
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11th February, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m. 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; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J. P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J. P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*) and Mr. N. W. BOXILL.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings of the 14th, 21st and 28th January, and of the 4th February, 1964, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a Pause*). Hearing no objection, the Minutes of those four meetings are now taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the ten months ended 31st January, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

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

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House declares that this Government no longer enjoys the confidence of the country, and accordingly calls upon the Premier to advise His Excellency the Governor to dissolve the Legislature so that a General Election can be held."

QUESTIONS

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the Junction via Fortress Hill and Lion Castle in the Parish of St. Thomas is very dangerous to vehicular traffic?

2. Will Government make provision for remedying same by placing Major Road Stop signs in order to check the flow of traffic and to avoid any serious accidents occurring at the said point?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941, be now read a first time.

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

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

REPLIES LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker there are two Replies to Questions ready. The first is the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 140 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, and the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 148 also standing in the name of the same hon. member.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Replies have been laid to Questions Nos. 140 and 148 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. 2.50 p.m.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, Question 140 reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that a public standpipe has been erected in Waterford Housing Area, St. Michael, since December, 1962, but that the water service with respect thereto has not yet been turned on by the Waterworks Department?

2. Will Government see to it that the said water service be turned on without further delay?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is in the negative, will Government state why?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

"Yes, Sir. The delay was due to the taking of measures to safeguard the underwater supply in that zone from pollution.

2. The water supply has since been connected.
3. Does not arise."

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Hon. Minister for the action he has taken to assist those people in that district with water.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 148 also stands in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister.

Is the Minister aware that the roads in Free Hill area in the parish of St. Michael are in an acute state of disrepair and are now well nigh impassable to vehicular traffic?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

"I am aware that roads in the Free Hill area are in need of repairs. Reconstruction of four roads in the Free Hill area was commenced on 18th October, eleven days prior to the question being asked."

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more answers laid, and we therefore may proceed to Private Members' Business which is on page 11. I notice that the first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, and I observe that when the debate was postponed on this matter, the hon. junior member for St. Michael moved seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that further consideration be postponed. The Order was to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution *re* the provision of a bus service for the Lodge Hill District.

Does the Hon. Minister of Communications desire to resume his address?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this question, I had informed the hon. member, in view of the pending report of the entire transportation system in the Island, that I would answer this question as soon as the Committee had reported. We have just received only a few days ago, the Report of the Committee appointed to investigate, and it is now being studied.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member propose to contribute to this discussion before the hon. senior member for St. Michael exercises, if he thinks fit, his right of final reply?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Resolution, in view of the fact that the Report of the Committee which was set up to investigate the whole question of the bus service matter connected therewith has only been recently received by the Government, we are craving the indulgence of the House at this stage - and in fairness to the Hon. Mover of this Resolution - to ask for a further postponement in order for the Minister to be fully apprised of all the various facts of the Report, and be in a position to reply to the Hon. Mover at some subsequent meeting.

With that in mind, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION *RE* DIVIDING CHILDREN INTO CATEGORIES AT ELEVEN YEARS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown: to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution relative to the system of dividing children into categories at the early age of eleven years.

When discussion on this Resolution was postponed, the Hon. Minister of Education was speaking. Does the Hon. Minister desire to continue his Address?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is nearly three months since I began to speak to the motion moved by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, and I suppose that from a certain point of view, it might appear as if the sense and substance of the discussion have been impaired by the lapse of time.
3.00 p.m.

This might well be true for almost any other topic, but I think it is certainly not true on any topic which has to do with education. That is because the subject itself, apart from its vastness, range, and scope, always brings new and exciting challenges in the minds of those who contemplate on any aspect of it and, more so, because there is always room for honest doubt and honest differences of opinion, and nobody can have or will have at his disposal a monopoly of wisdom in matters of education. There is room also for a certain amount of bold experimentation, and there is opportunity for discarding theories and practices which no longer hold sway and to attempt within the limits of administrative convenience and financial competence a thousand and one devices which can properly be put to a solution of these problems.

This motion is specific in its form. It draws attention to the fact that the methods of selecting pupils in the United Kingdom for entrance into Secondary Grammar Schools are methods which have been tried for some time, and that other techniques are taking their place. The motion in the light of that goes on to say:

"WHEREAS incalculable emotional disturbance is caused in the minds of Barbadian children annually subjected to this harmful and dangerous system of early selectivity,

BE IT RESOLVED that this examination be abolished and a more equitable and less rigorous method of selection for secondary education be introduced."

The hon. member in his speech, which showed clear and unmistakable evidence of his awareness of this very intricate subject, was kind enough to bring the House up-to-date with respect to the problem as is now experienced in the United Kingdom, the problems and difficulties of administering it, more so, the differences which English authorities find and experience in choosing admission to these Secondary Grammar Schools. He also with a wealth of illustration drew to the attention of the House that educational authorities in the United Kingdom have been very much concerned in recent years over the so-called 11-plus examination, and have been casting about here and there for some better working convenience, and to that extent, adequate alternative to entrance examination for admission to secondary schools in the United Kingdom; and he suggested that the experience now undergone in the United Kingdom may be more than relevant to our own situation, pointing out as he did, that even now despite Government's educational problems, for which I think he had some word of praise, we were somewhat behind hand in providing places for all those whom we can make use of and, in the light of that, he suggested that we should abolish this examination for one more suitable. That was the gist of the Hon. Mover's words.

When I got up to reply, I accepted most of all what he said and drew, rightly so, different conclusions from the same facts, and I shall show in the same detail why I drew different conclusions. I shall also show why I find it difficult to accept one of the premises of the Resolution and to accept the conclusion which the hon. member wishes to enjoin upon the House. But before I go that far, I just want to refresh the House's memory with the line which I was taking when I addressed the House on that occasion. I went in some detail to explain that the vast overwhelming awareness manifested by parents and the interest which they show in secondary education was a good thing and nothing at all to deplore, because it demonstrates an awareness of secondary training in these days which parents of a generation ago did not always have, even though some had the means of gratifying it.

I also pointed out that because of this tremendous pressure which, after all, is of recent duration, coming as it has done in the years immediately after the Second World War, and because in addition to that pressure there was not a sufficient awareness by the people directing our educational policy to know what that pressure meant and how it could be satisfied, we were almost caught in a situation in which we just could not build schools fast enough, although this Government's record has quite a lot to commend it and compares more than favourably with the records of the previous regime. But this is not a matter of distributing praise and blame of one Government and another. If we are able to do more than the last holders of power, it may be that we have made the community more alert and aware of the value of education, and therefore, can call on the support of the community in this matter in a way which our predecessors could not do because they did not make the community sufficiently aware of its value. It may be that, since we have a different set of priorities and, therefore, a different outlook from those who last held power, we are exhibiting a greater sense of urgency and, to that extent, can do much more than they could do, because they were not as much aware of the challenges of the age in which we live.

However, Sir, I go on to say that whatsoever one chooses to say of this Government's educational policy, one has to admit that it is forward looking, that it is a sincere and resolute attempt to come to grips with the awful problems of the time in which we live and it has a sense and purpose of direction which implements the aspirations of every right thinking person.

3.10 p.m.

That is why the problem of the Secondary Schools and admission thereto is not looked upon by us in isolation from the general problem of education. It is part of the whole picture and it is to be taken against the background of the whole problem. I therefore cannot accept one of the basic principles in the hon. member's argument, that is, that incalculable harm is done to, and incalculable emotional disturbance is caused in, the minds of Barbadian children because of their having to sit these tests. I pause here to remind the hon. member of this; when he says that incalculable harm is done he may mean two things. In the first place, he may mean that the harm is so great that it cannot be measured or, in the second place, he may mean that it is so small that it need not be measured. In either case the harm would be incalculable. I am not arguing that if the harm that is done is small that that is any justification for having any harm done to these children at all. My argument is not in that region. My argument is simply this; that although everybody who is connected with education must sincerely desire to impose no system on children which would inconvenience them in any way, at the same time everybody must agree that tests and examinations of some sort there must be.

The problem, therefore, is not to abolish the examination as such unless you may be sure beyond any shadow of doubt that it was positively harmful — and no educational administrator or teacher would be worth his salt if he were to continue the system a moment longer after he was convinced of its harmfulness. Apart from that, there is also this fact; education is not only a matter of theory, it

is a matter of practice also and that while some experimentation is to be indulged in in the matter of education, like most other fields of human endeavour, experimentation is always attached to hard bed-rock experience. In other words, Sir, the experiments you try arise out of some experience which either the child or the teacher or the educational authority has had.

Now, Sir, I am willing to admit that some Barbadian children, like some English children, experience in varying degrees, according to the temperament of the child, some sort of nervousness at having to take any kind of test. That would be true not only of the eleven plus examination, but it would also be true of the ordinary seven plus routine which is carried out in all our primary schools — which is, of course, a private exercise which enables the teachers of infants to make some assessment of the progress which they are making; but the little child of seven who, on that particular day, has got to do a few extra sums or a little extra reading, because he knows that that is the day, although no rewards or punishments are attached, naturally he feels somewhat tense until the moment goes. That happens to everybody in the world. If it is true that new occasions teach new duties, then new challenges bring about new nervousness. Anybody who has to take an examination or offer himself for a test, whether he be a child or else, gets tense. Whatever it may be, you get tense; if you are a singer or whatever you may be, you get butterflies. That is because you are human enough to realise that it is an adventure on which you are entering.

Mr. Speaker, what makes me differ from the hon. member in this respect is this: while I am prepared to admit that there may well be some highly-strung children in Barbados who, either because of their own temperaments or more particularly because of the misguided attitude on behalf of their parents, are affected when the time comes for them to take this examination — I admit that and, consequently, such children may suffer great emotional disturbance. I make bold to say, however, that there is nothing which the Ministry of Education does now so long as the present outlook continues — there is nothing which it will ever do which will increase that tension or will in any way make it appear anything other than negligible. As a matter of fact, I may disclose this to the House: I have been keeping a very close check on this problem. I say this without boasting; among the many aspects of the work of my own Ministry which engage my intention from time to time, this I would single out to be the one which I consider the most absorbing as far as interest is concerned — the one to which I pay the most attention — because I am very much aware of what effects there can be to a child if he is made to think that his whole future depends upon what happens to him upon a particular day.

I should like to give the House the assurance that there is nothing I would shrink from doing in order to carry out this selective examination under the best possible circumstances, under the best possible psychological conditions, so that the children may enter into it with a spirit of adventure and not with a spirit of diffidence or of fear. Therefore, Sir, one of the things which I am doing this year is this. Instructions have been given to the primary schools that they must, I repeat, they must enter for the common entrance examination of their pupils between the ages of ten and twelve years.

3.20 p.m.

Now this is of tremendous significance. There will no longer be any question of favourite pupils specially coached in primary schools being hand-picked for purpose of prestige or otherwise, and pushed into the examination whether or not individual pupils are quite ready for it, and others who might have more to offer and therefore make a better showing are kept back for no reason which could be called scientific. Rather than that, every pupil in every primary school who is between the ages of ten and twelve will be entered for the screening test. Now that means that this year I shall be faced with a first examination being taken by some 9,000 pupils. Now this is phenomenal. There may be even more because I imagine that the private schools will also avail themselves of the opportunity, if that is the

desire of their pupils or their pupils' parents, to enter those of their pupils who come within that age range; but I certainly know that as far as our own primary schools are concerned, there will be 9,000 pupils entering for this screening test.

