told by medical men, here stands a very able man. But how are you going to make this gentleman Medical Superintendent and then say he is entitled to consultant practice? Do not think I am going to let anybody get away with the feeling that this consulting practice means that if Doctor "X" from St. Lucy or St. Peter is baffled about a case he can call him in and tell him that he is baffled about the case, ask the Superintendent what is his fee and let him do the case. It means he is lord of the other people there and doing the same work as when he was Physician Specialist alone. If you can tell this House or the public of Barbados tonight that it is difficult and impossible to get a man, that would be different; but the office was advertised for and he accepted; therefore he knew the conditions when he accepted unless there was a promise which we knew nothing about. He knew well enough that these two offices do not go together. You are saying that he is to be Medical Superintendent and now you are going to circumvent it by allowing him also to be Physician Specialist at the Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the debate be temporarily postponed at this stage.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS No. 5

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg at this stage to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended in order to facilitate the debate during the remainder of the Sitting.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the debate be now resumed.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Government of this country has not really been grounded with this problem. I want the Government to look at it in an equitable manner. Let us realise that this is going to cause people in this country to suffer. You appointed Forde as Medical Superintendent; he was Physician Specialist, and he knew when he took this job that he could not do the other. How could it be fair to appoint a junior who has the same qualifications as a Physician Specialist, is building up a reputation and getting work and tell him that he is in competition with this other doctor? How do you expect him to feel? If I must call names, I can do so. You appointed Forde as Medical Superintendent and you are saying you will change and let him have consulting practice— which does not mean coming to my house when a general practitioner calls him out. It means that he will carry on at the Hospital where he can charge \$5.00. I am not objecting to the regulations by Government where he gets 75% of the fees.
6.50 p.m.

The gentleman is not a child; he is not a 24-year-old or 25-year-old man; he should make up his mind. There are two posts; one is Physician Specialist and the other Medical Superintendent. He can say: "I am applying for the post of Medical Superintendent"— and, as a matter of fact, he applied for the post of Medical Superintendent and you gave it to him. What is happening now that you have somebody qualified to the point of Physician Specialist? You come in here today and say that you are letting this man who is a Physician Specialist in his own right and who is the Medical Superintendent and whom we allow to act as Physician Specialist to carry on as a Specialist drawing fees; therefore, you will be paying him fees, and as he is a Physician Specialist, no doubt, everybody will be consulting him. It is like this. Everybody in Barbados cannot afford to go away to consult a Specialist. They would say: I know Mr. Leacock is a Surgeon Specialist and if anything happens to any of my family or myself, I will get Mr. Leacock. They may know somebody else, but they may say: "I am not allowing him consulting practice although he is an F.R.C.S., I am consulting Mr. Leacock."

I feel strongly on this matter because it is personal legislation and you all have no right doing it. If you all over there find yourself having to do something for your friends I do not care; I say that you all have no right doing it and it is dishonest. You have people applying for the post of Physician Specialist. You know that you have somebody to appoint as Physician Specialist.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate what the hon. member is saying on the matter; but without being presumptuous to intervene, I think since the hon. member has gone so far as to accuse the Government of dishonesty that he should have given way to allow the Hon. Minister of Social Services to explain.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He can reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would sit and hear what is the position, I know he is sufficiently rational and has the understanding to appreciate the Government's position.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate what the Hon. Minister is saying, but the Hon. Minister knows how strongly I feel on this matter. I have no personal axe to grind. As I have said, I believe the present officer whom you are dealing with is a very able man. I have no means of judging him, but I hear people say that he is a very able man. You advertise for one job and the man decides that he is taking that job. I happened to serve as a member of the Hospital Committee. I said to him: "If I had something to do with the appoint-

ment, I would not make you Medical Superintendent because you are too well qualified as a Physician Specialist." I told him so to his face. I also said that I would take a man of lesser qualifications and make him Medical Superintendent. That is how I feel about the man. You have a job vacant; but having nobody to fill the job you allow this gentleman to act in that post; but now you come along and have somebody who is qualified to do the job — and you know what is happening at the Hospital — you say to that person: "O.K., you are qualified; you are going to get the job. It is \$8,880 per annum and you will be allowed private consulting practice." But the man who is appointed here as the Medical Superintendent and whom the people here are accustomed to visiting for consultation, you tell the man whom you are going to appoint that he will have to be in competition with him because you are passing legislation to give him the right of consulting practice. That cannot be fair. I say it is personal legislation. The Hon. Minister says that I am accusing his Government of dishonesty. I said that to pass this Resolution is dishonesty. How can any rational being agree to it?

What did I say last week? I asked the Hon. Minister of Social Services to tell me if those doctors who were now permanently employed and now entitled to pension in the Government Service and those whom we know as visiting surgeons and who use our Hospital for consulting practice, if according to professional ethics, it is not the custom to do two-thirds paying patients and one-third pauper patients. I asked that question because I have certain facts at my disposal. If the Hon. Minister has not heard and if he does not know, I can tell him that there is dissatisfaction. 7.00 p.m.

If the Hon. Minister could come in here and say: "I am allowing the Medical Superintendent to act as Physician Specialist", that would be all right. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER knocked the gavel.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir, I have my views and even the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not daunt me. (Mr. WALCOTT: That is personal.) Well, if the hon. member feels so, that is a matter for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The turn for the hon. senior member for St. Peter to speak will come in due course.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have always said that you should have two Surgeon Specialists and two Physician Specialists. The hon. member does not agree with me on this point of view. If he says that the Physician Specialist is going to act because the services of the two Physician Specialists are at the disposal of the public, that is all well and good; but now that you are giving the boss the right to do this thing, that is a different matter. I have heard it said that an hon. member can say what he likes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to inform the hon. member that no hon. member can say what he likes in here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As long as it is parliamentary. The hon. member said that I do not like Dr. Forde, but I do not belong to the class that dislikes him. (Mr. WALCOTT: Do you like everybody in the world?) There are those whom you dislike and there are those whom I dislike. I say that you should have two Surgeon Specialists, and if I were in the Government I would have two Surgeon Specialists. I have told Dr. Forde that he is a good man as a Physician Specialist. He is a good man in his field, but I would not make him Medical Superintendent. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is a good man but not in any field. Do not let anybody feel that I have anything against Dr. Forde, because if I had to take the opinion of any Physician in Barbados, I would take the opinion of Dr. Forde; but I cannot agree that you should bring in this sort of legislation. You can have two Surgeon Specialists and two Physician Specialists. I am saying that you could create a post and call it Senior Physician Specialist; but what I say you are doing wrong is that the Superintendent of the Hospital is responsible to the Ministry and yet he can carry on the same practice as the other men.

Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my view on this matter; but to say that I have something against Dr. Forde is

stupid. Day after day and week after week I see poor people who are sent to the Hospital by Medical Practitioners. I have had to deal with the Medical Superintendent, no matter who he is, to find out why Doctors "A", "B" and "C" have been keeping up a list, what the Superintendent calls an emergency, for some length of time. I get the most courteous of all treatment when I call upon Dr. Forde enquiring as to why a case has been held up for such a long time. I would be satisfied to say now that with Dr. Forde's experience in England, British Honduras and Jamaica he could be the Senior Physician Specialist at the Hospital at a bigger salary and be allowed to get his practice; but you cannot put a man to whom I must complain that one of his competitors has not been right. He has got to make the decision on that and he has got to satisfy the Ministry when I ask the Minister a question. I cannot see how I could vote for this Resolution.

I say that this is personal legislation. If you want to make Dr. Forde the Senior Physician Specialist, that is all well and good; but do not come and tell me that you are passing this Resolution and you say in the Addendum that the Resolution seeks to provide an improvement in the conditions of service for the Medical Superintendent. You know that we have not yet heard that there was any complaint about the conditions of service of the Medical Superintendent. We have not heard that yet; we have not heard that there was any quarrel about the conditions attaching to the post. When the post was advertised, the conditions of service were well known and they were accepted. 7.10 p.m.

Let us say that he was Anaesthetist at the Hospital; he would therefore enjoy the same conditions. What would be the position if at 1.30 a.m. a woman from Neils has a ruptured appendix and has to go to the Hospital? One of the doctors must come out and attend to her, though this is not something he is getting paid for. The Medical Superintendent can have all these conditions, but he should not be Medical Superintendent being boss over the others at the same time. Down in the hearts of members of the Government, they know what I am saying is correct. Make no mistake about the fact that there is a row between Graham who is qualified and the Superintendent and that an appointment has to be made by the Civil Service Association. I do not know if the Government is doing the appointments now or the Whitley Council. Now that you have a man to appoint, you are going to do this with the present Physician Specialist. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, a thing like this passing this House tonight and I am a party to it! You all are going up a ladder; be careful that so suddenly you can turn from being the champions of the people to being the champions of a few officials. People have short memories in some respects, but not in all. The thing for you to do would be to make him Senior Physician Specialist.