It is very possible, Mr. Speaker, that 3,000 of them, if past statistics are anything to go by certainly for the last three years, will qualify by passing the screening test and will therefore be eligible for the common entrance exam. I pause here to say, of course, that nothing I am now saying must be taken to mean that those pupils who already have passed the screening test but did not succeed in passing part 2 cannot now enter so long as they are under twelve years. I think that is well known. I know that when the 3,000 pupils from that 9,000 or 9,500 emerge this year to take the Part 2 examination — and I shall speak about that examination in a few minutes — immediately the question will arise in everybody's mind: if 3,000 children take Part 2, what is going to happen to those hundreds for whom there might not possibly be places? Now there are two answers to that question. Let me deal with the first answer. I attack it this way by saying that the question itself is based on a misconception. It is not a case that people pass and there are no places for them. This is a competitive, selective exam which is based on certain standards, and while I cannot speak for anything that took place in 1960 or 1961, I can most certainly speak for anything that took place in 1962 and 1963, and I say this without fear of contradiction that I know of no instance in September, 1962 or September 1963 where a child had satisfied the standards required and a place could not be found.

Now I pause here to say that in this matter as in other matters, Mr. Speaker, there are always people — I regret to say there are some of them in the teaching profession — who care for prestige a little more than they may care for accuracy, and I myself from my own experience as a teacher know that no teacher relishes the idea or the experience of having to tell the parent that his or her child is not as promising as the parent likes to think the child is. Consequently I have had complaints coming to me from parents saying that they cannot understand how their child or children was or were not awarded a place or places, because they went to the school, so the story goes, and the teacher has told them that the child has passed, but there was not any room. Let me make it absolutely clear. The Part 2 common entrance test is not controlled by the schools at all, either by primary schools or secondary schools. It is controlled in its entirety by the Ministry of Education, and consequently only the Ministry and its competent authorities can say with any definiteness whether or not a child has satisfied the examiners. The schools know that they have when we tell them the results of the test, and I think on balance the Ministry is very wise to take this matter entirely out of the hands of the schools; so the one charge that cannot be levelled at this examination is the charge of favouritism, because the people who might possibly be weak-minded enough to indulge in a bit of favouritism naturally out of loyalty to their schools, are precluded by the very nature of the arrangements from so doing.

If anything goes wrong in the common entrance examination, I should be prepared to take full constitutional and other responsibility, because it is an examination carried out completely and entirely under the auspices of the Ministry, and neither the schools which the pupils are leaving nor the schools to which they may be going have anything to do with the conduct or management of the examination. The schools from which they are coming, that is to say, the Primary Schools, have the business of entering them for the examination. The Secondary Schools have the business of receiving those who satisfy the requirements; but between the point of entry and the point of admission, neither of these two schools take part. The Ministry of Education itself is entirely responsible, and I should be more than willing to reiterate this to let parents know that it is useless and worst than fanciful to go to a teacher at any school from which the child sat the common entrance to ask how the child did, because the teachers, unless they themselves specially enquire, are not in a position to say what took place at the common entrance examination. Now this is

very interesting because on several occasions last year and the year before, I have had parents coming to me on this same point, and I must say this in fairness to the parents, although I do not mean this as a severe criticism on the teachers, because I think I understand what makes them do what they have done. I have had parents coming to me as parents have told me, and invariably I have used my discretion to give instructions that the parents themselves can see the marks which the child received, and the method which has been used to mark the child's work, to explain it individually to parents whenever they come in detail, and I have not yet found a case where a parent went away unconvinced about the justice of the marking, although a parent may have gone away disappointed at the results of the child; but that is a different matter. 3.30 p.m.

Now, this is very important. If the Ministry of Education takes upon itself that it wants to see justice done and because it wants to avoid, so far as humanly possible to do, any charge of favouritism or suspicion to control the education, the Ministry of Education will be more than foolish if it did not keep the mechanics of the examination under its continual review. Therefore, my decision that all primary school children of the required range should enter for the screening test — I am coming back to the problem of the later examination — is all part of the experimentation which I am carrying on. The reason for that is that when all enter, I see the percentage of passes; and in the screening test, I get a fairly accurate idea from past experience of the number of places which this Ministry must provide in the years to come.

However, I realise that I am going to be faced with an immediate problem this year, because if 3,000 pupils pass the screening test, I shall well imagine that about 1,000 will win places this year in the secondary schools.

Just let us look at some figures. In September, 1962, the admissions to the secondary schools were 583, which were nearly 150 more than in September 1961. But largely because we had started early in 1962 to step up on our school building and extension programme, we were able to offer these extra places in 1962. In 1963, the admissions rose from 583 in the previous year to 744, and this 744 we were able to accommodate again because of the continuing school building programme and because last September I did a thing which I am very proud of although I do not boast about it.

The Ministry gave instructions to all the Governing Bodies of secondary schools that they were to fill up to the last bench and the last desk so that there was no question of there not being room, and we were able to take in everybody who satisfied the requirements of the examination. It was also due to another administrative policy. I said that if two children one aged 10 years and one aged 11 years showed the same standard, preference was to be given to the 11-year-old child because that would be his or her last chance, and that in cases where the 10-year-old showed exceptional brilliance, he or she was not to be kept back because he or she was too young. I am glad to say that the instructions which I gave to the Governing Bodies of those schools were carried out.

As I have said, we admitted 744 pupils to secondary schools in September last. Now, I am going to be faced with a request and demand for 1,000 this year, and hon. members may wish to know how my Ministry proposes to meet this demand. The same policies will hold good. Every available place will be filled, and preference will be given to the 11-year-olds where the 10-year-olds and 11-year-olds are of equal merit; but there is something else which the Ministry proposes to do to meet the broad challenge of this year's entrants.

The House is well aware that a new Secondary school is being erected on part of Government House grounds next to the Primary School which is already opened, and part of it will be on property which Government has acquired. That school when it is filled to capacity will accommodate 1,000 pupils.

Naturally, when it starts in September, the entire 1,000 will not be admitted. What we propose to do is this. I propose to move all the girls from the Parkinson School to the new school because I am very much concerned about secondary education for our youth and more particularly for the girls and the fact that we are not offering all that we can offer for the girls. Therefore, I am moving all the girls from the Parkinson School and bringing them into this school. That is about 500 and that would leave about the same number of boys at the Parkinson School.

I propose to provide 105 places in the new Secondary school for pupils who satisfy the requirements of the common entrance examination and another 105 places at the Parkinson School for additional pupils who satisfy the common entrance requirements so that if this new development were not still taking place, I would still at any rate be able to admit 750 as I did last year; but with this, I can add another 210 or perhaps another 250 and therefore make up the 1,000. Therefore, there will be pupils from the common entrance examination going to the new secondary school in Government Hill and there will be also admissions to the Parkinson School from the common entrance examination.

This raises a big problem and poses a set of questions which I know hon. members have a right to ask and which I will answer as frankly as I can. Nearly everybody in this Island expresses some concern, even although they are not familiar with the problems, about the status of these schools which by common consent are called Secondary Modern Schools. I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker. The reason why Harrison College, Queen's College, the Lodge School, Combermere School, the Coleridge Parry School and the whole lot of those schools are now by common agreement secondary schools of the highest essence is that from the time they began, those who were responsible for starting and launching them decided that certain high standards were to be preserved in them.
3.40 p.m.

In other words, Harrison College is what it is today because the people who founded it wanted it to be in this way. The inference is this: if those who established what are called Secondary Modern Schools in this island wanted them to approximate to standards which all agree, I myself included, are desirable, they would have started putting them in the direction which they ought to have. Mr. Speaker, I am up against this difficulty whenever I am discussing this matter of education: As soon as I make any criticism of the former Government, there are a lot of people who rush to its defence, who really do not need to rush to its defence because the criticisms which I make of them are political criticisms which they can answer for themselves. I notice that they never answer criticisms of their educational policy or when they do answer those criticisms they bury their answers in a mask of euphemism admitting, so to speak, that they were wrong about that; but you have to search their language through very carefully in order to find their admission. It all reminds me, Sir, of the story of the man who was applying for an insurance policy and, as is the case with these things, he had to fill out a long questionnaire. One of the questions which he was asked was this: "How did your father die; and at what age?" Of course, his father had been hanged and he did not like to say so; therefore in answering that question, he said: "He died while participating in a public function when the platform gave way beneath him" (laughter).

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the trouble with the Barbados Labour Party. Their educational platform has given way beneath them. That is what they say without saying why I gave way. When therefore they thought that the time had come to expand, if that is the word, secondary education in this island, they should have reflected that there was the pressure for secondary education; the demands of the people were so great that here was an opportunity to foster not only excellence of high standards, but to train the very sound democratic instincts of the people along the new lines, and therefore to make the new secondary schools the vehicle of a kind of education which would not only be another programme in excellence of the one with

which we were familiar in the other schools, but which would criss-cross it at certain points. Even in their thinking they caused the people of this island to look down on these secondary schools because they limited them to the Primary schools. All the administration was on the basis of the Primary schools. But we are now trying to disentangle them from the Primary Schools. As a matter of fact, I have given instructions that these schools should not be referred to as Secondary-Modern Schools at all, but as secondary schools; that is what they are.

Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks' time, I am going to the Princess Margaret School to attend a Prize-giving function and to declare open a new block of buildings to be used by pupils at that school who are to be trained for the G.C.E. How many people know that you can go to the Princess Margaret School today and show promise and you will be started on a four-year course which will end you up in taking the G.C.E. in subjects such as Spanish, English, General Science, Mathematics and History, just as you would do if you were a girl attending Queen's College or if you were a boy attending Harrison College? This is work which these schools have been doing and they are doing it quite well. The reason why their praises have not been sung is that, for the first few years of their existence, nobody took the trouble to publicise them or to give them the standards to aim at which they should have had. The position is that any child who, in future, is gifted enough to pursue an academic course of study may do it either at the older established secondary schools or at one of the new secondary schools where there is a variety of instruction and courses to suit all types of aptitude which students may show. Those who show an aptitude for the academic will have all the resources open to them; and those who are more technical and modern will also have these facilities available to them in such a way that the pupils of any one kind of school would have no desire to look down on the pupils of another kind of school. There will be technical streams as there are now at Harrison College and Lodge School and there will be extended academic streams at the other schools. Therefore it will be perfectly possible in the very near future for some child at school to be found in both types of instruction in perfect equality with the same type of facilities which are being offered in other schools.

Mr. Speaker, I say all of this — and it may seem that I have made a wide diversion — so as to let hon. members know that when you ask a Minister to abolish the 11 plus examination, the Ministry does not quite see the problem in that way. The Ministry sees the problem in the way of something that we should keep under examination and under continual review, and I am most interested in providing a type of examination for the eleven plus which is adaptable and suitable to local circumstances. I think we would be on common ground with anybody who wants the examination legalised in the sense that when their children meet it they see it as an exertion in familiarity.
3.50 p.m.

To abolish the exam as an exam would involve the search, even before the discovery was made, of an alternative, and I do not know at the moment what alternative would be better. I am not saying there is not one; I am only saying I do not know it. I mentioned that the problem of entrance will be taken care of this year and that there will at least be 1,000 places provided for the grammar school type child, and I shall myself enlist the sympathy and support of the parents in this venture by doing all I can as rapidly as I can to raise the standards and increase the facilities of these new secondary schools, which really if words have to be used to describe them, are and will be comprehensive schools — schools which offer a variety of courses; and in time the schools which now appear to us to be purely academic, like Harrison College and Queen's College, will in time become comprehensive schools, because they will themselves without in any way lowering their standards, without in any way changing their direction, as time goes on, even as they are now doing, offer a variety of courses.