I must confess quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that I have tried to figure this out myself, and to me it cannot be a desire for wealth, because in discussing this with doctors, I find that if Doctor Forde was practising privately in Barbados, he would make more money than in his post at the Hospital. If my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, thinks this is something personal, he is absolutely wrong. If you want to make the man Senior Physician Specialist, do so; but do not say he can be Senior Physician Specialist and still be Medical Superintendent and boss of all these things. Let all the accusations come against me; it does not make any difference. I am not voting for it because quite honestly I feel in my conscience that is wrong.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member really feels hurt about this because he spoke for an hour on this matter, but I am sure I am not going to speak as long. The hon. member apparently has been briefed, and that is why when a person is briefed on one side, you usually get him hammering the side he has been briefed on, but he cannot see the other side. Some weeks ago we clashed on hospital business, but today we clash in the opposite direction. The Medical Superintendent at the Hospital, whoever he may be, — and the hon. member brought in names — if he holds specialist qualifications is entitled to this practice. The hon. member talked about passing legislation, but you do not pass legislation for some abstract thing; you pass legislation for

individuals. When you look through the emoluments, you agree with the salary for the Surgeon Specialist, because there is a Surgeon Specialist. There was a time when we did not have a Surgeon Specialist in Barbados. Mr. Leacock was practising in British Guiana before he came here, and when it was known that he was about to come to Barbados, we created a post like that for him and there was no hue and cry. Nobody said anything about that, and that was personal, because everybody said we should have one.

Mr. Speaker, I was not briefed because no doctors come to me. I would regard it as an insult to the medical profession for one to come to me or to any politician to fight a case for him. What I would say is that the Government should have a Medical Board. What we are doing here in my view is wrong, because the hon. member is incompetent to negotiate on behalf of a matter like this which should have resided in the area in which a dispute would have occurred and then something would have to be regularised. When the hon. member said that what is being done here is against the wishes of the people in the medical profession and the nurses, how do we know that? (Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say that.) Yes, you did. You said they are against doing this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I said this is going to disrupt the entire medical profession at the Hospital, and I never mentioned a word about the nurses, and the Hon. Minister can tell you that is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made. Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter resume.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I am going to say is quite simple, and I am not going to take as long as the hon. member. If the Medical Superintendent holds specialist qualifications to allow him to enjoy all the other facilities, it does not prevent any person from being made Physician Specialist or Surgeon Specialist. All it says is that if this person holds qualifications equivalent to a specialist, you would let him have the same facilities as the others. What is wrong with that? The hon. member said last week that he would be glad if there were two Surgeon Specialists, and now that we have a man who has qualifications equivalent to the other, you say do not let him do it. What the hon. member is telling me, therefore, is that if Dr. Leacock had accepted the post of Medical Superintendent, he would obstruct him from being Surgeon Specialist. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, I would object to that.) The hon. member is going to object now, but last time he said he would let someone come from wherever they came from and go in the surgery, but the Medical Superintendent should not go in the surgery.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I object again.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not saying that the hon. member said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am on a point of order. I have not said that and that could not be an insinuation from what I said. You can go on to have this man act until you fill the post or create a new post for two people, but I do not like the idea of one person holding the gun at the head of the Government and saying I must be the head and specialist also. He should take one job or the other.
7.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order is made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, explain to him what is the position. Just in his closing remarks when he was saying what he was saying and I elected to phrase it in that way, he must not be so flurried as to say that I cannot say that. I can describe what he said in my way.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are saying that you are not quoting him *verbatim*.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is the hon. member saying by the speech he made? He is saying if this man is Medical Superintendent, he cannot be both. I am not saying that he said it that way. I disagree with him because it is not logic so

far as his doing the job. The hon. member heard some information, somebody says something and now he has come in here and saying that. This is where we come in. You bring in an Order to say that you are permitting the Medical Superintendent who is a Physician Specialist, whoever he may be, to carry on his practice as Physician Specialist. This is what you have to decide and make a decision on. The Physician Specialist is the Medical Superintendent holding the qualifications necessary to permit him to practice as Physician Specialist. Would you permit him to do that? The answer is "yes" or "no". I say "yes", because the Minister of Communications cannot favour anyone, he cannot go into the Body which appoints people and say: "I am the Minister; appoint this person."