There was a time, for instance, when at Queen's College what we now call Housecraft or Domestic Science was

thought *infra dig*. Fifty or sixty years ago the idea that a pupil of a secondary school should be taught how to cook or home management or anything like that was thought to be *infra dig*, because it was believed that you were insinuating you were fitting the girl for the work of a maid or servant. Not now so at all. The secondary schools, in particular for girls, give its full measure of training in this subject in the best secondary schools whether here or abroad, because it is taken for granted that it is part of the complete education of a young woman that she should understand something about Housecraft. When you put on new Domestic Science blocks in a secondary school like Queen's College or St. Michael's, and when you establish commercial teaching on an expanded basis, and when in addition to these you teach music and the arts as well as the formal academic disciplines, you have a comprehensive school, a school which for its range and scope provides training in all the varied subjects which a pupil should have training in; so you get that trend taking place in the old established schools, and we are now building up the academic side to the new secondary schools. There is therefore no question of levelling down Harrison College or Queen's College; there is a question of raising up, and it is this levelling up process in education which the Ministry and the Government are trying to foster. When you understand all this, don't you see, Mr. Speaker, that the problem goes beyond merely abolishing a certain form of exam? The very fact that these developments are taking place means that there is and has to be a continual re-assessment of all the methods of getting children into schools. Naturally if we could build overnight ten new secondary schools and wake up tomorrow morning and staff them and train the teachers for them, I could abolish the eleven plus examination in the sense in which the hon. member is asking for it, because the question of selectivity would not occur, I could fill the schools because I would have them. Since I cannot do that, however, I have to make sure that the children of special talent, the exceptionally gifted children, do not lose an opportunity; and when I talk about losing an opportunity, there are certain things that really make me feel very embittered about the last Government.

Mr. Speaker, I very seldom let my temper rise except when I contemplate the enormous wastage of human material which went on in this Island under their regime. I some years ago had a conversation with a Mr. Jarvis who was on the staff of the Lodge School. Mr. Jarvis was a very competent teacher of mathematics, and he said to me there was something which was puzzling him, and I asked him what it was. He said that here at this school, meaning the Lodge School — it might equally refer to Harrison College — we hold an entrance examination. We supposedly picked the best people; yet when he had to teach them in the First or Second Form, he wondered how they got into the school, they were so dull; yet on the facts of it we are supposed to have taken the best. Now he was not making that as an absolute condemnation of the method of selection; he was making it as a general condemnation because obviously among the group there would be people who were bright and promising. Here was a teacher talking to somebody who was also a teacher, but in addition to being a teacher was a politician. I understood immediately what his problem was, but I had an insight into the problem which Mr. Jarvis could not command, because I happened to be a Barbadian and I knew what went on in this Island.

When individual secondary schools had to control all their own entrance examinations, obviously they would set the normal test in English and Arithmetic, and I am not saying that the children would be unfairly marked, because the point was not so much to test the ability of the child in that conception as to discover what they used to call a type of child suitable for Queen's College. Consequently the admission of children to this school — I am speaking now of six, seven or eight years ago or as recently as four or five years ago — rested more often than not on the interview, and it was the interview which made or broke the child, and for the life of me, I cannot understand; Mr. Speaker, how presumably the same people with the same care and interest in children could ever devise such a cruel and inhuman method of selecting children for places

in secondary schools as to embarrass the children in a method of selection. Children were asked whether they brought water from the pipe; if they used to sit down and eat their food at home with the bowl between their legs or in the half door; if they had wash basins; if they had knives and forks; if they are accustomed to bathing their faces and hands and changing into a new suit of clothes in the afternoon, and all sorts of questions like that. That explains why a lot of poor people's children who had ability — there is no question at all about it — failed to get into the schools which the taxpayers were providing.

If, Mr. Speaker, you want proof of the iniquity of that system, look at the common entrance results in 1962 and 1963 and see the type of children who gained admission to these schools. Both in 1962 and 1963 the percentages of admissions were 85% for children from primary schools and the other 15% came from children in private schools or children who were getting transfers from one type of secondary grammar school to another. These are not only the children of poor people; they are children of people who in nearly every case could not have afforded to send them to these schools if the schools were still fee-paid; and more than that — and this really answers Mr. Jarvis' questions eight years after he asked it — they are children who were entered for the common entrance examination and satisfied the examiners without any extra coaching; they were just put in.

4.00 p.m.

They are children who are entering for the common entrance examination and satisfying the examiners without any extra coaching; and the hon. junior member for the City who is the Mover of this motion, and his colleague, the hon. senior member for the City, are never tired of saying how the resources of the Bridgetown City Council are pressed to their fullest limits by the requests and demands for public assistance from the parents of these children who have been entering these secondary schools from the primary schools in large numbers. They say that the parents are so poor that they cannot supply the uniforms and books and the Council is asked to do so. That is a problem by itself and this Government has plans to deal with that. That is a remarkable thing — a new type of child from homes which could entertain only a very weak desire to send their children to Harrison College or St. Michael's or wherever it is, but they have no means of translating that desire into actuality.

However, Sir, there is no reason for us to go headlong and abolish the common entrance examination. All we need to do is to see that there are places for all those who satisfy the examiners. I wish to draw this to the attention of hon. members. I do not spin out educational theories. I have been a teacher myself and, speaking personally, I think I have a tremendous experience in these matters. But I honestly hate to push forward views of my own unless I had it to do in the requirements of my duties. However, I will have to see for myself what can be done to make the common entrance examination a better examination before I condescend to give my blessing to abolish it like that, because until you can provide places for everybody some selection there must be. I would like to look forward to the day when places would be available, or as many, or nearly as many as would be required, and that the question of selectivity would assume a proportionate requirement.

There is just one point more in this part of my speech. I am sorry that I have to detain the House on this, but these matters cannot be glossed over: and since I am responsible for educational matters, I would rather detain the House and leave a clear impression. When we come now to the question of the examination itself, perhaps the House would like to know this. The admissions to these schools are controlled by two examinations. One is the familiar screening test, as some people call it, and I think there is some merit in calling it the screening test because a large number of children take the examination, and I think in the confusion and excitement which comes out of it, some children might possibly be screened. Anyhow, the screening test is just an elimination examination and it makes the

common entrance examination a bit easier than it would be. If there were no screening test this year, I will have 9,000 children to sit the common entrance examination and I will have to organise the examination for 9,000 children; but, obviously, all would not have the same merit and there is bound to be a proportionate number which has better chances. In order to get at that proportion, we give a screening test.

We have found that of any number taking this preliminary examination or the screening test, about one-third passes it and that one-third gives you a good enough number to select from. The screening test is a simple examination in English and arithmetic within the pupils' range of experience. It is based on what they have been doing in school; but of course, it is the examination of the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry has a sub-Committee of its own, presided over by the Senior Education Officer and this Committee is responsible for the whole arrangement of this examination and it is entirely divorced from the school itself. There has never been any complaint that it has been an unfair test and, as I have said, it is an examination which is based on the pupils' experience and they enjoy it. Naturally, some show more promise than others and those who show no promise are eliminated. I can give the House the assurance that it is nothing to scare a child.

Part Two is a different kind of examination, and it is Part Two which is referred to as the common entrance examination. This examination is based on a standardised test. It is a test used in the United Kingdom upon which there have been very favourable reports, and the Ministry is using the "Moray House Test." It is a common examination in basic English and Arithmetic. The difference between this kind of test and similar tests which a child may have sat, say, five or six years ago, is that the answer to the questions do not depend on long and discursive treatment, but the quickness with which the entrants can grasp the essentials and put down the answers. In other words, it is not set in a way which requires that you should do a sum and put a long lot of working; the purpose of the test is to find out how quickly the pupils grasp the essentials of the problems. It is not hard in the sense that pupils will find it difficult, but it would be hard to the pupil who would be a bit slower in his mental process than one who is quicker. 4.10 p.m.

Now, in addition to the standard in English and Arithmetic, there is an easy question which is also set; there is a short essay which the pupil is asked to write. The essay is not used for any other purpose than that of assisting in the assessment of the pupil in doubtful cases. In other words, we ask the pupils to write an essay as a try-out, but they are not assessed on the try-out. In cases where the pupil appears to be on the border-line between selection and non-selection, we look at the essay to see the clarity of expression which is shown and that helps with these border-line cases. I say all that in order to let the hon. member see how much trouble the Ministry takes to see that no pupil suffers or gets an unfair break. If a border-line case does manifest itself, we can see what is wrong and we assist a pupil and give him the benefit of the doubt. I do not know of anything which is fairer than that; I would be prepared to re-examine the whole concept of the common entrance examination with a view to providing an examination which is more adaptable to local circumstances. I have not told my advisers this yet, but I am of the opinion that in addition to the test in English and Arithmetic, there should be an intelligence test. There are children of exceptional promise who just cannot express themselves through no fault of their own.

There are children who cannot write well. Sir Winston Churchill has told the story of the Entrance Examination which has always amused me. He said that at Harrow, which is a school like Harrison College, away back in 1885 when he was shown his question paper, he spent half an hour in trying to read it. He spent another half an hour in trying to understand it and it was only at the end of an hour and a half that he managed to mark No. 1 in any attempt to answer the first question. At the end of the first question he wrote his name, spilled some ink and then handed in his paper. Well,

Sir, you could not say in 1960 that he was not a person of exceptional promise, all of which had been more than amply fulfilled. I am conscious of the fact that because a person can be a late developer you should add another prop to the examination of testing children in native intelligence.

I would recommend, where children tend to show well in English and Arithmetic, that these children be given a chance where the other matter was concerned. If this matter were to be gone into more fully we could probably have a Committee of Experts, with a University Committee assisting to examine the problem from the point of view of how we can make an even better examination, so as to give children an even better chance of being selected. I cannot accept the implied censure, which the hon. member wants to visit on this Government, by saying that incalculable and emotional disturbance is caused in the minds of Barbadian children because of the present system. Some children may feel uncomfortable about this hurdle; but for me to admit that this harm is incalculable, I would have to be sure that it is so great as to warrant an immediate stopping of the examination, in which case I would have to ask the hon. member for further and better particulars, as the lawyers say, so that I am very unhappy about accepting this implied censure. If I were to permit the hon. member to say that incalculable harm was caused, constitutionally I ought to hand in my resignation to the Hon. Premier, because I would be admitting that I am powerless to stop a state of affairs which is obvious to the hon. member. Not only that, but I would be positively encouraging it if I allowed the hon. member to make the implied censure on the Government.

I reject the hon. member's contention on those grounds. We admit more people than ever have been admitted. We admit a wider range of social classes than before. That is the real point. You go and look at the First Forms of the older secondary schools and you would be amazed at what you now see as distinct from what used to obtain ten years ago. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown - I am sorry that he is not now in his seat - told us that a lady had rung him up and told him that a terrible thing had happened and when he expected to hear that there had been some private misfortune or bereavement in the family and he was ready to extend his sympathy to her, the terrible thing that had happened was that her cook had managed to get not one, but both her daughters into Queen's College! If that was a disaster, I would wish that we could have that disaster repeated ten-fold, and every time we could fill in these schools with the children of agricultural labourers, cooks, planters, merchants and everybody else, but particularly of those who are numerous enough to need it more; but may God send these disasters as often as He will think of them! We are standing on quite firm ground in our education policy.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have told the House enough to set the minds of hon. members at rest and to show them that I am as much concerned as the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown in this matter. I am at least just as aware as he is of the requirements and I am prepared, in the light of the hon. member's criticisms and in the light of my own findings, to provide a better eleven plus examination. The Government is pushing through its school-building programme which is one of the contributions which it is making in order to provide a solution to this problem. 4.20 p.m.

While we thank the hon. member for giving us the opportunity for setting out in some detail our policy on secondary education, it is with the utmost regret that I have to say that you cannot accept the hon. member's motion in its present form. The hon. member's motion reads as follows, and after I have read it, I am going to move an amendment which I hope the hon. member will accept, because acceptance of my amendment will not prejudice his own case, but will on the contrary give him and me further reason for reflecting on this important problem. The hon. member's motion, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS it has been found in England and Europe that the system of dividing children into categories at the early age of eleven has proved unscientific and unreliable,

2061

procedural arrangements being now made in England to do away with the Common Entrance examination in its present form by the end of the current year....."

That I can accept because it has reference to experience in the United Kingdom, and his views and mine on that matter are identical. Then it continues:-

"AND WHEREAS incalculable, emotional disturbance is caused in the minds of Barbadian children annually subjected to this harmful and dangerous system of early selectivity,"

That is where we part company and I therefore cannot accept that, because as I have outlined, the manner in which the Ministry of Education conducts these exams is calculated to remove, as far as we humanly can, the emotional damage and disturbance in the minds of the children, and we do that by putting it beyond the shadow of a doubt and making it known and obvious that no child is kept out because of Party or because of other circumstances so long as he shows the aptitude.

He therefore wants the House to resolve that this examination be abolished and a more equitable and less rigorous method of selection for secondary education be introduced.

I cannot accept that, but I am prepared to invite the hon. member to consider this amendment.

"BE IT RESOLVED that the method of selection be further re-examined and consideration given to adopting the best techniques suitable to local circumstances."

I would accept the first part of his preamble; regretably I must reject the second part of the preamble and I find the text of the Resolution where the House's concurrence was asked to be engaged on also unacceptable, and I would offer for his consideration this amendment, the text of which I will ask through you, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk to let the hon. member see. I wish to thank the hon. member for the opportunity which he has given me both on the last occasion and on this occasion for expounding Government's and my Ministry's policy on this matter, and for setting on record once again the tremendous contribution which this Ministry and Government with the goodwill and support of a very wide section of the community is making towards the uplift of the young people of this country. *(Cheers)*.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the Hon. Minister of Education to have moved an amendment. Has that amendment been seconded?

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the Hon. Minister of Education, and I would like at the very beginning to puncture the arguments which he adduced before I speak in detail on the several points which he has raised. If I may, I would quote from Professor Peers who has this to say of the eleven plus examination:

"The eleven-plus casts its shadow before it, narrowing restricting and distorting the curricula and teaching methods of the primary school, hanging like a millstone round the neck of the progressive primary head.

The uninformed and anxious public wrongly judge the primary school by its success or otherwise in the selection examination. The primary school child himself is subject to undesirable pressures from all sides and his junior school days can become a nightmare. The abolition of the eleven-plus would stop all this and completely liberalize the primary school's teaching."

No doubt the reputation of Professor Robert Peers is well known to the Hon. Minister. To continue, sir, if I may deal with one of the later points first, I should like to point out to the Hon. Minister that a change in nomenclature would have no effect in Barbados in making people believe that a secondary modern school is the same as a classical

secondary school. No one would ever make people believe that St. Leonard's has a parity of esteem with Harrison College, or the Parkinson Memorial with Queen's College. We at the Bridgetown City Council have had the same trouble before when we attempted to make people refer to the place in Beckles Road as the Infirmary, but they continued to call it the Almshouse. No other persuasion can make a Barbadian refer to a rodent exterminator otherwise than as a rat catcher. Even the hon. member on my left, no matter what signs he puts up as a mortician, would still be referred to as an undertaker; so it is not a question that a mere nomenclature would be enough to gain for these schools that parity of esteem which the Minister so earnestly desires.

I was very pleased to learn that there would be a great number of places available for children at the primary schools in the next examination for entrance.

GVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Private Members' Business having expired, the next Order of the Day under Government Business is in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

HON. E. W. BARROW RAISES MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with Government Business I want to rise on a matter of privilege. Your Honour is aware that there is nothing which indicates that a member requires leave to raise a matter of privilege. A question of privilege supersedes any other business which might be engaged in.

It has been brought to my attention that a motion was filed here today which I would respectfully submit is a gross breach of privilege of this House, and a matter which touches the prerogative of the Crown.
4.30 p.m.

I can only take it that Your Honour has not had the opportunity on ruling on something which is entirely unparliamentary and which cannot be possibly entertained by this House. It is a reflection on the vote of this House and I am calling on Your Honour as a matter of privilege to rule that it is a gross breach of privilege not only on the House itself, but it is a matter which involves constitutional issues. It is a reflection on the Royal Prerogative and the constitution which we now enjoy.

I do not think, Sir, any debate is necessary. I regard it as a motion which should be struck off the Order Paper because the power for the dissolution of the House is a matter which is exercised by the Officer administering the Government of this country and it is exercised by certain conventions and not by any vote of the House. On the advice of the Premier alone the Officer administering the Government exercises the Royal Prerogative.

In all the parliamentary annals, there is no precedent whatever for a member of a House having the effrontery to suggest to the Government or to the Crown that the Royal Prerogative should be exercised. It is something which is unsurpassed for insolence in British Parliamentary Practice, and, I think Your Honour should not entertain the particular motion to which I refer. I suggest that it should be expunged from the Order Paper.

I am not calling for a Vote of Censure on the particular member under whose name it stands, because I can only assume that his action arose from monstrous ignorance of parliamentary procedure or it may be that his legal advisers are the same people who could not draw up a simple complaint to put before a magisterial authority in this territory. It is only susceptible of explanation that the House should be affronted either through the monstrous ignorance of the hon. member or that he was inexpertly advised.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. and Learned Premier making a motion?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would say that it is a matter of privilege and it is therefore a matter for Your Honour to rule on. If you want me to make a motion, I am really not going so far. As a matter of fact, I have drawn the matter to Your Honour's attention so that future members of the House would be in a position to see how the House dealt with this matter. I am certainly suggesting, however, that the matter should not be entertained by this House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Speaking on a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I was not in the Chamber, but I understand that a motion of "No Confidence" was handed to you. It is your prerogative to take any motion. I understand that the motion sought a vote of "No Confidence" on an issue purported to be one which this House of Assembly passed a Resolution on. I do not know what subversive methods are used to circumvent the consequential course of parliamentary procedure. It is true that this is a free place and we find ourselves overloaded with ignorance in this country, so much so, that when we come to this Chamber we find this ignorance prevailing.

If someone wants to move a vote of censure, he can do so at any time, but you must adhere to the normal procedure in allowing the Government to know on what you want to move a vote of "No Confidence", so that somebody can move a substantive motion to it. The debate must have something in it which refers to the matter. If it were not so, any day a member could come in here and just say that he is introducing a motion of "No Confidence" in the Government. You put in one last week, and if that fails and you bring in another this week. Are you going to turn this Chamber in some burlesque or something relating to a circus in South America? If someone is moving a motion of a vote of censure, it should be on something which you are putting before the House. It should not be that this House has no confidence in the Government. Of course, that can be done only by some crackpot.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would just give way, the hon. member, just like myself, was not in his place when this new innovation appeared. Apparently, the hon. member who moved the motion last week has been better advised and at the same time more legally advised because the motion which was put last week has been supplanted by the following motion:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House declares that this Government no longer enjoys the confidence of the country, and accordingly calls upon the Premier to advise His Excellency the Governor to dissolve the Legislature so that a General Election can be held."

I do not see how the House can declare that this Government no longer enjoys the confidence of the country, but quite apart from that — and this is what I call downright presumption and effrontery — I do not see how this House can call upon the Premier to advise the Officer administering the Government to dissolve the whole Legislature so that a General Election can be held.

The only person who can dissolve the Legislature is the person who is in charge of the Government and that is myself, therefore, this House cannot call upon me to call upon His Excellency the Governor to exercise the Royal Prerogative. Of course, this is a matter which should be excused on the grounds of ignorance and this House should not allow itself to be held up to ridicule by posterity or members of the present generation by entertaining anything of the present kind. How can this House call upon me to advise the Officer administering the Government to dissolve the Legislature? Sir, I just wanted to point out this to the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was not in his place.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that you should be embarrassed if there is a move on foot to get Your Honour to have a motion like that debated in this House. If they want to bring a motion of "No Confidence", let them come the straight and narrow path, because I believe that a lot of people are not going to come out of it as well as they expect. I am as anxious as those who want to get a debate on these things; but when you get these crack-

pots coming into the Chamber with these things, I must say, Your Honour, that it is no reflection on you, but some of these things are more fit for the wastepaper basket than anything else.

4.40 p.m.

I am sure that Your Honour has a long Parliamentary experience. The last motion which was made last week you could only dream of having in a mock House; it is only in such a House that you could get anybody introducing a Resolution asking the House to condemn its own actions carried out in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the hon. member that no motion was introduced; there was merely an attempt at introducing the motion but it was not successful.

Mr. WALCOTT: That motion was fit for the wastepaper basket. I think that these nonsensical Resolutions which are handed to the Clerk should be destroyed because they have no meaning. I do not think that Your Honour would entertain anything which anybody writes whether it is within the propriety of this Chamber or not. How could anybody, at this stage of our history, propose a Resolution asking the House to call on the Premier to dissolve Parliament? I say that such a person is in the wrong place; he is not fit for being in here.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and ashamed at the action taken by hon. members here this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member also speaking on a matter of privilege?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, I take it that Resolutions, Bills or any other kind of Documents which are to be presented to this House are to be handed to the Clerk of the House and then to the Speaker. This debate is entirely out of order and you should deem it out of order and disallow it. I feel, Sir, that you have seen this Resolution and you have ruled on it by allowing it to be introduced on the floor of this House. I take it, therefore, to be a reflection on Your Honour's Ruling when hon. members can get up and challenge Your Honour's ruling relative to a Resolution of this sort whether it is in order or not, when in truth and in fact Your Honour is responsible for its being before this House. One hon. member has said that he does not take it as any reflection on Your Honour, but I am taking it as a reflection on Your Honour because the Resolution could not have been introduced until Your Honour had okayed it and passed it. I feel that Your Honour has done that and I do not feel happy about the way in which hon. members are challenging your ruling. It makes me feel, Sir, that you are a Mock Speaker and I hope you will rule on this matter before we get any further.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there are some hon. members of this Chamber who feel that the employees of this House — and some of the employees too, think that they are the employees of the former Government Party. I do not care when they were taken on in their jobs; the fact that they happen to be employed at a certain time and I may say that they could not have been employed at that particular time unless hon. members of this House agreed that they should be employed. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph seems to think that he has the Speaker's ear and the Speaker's eye as well. I have drawn to the attention of this House on several occasions the fact that the employees of this House are in the habit of drafting Resolutions and Questions which they feel will embarrass the Government because they do not feel happy with the Government. I am submitting, Sir, that all they have to do in that case is to resign from their posts. This Government can reduce or remove the salary of any Officer of this House if the person is not acting in the best interests of the country as a whole on the constitutional privileges which this country is enjoying. I am not now preaching "Nkrumahism," but it is a great pity that we do not have any "Nkrumahism" in this country because quite a lot of people who are now at liberty would have been in jail. I would not have Officers of this House to prepare Resolutions for their friends as has happened from the 19th December. This is a piece of mis-