We are dealing with a post at the General Hospital and we have made a revision of all these top posts at the General Hospital from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when there were no fees attached to any of these posts. There was a time when we appointed people at a very low salary. Dr. Leacock came here at a salary of £1,000 per annum without any fees. You have to agree that you have to change at times. If one of the changes is that the present Medical Superintendent is an outstanding Physician Specialist and the Government has made an Order, so that the Medical Superintendent would be able to carry on consulting as a Physician Specialist, I do not subscribe to the view that you cannot do that because the present Medical Superintendent is performing a service to the people in this Island. I have been into Dr. Forde's office and saw all sorts of people. There are people who when it comes to medical services pay for it. There are so many people now seeking medical attention that no one specialist can deal with them. What do you know of which is being given away that everybody can get, except air? There is nothing being given away free that everybody gets some apart from air. If the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has old clothes giving away and he says that everybody in St. Michael can get a garment, do you think everybody who went would get some? You will find some getting twice and some who even if they went will not get any at all.

The hon. member knows that one of the reasons that permitted the last Government to have this specialist service is the fact that lots of people were forced to leave this Island and go overseas for medical treatment. Many a person could not afford the medical expenses which they incurred with their family or themselves because they had to take them away, but they had to do so because the medical services were not available here. People had to leave here and go elsewhere and that is one of the things which prompted the Government then to make a change in the medical service. It was not done on the basis of the poor. As a matter of fact, the very poor do not want any Physician Specialist. They say: "call the doctor" and whoever comes first, they want. These fees which we are paying to Specialists now are based on the fact that there were people who could not afford the expenses of leaving the Island for medical treatment. They can find the money to pay a physician \$5.00, but they cannot afford to go to the U.S.A. for treatment.

Sir, I do not feel that there should be any real objection to the Medical Superintendent being permitted, where he holds Specialist qualifications, to engage in consulting practice. If a Medical Superintendent is not capable he would not do it. Where I differ from the hon. senior member for the City is this: the appointment of a man to a particular post is not really a question for us to decide. It is for the particular Board to decide that. What the hon. member was labouring on all through his speech is the person. He said that if this man accepted the post of Medical Superintendent, knowing the conditions of service prevailing with the post of Medical Superintendent, he should know that it did not permit him to get these other facilities.

Now, all of us accept things knowing the conditions that prevail then, but we also know that things change. There was a time when my argument was like the hon. senior member for the City. I did not agree at the time to granting fees to the Surgeon Specialist. I do not see any-

thing wrong with the Medical Superintendent, as Superintendent holding this post, being permitted to have consulting fees. This is where I disagree with the hon. member. We talked about the Hospital but I told him to look at the number of doctors registered in Barbados. You have 48 doctors in Barbados. (A VOICE: There are 54 doctors.) I am talking of the doctors who are practising. I think they are only 45 who are practising. It is not a question of more doctors being available but a question of if you can utilise his service.

7.30 p.m.

I thought that the hon. member would be in agreement with this. He would be very disturbed if you had a man with these qualifications available in this community and he was only doing administration. I appreciate what the hon. member has said as a comparative position, but as a Civil Service and structural arrangement you cannot deal with it in that way. If the Government care to give the holder of this post this consideration provided he has these qualifications, there is nothing irregular about that; far from that, this Government is doing something for which they were not responsible where the creation of the post of Medical Superintendent is concerned. Those are my views on this matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have been the most surprised man to hear one who has advocated the necessity for having the services of more Specialists, whether Physicians or Surgeons at the General Hospital, criticise the step which has been taken by the Government to secure the services of two Physician Specialists instead of one.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has not called the name of any hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But he says that he is surprised to hear the objections and I am the only hon. member who objected.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What the Government is presently doing, I cannot emphasize enough, is in the public interest. Some three years ago the Office of the Medical Superintendent became vacant in Barbados. The Government advertised to fill that post and the only person whom they could get to come in under the conditions was an expatriate, an old resigned man. We had to rely on the services of the present Medical Superintendent who, for two years, has been acting in the office of Physician Specialist. He has done the job of Medical Superintendent satisfactorily, together with holding the post of Physician Specialist for two years, and being responsible for the medical care of the Hospital beds and all the other physicians were working under his leadership. It has been proved that the post of Medical Superintendent does not exceed all the working hours of the Officer from 8 o'clock a.m. until 4 o'clock p.m., and you have a man who is considered, if not the best physician in the West Indies, as one of the best in the West Indies.