chievous effrontery on the part of the Officer who prepared it; I do not care who it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have paid careful heed to the observations which have been made by the three hon. member who have spoken on this matter of privilege. I propose to consider all the points which have been raised and I will give my considered ruling — I hope — at the next meeting of this House in the light of any further research that I may deem it necessary to make in the circumstances.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I omitted to mention this. I definitely deprecate the suggestion which has been made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to the effect that anybody was reflecting on Your Honour's ruling. The impression which I got was that Your Honour did not give any ruling in this matter. I do not think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be allowed to get away with any suggestion and trying to get Your Honour's support in addition to his supporters that there was a reflection by this side of the House on some hypothetical ruling which Your Honour has given. I want to say, Sir, that the only person whom the hon. member is deluding is himself.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that I said there was a reflection on your ruling. I am a layman and I am saying that as soon as Your Honour okayed that Resolution, that was your ruling. Since it was not questioned by anyone, there has been a reflection on Your Honour's ruling. You ruled that the Resolution was in order and that it could come before this House. I do not mind what the Hon. Premier says.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, since points of order have arisen, I too will rise on a point of order. I am saying that any hon. member has the right at any time to rise and speak on a motion without any reflection whatsoever on any Speaker. That is a right which we possess.
4.50 p.m.

On any question of a motion coming before the Chamber, any member can rise and query Your Honour about that motion coming before the House. It is not a question of a ruling. If it is a question of a Resolution turning up, we have the right to speak on it. We have had some bogus rulings in the past by Speakers, but like the decisions from Judges in Courts, we have to live with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to previous Speakers?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it no hon. member would certainly think there will be any means of canvassing myself either for one way or the other. I can only be canvassed for what I deem to be right, and no attempt to canvass me would have the slightest acceptance from whatsoever source it may come. I thought that was clearly understood. If it was not, let it be from now.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, I mentioned some time before the matter of privilege was raised, is a motion in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 49

Head 8 — Communications — was called.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks the approval of this House to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part II by the sum of \$3,516.

As set out in the Addendum, a new 90 Kilowatt automatic generator plant was installed at the Airport, and this amount is required as a new switch-board had to be refitted for this new automatic generator. The amount of \$3,516 is necessary to supplement the Estimates under Head 8 Communications — Item 15 — Plant and Equipment.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 50

Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Item 5 — Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute, the sum of \$2,154 is required. The note points out that the cost per student place at the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute has increased owing to the low student intake for the 1962/64 and the 1963/65 courses. The present cost is \$3,200 per student place per annum. The provision in the 1963/64 Estimates was based on a cost of \$2,800 per student place per annum.

Under Item 11 — University of the West Indies — an amount of \$156,384 is required. The note sets out that to meet this Government's recurrent contribution to the University of the West Indies, a sum of £100,000 or \$480,000 was provided at Head 47 — Item 11, for the financial year 1963-64. It has been pointed out that the total contribution payable has since been established as £132,580 or \$636,384, and therefore supplementary provision of the difference of \$156,384 is required.

I beg to move that Head 47 — Subsidies & Grants — stand part.

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

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

Head 3 — Legislature — was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, under this Head the first amount is for refreshment, and you will see in the notes that an amount of \$500 was voted and the amount of \$140 is now needed. The note sets out that the amount of \$500 proved insufficient, due to the fact that there has been a greater number of meetings of the Council than had been anticipated when the Estimates were presented, and supplementary provision of \$140 is required to meet expenses to the end of the financial year.

The next amount, Sir, is for the sum of \$82 under Travelling for Ministers. The addendum points out that in June last year, it became necessary to appoint an additional Minister without Portfolio for a short period from 20th June to 31st July, and this appointment incurred additional expenditure of an amount of \$82 for the payment to this Minister's travelling allowance. This Item, Sir, in the Resolution is to provide the supplementary provision for this sum under this Head.

I beg to move that Head 3 — Legislature, stand part.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if the Minister would give me a breakdown of this \$82. It sounds slight, but I would like to know if this Minister was acting

for a Minister who was not doing the same duty at the same time; and I would like to know what became of the travelling for that Minister. I should like to know what was done for this \$82 by this particular Minister, and what happened to the other Minister, because if you appointed a man to act in the job, it means that the holder of the job was not doing it at the same time, and the same money should go to reimburse the new man. You already have a block vote of \$7,200 for travelling expenses, and I would like to know what travelling the Minister without Portfolio had to do, because I know it would not be from his home to the job or from the job back to his home; it would be travelling to places from the time he arrived on his job.

5.00 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not answering for the Minister or the Government, but you could not believe that you would hear such things. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is what I would regard as a classic time-waster in this House. He has been in the House for a long time and the Party to which he belongs has exalted him to the position of Vice-Chairman. You had better ask the question: what has the Chairman of Committees to do different from the Speaker? The Chairman of Committees sits in the same House, but he gets different emoluments. When you hear the Vice-Chairman of a Party, which once had power in this House, who has fallen in love with his position and with his voice, get up and say that he wants to know what travelling the Minister without Portfolio has to do and he is the hon. member who introduced a vote of "No Confidence" in this Assembly, you must wonder. You get this sort of classic behaviour. How can you describe a parliamentarian who does that in words that are really fitting? Do you think that this is a place for the hon. member to come and ask what travelling the Minister Without Portfolio has to do when the hon. member himself has been a party to the Resolution and the vote giving the Minister without Portfolio travelling allowance? He is today asking what travelling allowance the Minister Without Portfolio has to do.

Sir, I rose, not to reply to the hon. member, but to demonstrate the ignorance which we have in this Chamber because his question shows complete ignorance and it shows where ignorance can be displayed in an Assembly like this when an hon. member is asking about something which he has done. Arithmetic is a difficult thing to teach even in a class-room. Because someone acts for another, it does not mean that the other person loses what they are entitled to.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is asking the Hon. Minister a question like this because Ministers give the feeling that these are the sort of Resolutions on which you can ask any question. This is only a classic example of the products which we are getting now in the House of Assembly. The hon. member is aspiring to be a Minister. This would be a classic example of what Barbados would be coming to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is quite true that on the discussion of a money Resolution a certain amount of latitude is given to hon. members to ask questions which do not have anything to do with the matter under discussion, but this does not involve asking stupid questions. I told the hon. junior member for St. Joseph last week that apparently he likes to hear his own voice with which he is in love, but he should not detain the House on matters because of that.

This sum is part of the emoluments of the Ministers and, therefore, if one Minister is absent and he appoints a *locum tenens*, the Minister is entitled to draw his emoluments. The inclusion of travelling emoluments to the Minister Without Portfolio was accomplished by the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs and, therefore, it is stupid for him to come in here and raise the question when he was a party to it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Minister does not want to answer the question, I cannot make him, but it is my right to ask any question inside here. I am a representative of the people and I have been elected to this Assembly in the same way as anybody else.

If a Resolution comes in here asking me to give approval to the vote of \$82 for travelling, I take it, that travelling means your getting in a motor car and your driving somewhere to do something. The Hon. Minister says now that it is part of the emoluments of the Minister Without Portfolio, but I read here in this Resolution that it is travelling for Ministers. It is just the same as giving travelling allowance to Civil Servants and they have to give an account for every mile which is travelled by them. They have to set out that they travel from here to yonder to do so-and-so. That is how I understand it. It is my right to ask questions. If you are giving Ministers other moneys, that is your business. What it is that the Minister Without Portfolio had to do at that time? I am not replying to any hon. member yet. My time for that will come shortly. I am not out for any fight. I am not in a fighting mood because my voice is scarcely audible.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am ready. I am hoarse, but I am ready. This is another example to show that the hon. member does not know that travelling allowance to Ministers is commuted allowance.

All these are only examples. What fighting mood can the hon. member be in? The hon. member was in here as long as Ministerial Government was introduced and that was introduced on the 1st January, 1954, which is ten years now. When travelling allowance was introduced for Ministers, there was a very long debate on this question, and during the debate it was stated that it would be an indignity to a Minister to come in with a statement declaring that he went here and went there so as to obtain travelling allowance. Every hon. member has a right to speak and every hon. member has a right to make a fool of himself.

Mr. SMITH: And every member has a right to be a vagabond also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. junior member for St. Joseph want that for the record?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Up to now, people in Barbados vote for people who has not the slightest idea of parliamentary procedure and how the country is run and how things are discussed in here. They believe that all you have to do in the House of Assembly, is to get up, whether your voice is right or not, and shout abuse. It does not matter how crooked you are in public life or what your regard to voting is.

5.10 p.m.

Right next door to the hon. member is the hon. junior member for St. George. He spent three months in the United States of America in studying Hospital Administration; not pasteurisation or anything like that, but Hospital Administration. During the whole of that period the hon. member drew the full subsistence allowance and travelling allowance, and I will say that he was entitled to that. However, Sir, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had only appealed to the hon. member on his right, the hon. junior member for St. George, he would have been put right. The hon. member was able to draw the full Ministerial salary along with travelling allowance.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, at no time of my life did I spend three months in the United States of America. I did spend some time in that country from time to time but, collectively, I do not think it was any period of twelve weeks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member had leave of absence and he drew his subsistence allowance, travelling allowance and hotel bills; whether he spent it all in the United States of America or whether he went to Chicago or otherwise, I do not know. I do not know if the hon. member spent it all in Hospital Administration. I can check the record and bring it back for the hon. member. I concede to the hon. member that it was only a period of twelve weeks; I was speaking in round figures.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If my business required me to stay for three months I would have

to stay, but I did not say that I was in the United States of America for three months. Before I was a member of this Parliament I had to go to the United States of America and I went there on business. But if it were necessary for me to spend four by three months in the United States of America in the interest of the country, I would have to spend it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is only disputing the length of time. My recollection is that the hon. member asked for three months' leave of absence. He could tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that for the whole of that period he was entitled to and did get his salary and travelling allowance. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, this is an amount of \$80.00 a month for general travelling. Ministers have to travel all over the place. In Trinidad the equivalent figure is \$360 and the Ministers have drivers and motor cycle escorts since one of the Ministers met with an accident; and in Jamaica it is the same thing. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is suggesting that if a Minister is out of the island he should not draw his travelling allowance; and if you were to follow the hon. member to the logical conclusion, he is saying that when a Minister goes out of the island he should not draw his salary. That is pure, unadulterated nonsense. I do not blame the hon. senior member for St. Philip, because he has answered the hon. member's question. I must say that it is absolutely inconceivable for a person to spend ten years in here, to survive the exposure of all the debates on the Estimates dealing with travelling and all of that has floated over his head and he is completely innocent of any Parliamentary Procedure. In that case, Sir, I have to exculpate him.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you would not believe that the same hon. member drew money from this Parliament when he was in the United Kingdom and was not doing a stroke of work; and when he came back here he and his parliamentary colleague fell out because the latter spoke of table manners. (A MEMBER: Whom are you speaking of?) Not the hon. junior member for St. George, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. His colleague, the then hon. senior member for St. Michael, did not speak to him for six months. The erstwhile senior member for St. Michael did not speak to the hon. member because he came into the hotel and heard this clapping "Food! Food!" This hon. member was having this treatment meted out to him but he was still drawing his stipend from the House of Assembly. Now the hon. member wants to make somebody believe that somebody is going along with a commuted travelling allowance for somebody who is not a Minister.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend saying anything on this Resolution but I feel that hon. members should have read Note 2 or take it as read. Note 2 says this:

"It became necessary in June last year to appoint an additional Minister without Portfolio....."

This is not a Minister who is on leave or on holiday, but he is an additional Minister; and the Note goes on to read:

"..... from the 20th June, to 31st July. This appointment incurred the additional expenditure of an amount of \$82.00 for the payment of this Minister's travelling allowance."

If hon. members had read that Note it would have prevented this House from losing time and retarding its progress. Let us read the Note. It says this:

"It became necessary in June last year, to appoint an additional Minister without Portfolio from the 20th June to 31st July. This appointment incurred the additional expenditure of an amount of \$82 for the payment of this Minister's travelling allowance. Supplementary provision of the amount is accordingly required."

If that Note had been read, it would have cleared up all of this argument and the Committees would have got along with this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not see eye to eye with the hon. junior member for St. George. I have always said that the hon. member was entitled to go to the United States of America for as long as he likes. As limited as his knowledge would have been, I am quite sure that the hon. member would have been able to enlighten the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on this point. But the hon. junior member for St. Michael has brought out a very good point. The Minister without Portfolio was conducting talks with the Attorney General in the United Kingdom; therefore, there was no question of appointing a substitute; a Minister had to be appointed.

5.20 p.m.

We do not appoint a backbencher because a Minister has gone to England or the United States, but in the Other Place the only person to carry on Government Business is the Minister without Portfolio; so that an additional Minister had to be appointed, and I must thank the hon. member for St. Michael for clarifying that point. I should like the hon. junior member for St. George to know that I was not attacking him on this particular issue, because I will have a lot to attack him on but surely he should be able to tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph not to make a fool of himself.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Premier can talk as much as he likes. If I make a fool of myself, it is of myself. There are others who make fools of themselves. I wanted to know the duties of this Minister without Portfolio, because I have never heard that you appoint two Ministers without Portfolio. If the Minister went away for two weeks, anyone else in that Council could have conducted the affairs of this country until he came back. The Civil Servants who are getting travelling allowance do not get it that way. He cannot draw travelling if he is out of the Island; so if the Minister is out of the Island he is already provided with a maintenance allowance, hotel allowance and so on, and the travelling should remain here to pay his *locum tenens*. A man that does not travel and draws a travelling allowance is not honest, because he is drawing for something he has not done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member, Sir, can demonstrate his absolute incapacity to understand what was told him, but when he is going so far as to accuse a Minister of dishonesty in these circumstances, he certainly should be asked to withdraw the allegation because it is confounded stupidity not to be able to appreciate the principle we are trying to establish. To go further because he cannot understand what we are saying and say that somebody is dishonest is offensive.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I am not saying that anybody is dishonest. I asked if a man drew for travelling and has not travelled, what you would call that. If I went to the Treasury and drew for 20 miles travelling when I have not done that amount, what would you call that?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not understand that a Minister does not draw travelling in that manner. He gets a salary and a certain fixed amount of money monthly for travelling as part of his emoluments. You do not go to the Treasury and say "I have done ten miles going to Coffee Gully and ten miles to Blackmans, making 20 miles, pay me for it." If the hon. member would try to understand, therefore, what we are saying, he would not make such an exhibition of himself.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if a Minister is drawing \$6.00 a month for travelling and he is out of the country for two weeks, he should only draw travelling for two weeks.

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. George was a Minister for a number of years, and I want to ask him whether during his absence from the country he did not draw the amount of travelling to which he was entitled.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak and I should like to say that the Minister cannot ask the hon.

junior member for St. George a question across the House. He can only argue the question.

As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, this is a classic example in which it is difficult to explain arithmetic in a classroom and more difficult to do it on a public platform or even in a Legislature. You heard another example in which he does not know the meaning of the word "commute" because this allowance is a commuted allowance. It is not an allowance on a mileage basis; this is not for anybody carrying out a dung-basket; this is for a Minister whose salary and travelling allowance are commuted, and whenever you appoint a Minister that allowance takes place. Wego so far in this Island that even when the Legislature dies, there is an Act of Parliament which states that the Ministers and the Speaker shall still draw their salaries and allowance; so if we send the Speaker now to a Parliamentary Conference, he is entitled to all the allowances that are commuted. The Minister of Agriculture went to Malaysia, and although he was not travelling in Barbados during the period he still drew his commuted allowance when he came back here. The hon. member would have some ground if a Minister came here and said he had travelled too much last month or last year, and instead of the amount being \$960, he is asking the Legislature to vote \$1,000. Under our laws, it is a commuted allowance. But the hon. member for the sake of having a debate seems to think that his opinion is going to upset Parliament. He is just like the old lady who felt that everybody else was out of step except her son. Everybody in this House is wrong except the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman, a travelling allowance which is a commuted allowance for a Minister is part of his emoluments, because he gets it irrespective of whether he travels a day or a night, and this was introduced in this Chamber by the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs, and when it was being debated, some of us in this Chamber felt that the Minister Without Portfolio should not get the same travelling allowance as the other Ministers, but whatever was agreed upon was agreed on the basis of its being commuted. What he is doing now is part of the image they want to create outside the Chamber; but what they can do on a public platform, they cannot do in here, because on a public platform there is no one there to reply and they believe that they are speaking to a gullible public. They want to sell to the public that they are so much running this machine that they are making these misrepresentations to the public on every national issue, because that is the sort of speech the hon. member would like to make in Coffee Gully to create the image that a Minister is drawing money out of the Treasury for travelling when he is not doing travelling, forgetting who has travelled out of this country more than the Premier. Who has travelled out of this country more than the Ministers of the last Government? Some of them went to Ghana and all about. Go and look in the Treasury and see whether any of the Ministers gave up the travelling allowance to which they were entitled. There were West Indian Conferences to which the Ministers went, and they were given travelling when they went to England or were abroad; and remember, a Minister of the Government gets a better allowance than any other travelling officer because he is a Minister. Why raise this question now when this has been going on for ten years. You had better say that when a member of the House leaves the Island his emoluments should stop; but could we agree with that?

5.30 p.m.

The hon. member must tell his colleague to keep that kind of talk of a Minister drawing travelling allowance when he is out of the Island for the platform. That is trying to build up in the minds of people something which is dishonest. When they come in here in full blast with their equals and they come with any of this misrepresentation, we deal with them. That is why we have to deal with them, and the hon. member should be handed over to the Law Courts for this type of misrepresentation to which he has become so accustomed. He is so accustomed to it that it has become part and parcel not only of ignorance, but part and parcel of wickedness.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was reluctant for a number of reasons to speak on this matter. There are a

lot of things which have come out in this debate which, I think, should not have reached this House at all. What have you read? "It became necessary in June last year, to appoint an additional Minister Without Portfolio from the 20th June to 31st July."

I should like the Hon. Minister to explain this. It is specifically stated how many Ministers you should have.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked me a question. I do not blame the hon. member, because I had to point this out to the Secretary of State when they were talking about the number of Ministers. If the hon. junior member for St. George would read the despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies of the 15th May, 1951, he would see that the constitution of Barbados was that you should have not less than seven Ministers. I would ask him the same thing. His Government having established that this Government should have not less than seven Ministers, are we crazy that we should call upon the House to curtail the number of Ministers? You will hear the howls of protest if we had said that we are whittling down because we have established that we should have not less than seven Ministers.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Minister has failed to answer the question.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The answer is that the constitution of Barbados does not say how many Ministers you should have, but it says that you should have not less than a certain number. It does state the minimum which you should have. That is the constitution which the hon. member's Government has negotiated and I am not quarrelling with it.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, we will have all this talk and how the Premier runs to the Secretary of State, how he runs to Mr. Maudling and all around for money.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow the hon. member to get up and cast aspersions against this Government. The hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for the City were present when I had to appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Now the hon. junior member for St. George gets up and say that I was running down Mr. Maudling for money and I did not get it then.

The Secretary of State could not tell me about money. We go to the London Money Market when it suits us. About three or four months later we went to the London Money Market, as the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for the City will tell you, and raised \$6 million in 1 3/4 minutes, which is a record for a Colonial Government. I have not been back there since nor have I asked anybody in London for any money. It is not because we do not need money, but because we do not want to incur any debt charges on this country. For the hon. junior member for St. George to get there and say that I had to ask Mr. Maudling for money is pure, undiluted nonsense.

Mr. MILLER: The procedure is that if you have a Minister without Portfolio without emoluments paid to him, you should come to Parliament and ask for the money. That is according to our constitution. We are now asked to pay a travelling allowance to the acting Minister without Portfolio. The only thing which this House can do is to refuse to vote for this unless the Hon. Premier can tell you the agreement of Parliament to this. You know of all the emoluments which you can get. We understand everything of what happens in England. We are told of your getting \$7 million from America in four days and that we will have all of this swarming Barbados. All of these things we were told. I do not want to discuss these things in Parliament. I do not want to waste the time of the House, but if you start it, I am going to talk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. member. I do not see anywhere in this Resolution anything about sums of money. We are discussing the payment of Travelling Allowance to the additional Minister without Portfolio.

206

Mr. MILLER: No Minister can tell you that he is bringing a Resolution to pay somebody a Travelling Allowance eight months after he and his Cabinet has appointed the person. There is no reason for this. I would like to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter on this. He has been missing from the public platforms and is taking cover in Parliament to blow off his speeches.

This vote for \$82 should not be taken and Government in its right senses should not permit a vote to be taken on this. The House was never informed that the Premier was going to appoint another Minister Without Portfolio for one day. I have not yet seen one Resolution to pay this additional Minister. You know that you cannot permit this Legislature after all this and you are talking and running to the Secretary of State. You are asking the taxpayers of this country for the sum of \$82, miserly as it is, but there is no Resolution about your appointing an additional Minister Without Portfolio. You must come to Parliament to get agreement to appoint a new Minister, and you must come with a Resolution to pay the new Minister and then you can come and tell us that you want travelling allowance. You cannot permit the Treasury to pay out anything on any Cabinet decision. We have not got to the stage of a Castro Government. I believe that the people's representatives should be told, at least, that we needed an additional Minister Without Portfolio and that his salary should be X and travelling allowance should be X. We are told for the first time, today. I want to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter on this. 5.40 p.m.

What are we coming to? Listen to how this Note reads: It says: "It became necessary....." What became necessary? "...To appoint an additional Minister Without Portfolio from the 20th June, to 31st July. This appointment incurred the additional expenditure of an amount of \$82 for the payment of this Minister's travelling allowance. Supplementary provision of the amount is accordingly required."