The hon. senior member for the City brought in the question of personalities. I am here to defend the officers who work under me especially where names are mentioned. The hon. member made mention of two officers. I would like to get the record straight. Today, without the services of the present holder of the office of Medical Superintendent as a Physician Specialist, the position in Barbados would be suicidal. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Don't talk nonsense. You remind me of Sir Grantley Adams who said that if it had not been for Dr. Cummins the whole community would be dead.) I say that, without the services of the present holder of the office of Medical Superintendent as a Physician Specialist, the position in Barbados would be suicidal. When the services of a man are available you should avail yourself of them. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 28 dealing with "Interruptions" reads as follows:-

"No Member shall interrupt another Member except:-

(a) by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupt-

ing shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit to the Speaker or Chairman for decision; or

(b) to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech, provided that the Member speaking is willing to give way and resumes his seat and that the Member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair."

Such interruptions make it impossible for the Staff to look forward to the rest to which they are entitled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I bow, Sir.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Is the hon. member telling us that the public of Barbados should be denied the privilege of having the services of the holder of the post of Medical Superintendent? If we do not give the present holder of the post permission to do private practice, he will just be administering an executive post, but he will not be able to allow the public of Barbados to get the benefit of his services.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point which I would like to make. The new Hospital is nearing completion and there is a plan on foot to make the present Hospital a Teaching Hospital. The present holder of the post of Medical Superintendent is so good a physician that even the authorities at the University of the West Indies think that this man should be one of the first to be used as coach for young trainees in clinical medicine. Are we therefore to do without the services of this man? Right now at the Mental Hospital the Medical Superintendent is allowed consulting practice and he is looking after administrative affairs there. What, therefore, is the difference between the Medical Superintendent of the Mental Hospital and the Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has the hon. member risen on? Has he risen on a point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, I have risen on a point of order which covers a multitude

Mr. SPEAKER: Indeed it does not. A point of order must direct attention to the point which the hon. member desires to bring to the notice of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister is asking the difference between the Medical Superintendent of the Mental Hospital and the Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital, and I was pointing out the difference to him. The difference is that the Medical Superintendent at the General Hospital is entitled to full fees in respect of consultation outside the Hospital and a non-pensionable allowance equal to 75% of the fees payable into the Public Treasury in respect of specialist services rendered within the Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER: As an old Parliamentarian, the hon. member would know that a rhetorical question does not anticipate an answer.

7.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But I cannot let him get away with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member will have to let him get away with it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Now the hon. member is a bit worried about this situation, but there are certain developments which, when the new Hospital is opened, will take place and will take care of the fears which the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has. The hon. member also mentioned that it would lead to dissatisfaction among the medical staff at the Hospital. I would like the hon. member to know that there is already (Mr. MOTTLEY: With the other specialists, I said.) The only other specialist the hon. member could be referring to would be another Physician Specialist, who, it would appear, at present would lose some of the consulting practice. I would like the hon. member to

know that there is already an understanding that the Medical Superintendent will not only be looking after paying patients, but will be allowing the public wards to have of his services. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That was always the case.) I beg your pardon!

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of begging pardon; the Hon. Minister has not offended the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It means, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that there is absolutely nothing wrong with allowing one to have consultant practice as long as it is in the interest of the public of Barbados. I hardly think it would be necessary for me to say anything more on this, Sir, although there is much more that I can say. It is getting late and the hon. member seems to be convinced that this is a necessary step to be taken, and knowing that it is being done in the interest of the people of Barbados, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown will agree with it. Under those circumstances, I shall go no further.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BATSON; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CARMICHAEL and Mr. YEARWOOD; — 9.

NOES: Mr. SEALEY and Mr. MOTTLEY — 2.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for today.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 2nd April, 1963 at 2.30 in the afternoon.

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.

7.50 p.m.