We were not told that we needed an additional Minister without Portfolio. I would be surprised and I would bow in shame and would withdraw everything that I have said in here if the Hon. Premier could tell me that Resolution was debated in this House to provide for the appointment of this additional Minister without Portfolio. If that is not so, then you cannot vote this money. I want to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter on this matter. You may as well blow and talk all you can here and now; you can talk fifty-two times now because the Election is around the corner and you will not be back in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Election anything to do with this matter of Travelling Allowance?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. It will bring about that on the ground of the Election.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the hon. member that he cannot emulate my performance on a platform. He will not be able to emulate that. He has only had to hear me to know how much he can appeal to the public and how much I can. He only has to hear me to know that, and that is why he is asking to hear me now. I would not ask to hear him. With all the damage which the hon. member and his cohorts think they are doing to prevent people from getting on the platform, I say that the time is beginning to swing against them and they are trying to get through these back-door Resolutions. They can ask the people to march in Victory; just as you want to steal victory from something you know nothing about, now you want to steal kudos from something which you know nothing about.

Mr. Chairman, what is the constitutional position in this country? No Premier has to say to Parliament that he wants an additional Minister, or no Premier has to come to Parliament for a vote in order to appoint a Minister. Did we vote in the first instance for the appointment of a Minister of Education when it was decided to have a Minister of Education?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: The man was appointed as Minister of Education without any approval of Parliament (Mr. MILLER: You came for the money for the furniture.) The appointment of a Minister does not require the approval of Parliament although you have to come for the money. You know, Sir, that some people went to Combermere School and they came out at the Third Form. There are those who went to a Secondary School, but how far did they go? I want to say, Sir, that there is no prize attached to buying a crest because you can always put it on your jacket. It is not what is on your jacket; it is what is in your head. (Laughter). You do not need any Resolution from the House in order to appoint a Minister. Under our constitution the Minister of Finance is the Premier. Tomorrow, if I were the Premier, I would say that I want to appoint a Minister of Finance, because we have already been given approval for that under our constitution. We can have as many Ministers as we like; any Government can come in here with eight, nine or ten Ministers; there is nothing to prevent the Government from doing that.

You do not have to pass any Resolution for the purpose of having a Minister of Finance; the hon. junior member for St. George is getting mixed up with this. When the Premier appointed a Minister and that Minister leaves the colony, he had the authority to appoint another Minister. What the Government is doing now they could not do otherwise; they could not pay this money out of the Treasury; they could not pay out this \$82.00 until they came here for authority to pay it out. What they are required by law to do they are now doing, but they were not required to come to this Parliament in order to appoint a Minister without Portfolio. To carry out the removal or the rejection of a Minister is just like what obtains in the United Kingdom. There is no law for the appointment of a Minister; the provision for such an appointment is in the constitution.

I may say that every Minister in the United Kingdom is not a Cabinet Minister; but the hon. junior member for St. George is saying that, because a Minister was appointed to act as Minister without Portfolio, that is a matter which should have come before this Parliament. The hon. member is like some of those who have not got any originality. The hon. member brought in the question about the Election and when he speaks about the Election and about my talking here because he feels that I will not be coming back here, well, Sir, I will just laugh at that. 5.50 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. George feels he can come back in collaboration, but outside this Chamber the same member not too long ago was exhorting me to come and join his Party because one of the culprits had gone. It is true you never said the word "culprits", but I am saying that what you referred to was a culprit, because in the dining room you said you had got rid of Cox in the presence of my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and you asked me to come back in. Now you have the brass to say you did not say it. Those are the sort of things you get, and I know that you said on another issue that you would not have given the people a cent; you would have kept all and invested it in something. I do not have to lie on you; but now you have the brass to come here and say to someone that he is making his last speech because he will not be able to get back in here. If you with your record, public and private, have the right to get up in public and think you can get a seat in the House of Assembly, with my record I should get ten. I am an angel as compared with you, privately and publicly.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, I have always heard and I am persuaded to believe that the road to hell was paved with the best of intentions. There is nothing wrong in calling yourself an angel, but I would be very hesitant to say I am an angel because I am indeed very far from that. If the question of saying that we had better make speeches now because we are not likely to come back has prejudiced this affair and infuriated the temper of my friend, he is at liberty to say what he likes; but certainly when that statement was made, I did not have any feelings in mind like the dragon throwing the fire. You can imagine what has been

happening in his mind when I said we would not be coming back. It is not a question of whether you are a prince or a pauper, an angel or a devil. I dare the hon. member to say anything about my life, because I know nothing of his. I am free at election time to say some untruths, and at least that is permissible, and since there is nothing he can say about me or anything I can say about him, maybe he is worried of what will happen at election. I did not think it would have exploded like a bomb. It is possible that I may not be coming back and we would both be holding hands on the outside and old-talking like before.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I never challenged the hon. member as to whether he is going to come back. The question of election started with him; so if election is on anybody's mind, it is on his mind because he is the person who raised it. I only replied to the same point he raised. Unfortunately for me when these gibes are made at me some people laugh, but when my turn comes they never take them the same way.

It is not the function of Parliament under our present constitutional arrangements to appoint Ministers. The appointment of Ministers, Mr. Chairman, is for the Premier himself to do under our present constitution, and therefore if he appoints a member to act as a Minister without Portfolio, he is acting in accordance with constitutional propriety in so doing, and coming here with a vote to pay for any expenses incurred in such an appointment is in order.

Mr. MILLER rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will only listen to matters pertaining to travelling.

Mr. MILLER: You are asking, Mr. Chairman, for \$82 to pay travelling for an additional Minister without Portfolio. We must therefore assume that the time will come for a Resolution to pay his emoluments. There is no indication, and unless I am told that there was a Resolution passed some time ago in this House to pay this money, no matter how you look at this, it is improper. Why not bring a Resolution asking for a salary or for emoluments? That is what I said in the beginning.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that was not the point the hon. member raised. He raised a matter of principle that the member should not be appointed as Minister until a Resolution was passed in this House approving of this appointment. He asked me to speak on that and I spoke on it. I am no constitutional lawyer, but I have been in the House long enough to know the constitution of Barbados, and I know that it does not require a Resolution from this House to appoint a Minister in this Island; but when a Minister has been appointed you can come at any time to pay him and there is no affront to the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. HUSBANDS rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, if I had got your attention earlier, you would have heard me say the same very thing that the hon. junior member for St. George finally did say. I do not want any explanation of the constitution of Barbados, because I do not think that is presently before us; but what I should like to have explained to me by the Hon. Premier who is Minister of Finance is that seeing that for the period of about forty-two days an additional Minister without Portfolio had to be appointed and was functioning and as a result of that this House is asked to pay \$82 as incidental travelling for that Minister, how is it that we have not been asked to pay any salary for that same period? I was expecting that we would be asked to pay not only the \$82 incidental to his travelling, but also some remuneration for the work performed during the time this individual acted as Minister without Portfolio, and I would ask the Hon. Premier to make that explanation. While it is true that a Resolution may come sometime after now for money to pay the salary of this Minister, it looks to me rather unusual just to be asking for \$82 to pay travelling for 42 days without knowing what his remuneration would be or

not being asked to pay it, because unless some other Minister acted for the Minister without Portfolio when he happened to be absent from the Island, — and I do not think a Resolution would come on those terms — I do not think we would then read that a Minister had to be appointed. It seems as if an additional Minister was appointed and was functioning as such, and therefore a Resolution for \$82 looks to me just a meagre amount. I do not know if the actual man worked for nothing; that also may be true, and the Premier may be able to say so, but at any rate let him say so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. junior member for St. George has confessed that he had nothing on what the hon. member chooses to call his mind, perhaps we can get on to the real issues of this debate. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has stated that he also has something on what he chose to call his mind in the question of the appointment of the Minister without Portfolio. 6.00 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has explained the constitutional position on this matter. I do not have to come to this House to ask the House for permission to have an additional Minister or a particular Minister because to give an illustration of what can take place, some hon. members may not approve of a particular Minister. As I stated, in a despatch from the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in May 1951, all that was stated was that Barbados should have not less than seven Ministers. Note the words "not less than". In other words, we would be breaking the law if we did not have seven Ministers, but we can have so many Ministers as we choose to have. As I have said, this House can only be dissolved by the Officer administering the Government with approval of the Premier. This is nothing to do with Castro of Cuba; this is the constitution of Barbados. If you do not like the constitution of Barbados, introduce a Resolution to change it. It is the constitution of Barbados and as long as it is the constitution of Barbados, I am going to exercise my prerogative. I know my constitutional position in this Island and, very often, when I should exercise it, I do not exercise it.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter has explained quite rightly that the decision was a decision of the Ministers. Ministers' salaries are fixed by law, and if they are fixed by law there is no one who can change that unless you go and alter the law.

On page 47 of the Estimates of 1963-64, you will see that the emoluments of Minister are fixed by law. You will find under "Legislature", on page five of the Estimates, Item 16, Premier, \$12,000; Item 17, six Ministers, \$51,840. You will see that the emoluments are fixed by law. You will see on the next page that the total of \$7,200 is in the column "to be voted", for travelling for Ministers. That amount has to be voted. As long as we do not exceed the total amount of emoluments which is fixed by law, I can decide to have, let us say, 14 ministers, and cut their salaries in half, because this is a matter peculiarly within my prerogative. Dare anybody on this side of the House to tell me that I have too many Ministers? I know that the Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot interfere; but if I decided to chop all of the Ministers' salaries in half and pass about the work of them to other persons so as to please everybody, that is within my prerogative. Some people feel that you cannot say that because there are 24 members you can divide the salaries in 24 so that everybody will have a piece. All the House has to be concerned about is if the vote is exceeded.

Under page six, you will see the sum of \$7,200 was voted for travelling for Ministers; so if this was increased, we would have to come back to the House. That is an amount which is laid down and until we exceed that amount, there is no need to come back. I doubt very much that the vote for Ministers on page five will be exceeded, but I do not know how much money there is left under the vote. In June last year, half of that amount was not spent under Ministerial hospitality and there was no need to come about that. It may be necessary or it may not be necessary because I have not examined it, though a supplementary may be necessary. At that time, we were advised that it was un-

25/
2069

01

necessary. The next time hon. members on that side will tell you that I have to submit the names of Ministers before I appoint them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, why should all this extraneous matter be brought to bear on this matter? What has been explained lastly by the Hon. Premier is actually the correct thing. To change the salaries, you would have to bring in an Act because anything fixed by law means that it has been fixed by an Act of the Legislature. The Hon. Premier is quite right when he said that you must come for a matter which is not fixed by law and get it voted. On page five, the sum of \$51,840 is fixed by law for the payment of emoluments to Ministers. It is not a matter for us to say the number of Ministers because there is no limit, the constitution says "not less than seven"; if it were a question of "not more than", I would have taken the stand which the hon. junior member for St. George took. This must have convinced the hon. member. He knows that a matter fixed by law can only be changed by law; therefore, it is not beside the point; it is the point.
6.10 p.m.

If you have this \$51,000 here and this money is being overspent, then that will have to be stopped. We have not got to be told right now who is the Minister and what the number of Ministers is; it is a question of voting this amount which is a very small amount. If this amount works out to what Ministers are paid, then I do not think we should make so much fuss about this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should be satisfied beyond the shadow of doubt. This white-washed speech which was made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter should be put in its right perspective. The question about the appointment of a Minister under our Constitution is an automatic requirement in the Legislature, insofar as the Ministers' salaries have already been stipulated. What is not stipulated is the number of Ministers which you should have. All of this has already been given in our constitution. When you appoint a Minister, that is an automatic expenditure which you have incurred. (Asides) All you have to do is to pass a substantive motion to the effect that you do not want to have any more Ministers. Anybody can say that it is not necessary to have an additional Minister of Finance. There is no question of the Hon. member saying... (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member cannot address you now; he just cannot keep above a joke. Well, Sir, I am talking above a joke. We are now talking about the constitutional position.

Tomorrow if the Hon. Premier were to say that there shall be a Minister of Finance, that Minister can be appointed; and if any Minister is appointed, we have automatically to provide the amount of money to pay his salary. The hon. junior member for St. George is saying that a Resolution for that purpose must follow. I must say that this was not the appointment of an additional Minister really; this was a question of a temporary appointment having been made. The hon. member must bear that in mind. A temporary appointment in so far as the vote is concerned is only a matter of the stage at which you would require a vote; but the hon. junior member for St. George has raised the point about the constitutional position as to appointing a Minister without getting the approval of the House. I say that that is all nonsense because you do not need to do that. You can appoint a Minister today and come for the Minister's salary next week. If there is an automatic position under our constitution that you can appoint as many Ministers as you care to appoint, the next Minister's salary would be fixed by law. They did not have to vote any money when they appointed the Minister of Education in the last Government of which the hon. junior member for St. George was a member; they put the money in the Estimates and we could not say anything about it at all. We felt that there was the need for a Minister of Education independently; but they felt that God was at the right hand of the then Premier and he felt that he could be a Minister of Education and a Premier too.

When they appointed a Minister of Education, did they pass a Resolution appointing that Minister of Education? Nobody said that they were appointing Mr. Thorne as Min-

ister of Education. When Mr. Thorne was elected here as a representative for the parish of St. John he was not elected as Minister of Education; he became Minister of Education after he had been elected in here. The matter was placed in the Estimates, and the person who was appointed came in here and he was congratulated on his appointment as Minister of Education.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the position is that if you have seven Ministers, you appoint them; you need money to pay them and you bring down a Resolution for the money which is needed by law. If you want eight Ministers, if you want as many as those, you must come down with a Resolution to pay these Ministers. If it is a question of Travelling Allowance, if you are asking to add this \$82.00 for the payment of Travelling Allowance along with the Resolution for the payment of the Minister's salary, you can say that you have a vote; but when that money was put in the Estimates you had seven Ministers. Mr. Chairman, the position is now that they want money for the purpose of paying the eighth Minister and do not tell me that you have put money in the vote to provide for eight Ministers.

It is true that you may have eight Ministers and two of them may be local preachers; but I am asking why should they come down with a Resolution for this \$82.00, as has been set out here, when they are not asking the Legislature to pass a Resolution to provide for this Minister's emoluments? I do not think, Sir, that you can appoint a Minister without having the approval of Parliament. As I say, Sir, if you were to require eight Ministers you must come here with a Resolution for the authority to pay these people; you must pass a Resolution in this House to provide for their emoluments.
6.20 p.m.

How can you get out of this? You can argue until the cows come home, or you can argue until election begins; I know some of us will not be coming back here, but you will have to come back for money to pay his salary. You came down in the Estimates thinking in terms of six Ministers in the House and one Minister without Portfolio, and now you are coming with an additional Minister for one month. On behalf of our Party we must vote against it, and we would like to press this division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely incredible. Here it was the House was accusing the hon. junior member for St. Joseph of massive ignorance on things Parliamentary. I invoked the assistance of the hon. junior member for St. George, and I suggested to the hon. member that on a limited matter he could appeal to the hon. junior member for St. George; but here it is the hon. junior member for St. George is making the same kind of exhibition of himself that we deplored so sadly at an early stage of today's proceedings. He has been a Minister of Government, and it is absolutely fantastic that he does not understand the constitution of Barbados. The question of Ministers' salaries are fixed by law like a lot of other things. The hon. member says that we can wait until the cows come home; we will have to come back here; but if he looks at the Appropriation Bill, he will see that you do not vote anything in the Estimates. What we vote here is an Appropriation Bill of supplies to the Government of the country, and in that Appropriation Bill you do not find a single Civil Servant's salary or Ministers' salaries, because they are fixed by law.

Mr. Chairman, I have the same Head here in front of me in the Appropriation Act of 1963-11. I quoted today from the Approved Estimates of 1963-64 which is on page 5 and on page 6. Contrast this to page 5, Items 16 and 17, Premier and Ministers. The total amount was fixed by law.

I do not think the Chair should wait on members to call for order. I think it is the duty of the Chair to call for order. Anyhow, that is an expression of opinion and not intended as any reflection on the Chair.

When we come to the question of travelling, you will see that \$7,200 were voted for travelling in the same way that Reporting \$21,000 and Payment of Substitutes \$1,000 were. Payment of substitutes \$1,000 under Item 23 is a

16
2064
2070

classic example, and it comes right after "Reporting" \$21,000. If you turn to the Appropriation Bill you do not vote Estimates, Estimates are presented and after the Estimates are presented and discussed, you then have an Appropriation Bill which is brought down to the House before 31st March, and those are the appropriations in aid to run the country for the ensuing financial year. You will find that the items and the salaries for the Chaplain, Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Librarian, Marshal, Speaker, Deputy Speaker, fourteen members, Leader of the Opposition, Deputy Marshal and all the way down the list until you come to the salaries of the Reporters are fixed by law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If hon. members are not interested in the debate, I think they can leave.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, when people are trying to straighten things out which members do not understand, they do not listen. They do not want to learn anything. They were all born yesterday with the same sense, and every day is the beginning of creation as far as they are concerned, and that is why they never learn enough. You get this kind of display after seventeen years, and when people politely try to explain something for their edification and personal benefit and enlightenment, you get this kind of cross talk. As you said, if they do not want to hear, let them go outside.

You will see that in the Appropriation Bill, you will not find a single salary. Not even the salaries of members were passed in the Appropriation Bill, because they have already been fixed by separate laws of the Legislature; therefore if those are fixed by separate laws of the Legislature, and if the constitution of Barbados says that there must be not less than six Ministers, how can you then say we must come back and ask the Legislature to pass money? We would be reflecting on something that is the Statute Law of the land. I happen to know we will not come for any, and I was a bit surprised myself that we had to come for travelling, but it was pointed out that the column this came under in the Estimates was not that fixed by law; but the Auditor General would not pay out any money unless he was satisfied.

We have provision for amending the Standing Orders to appoint a Public Accounts Committee, and therefore if you think something is done which should not be done, the Public Accounts Committee will be there now. Your Government never attempted to bring in a Public Accounts Committee where every public servant and every Head of Department would be accountable during his term of office. We can afford to do that; so let us hear less of this kind of sensational talk, this testifying and this business of political evangelism at this late hour. The time for evangelism has gone and will never come again.

Mr. MILLER: I would say finally, Sir, that listening to the remarks of the Hon. Premier, what is unusual is the lack of dash or the ring of sincerity in the things that come from his mouth, and he is now calling on the member for St. Peter and the member for St. Joseph. We are accustomed to his kind of fire and flash, and there is a lack of fire falling out of this sawdust Caesar. What is going to be the history of this country?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this anything to do with the debate?

Mr. MILLER: Caesar was ambitious, but Brutus was an honourable man. The taxpayers were exposed to the most lukewarm and lackadaisical talk today, and it is not like the Premier we know. We know the retreat is on; we are not on the warpath at the moment nor even beating drums, but we can still talk about this money; and though there is no provision made for it, we hear all this low talk and all these cruel things said, and our Premier who a couple of years ago would walk across the floor with a piece of iron seems to have lost.....

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

Mr. MILLER: I would not do otherwise, Mr. Chairman. You know of my undying and unswerving respect for the Chair, and I would do nothing to hurt you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. junior member for St. George to refrain from hurting me by sitting down.

Mr. MILLER: No, Sir, There are too many people when you think of the 14,000 in St. John. You know that those in St. Thomas made a mistake and are anxious to rectify it, and are prevailing on us to see that the Government brings about an election.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member with that kind of talk wants to reduce this debate to that level, I can enter into it also and say that he can only do what he is doing to you. If I were in the Chair, it would not be a matter of naming him, because what the hon. member is playing for, all of us can play for. If he comes here talking about an election coming off, he is going to be the first to run. He has always been a coward — a born coward — and came into politics when it looked easy. When the struggle was going on, where was he? Now he can talk about somebody having gone and is bamboozling the Chair.
6.30 p.m.

You have always been a coward and one of those cowards who have to look to somebody for help. You are telling somebody about being a coward in St. Thomas. Where have you been in this country evangelising to reach somewhere? People have been evangelising for you. There are people like you without any conscience. You are making fun at the Chairman because he is a young Chairman and does not know how to deal with you. You are playing a game in here which you cannot play outside. You are holding up the debate in the House. You are fooling the people. That is what cowards do. You are nothing more than a coward. You talk of buses. Does that have anything to do with the vote which is before the House? You are taking advantage of the Chair. You have been reduced in the last election to a pulp. Why talk about "Man born to be a King" and all of those things and then do some of the most evil things? That is the sort of nonsense which you get from the hon. member and then his taking advantage of the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is suffering from historical neurosis.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining any more of that on this Resolution from the hon. member. If he continues, I would use my authority.

Mr. MILLER: We have heard of these cowards.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would give way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening now to the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am sure the hon. member has allowed the heat of the debate for the entire day to becloud his better judgement, but I wish to say only this. On this question of money for the additional Minister without Portfolio which seems to be worrying the hon. junior member for St. George, the Hon. Premier was at pains at times to explain it. May be, the language which he has used may be involved in legal technology. The amount for the payment of Ministers is fixed by law. Under the law, there is no limit to the number of Ministers that can be appointed. We appointed a Minister Without Portfolio for the holder of the substantive post for six weeks. In the Estimates, we have a sum of \$51,840 fixed by law for the payment of Ministers' salaries. To get the money to pay the acting Minister without Portfolio, it was not necessary to come back to the House at all for the simple reason that Ministers' salaries are fixed by law and what will happen is that when we get the revised estimates, the additional amount will appear under that. It is as simple as that. That is what the Hon. Premier was at pains to explain. It is the most simple way to put it.

Mr. MILLER: You were anxious and at pains to explain that sometime you have to come to Parliament to get this money to pay this Minister. We have also heard of all these cowards. You will talk of removing the portrait from the wall because you cannot get at the man whom

you say is not an image of what the people represent. When the people put an idol before you and anybody tries to knock him down, what is he? All about the Minister Without Portfolio is set out in Note 2 and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you are following what I am saying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All the time I am listening to a repetition by the hon. member.

Mr. MILLER: You must not shout to members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am fed up listening to the same thing all the time.

Mr. MILLER: You must not do that. You must not be fed up with any one member. We have heard all about these cowards, and you have the temerity because you cannot face up to the man to look for a lifeless photograph of him and tear it down from the walls.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is making fun.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit?

Mr. WALCOTT: I tore him down and will tear you down too. Do you think you can go anywhere with your record? Do you think that you can bring anybody else in here? The way how you come in here, anybody else can come in here too.

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

HEAD 18 -- POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 18 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 29 -- TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 29 - Town and Country Planning - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 33 -- CIVIL AVIATION

Head 33 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 33 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 36 -- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (6) INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (6) Industrial Schools - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

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

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

ANNEXED ESTIMATES -- POST OFFICE

Annexed Estimates - Post Office - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part.

Mr. MILLER: You cannot put that, I am here waiting to speak on Head 36.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear you.

Mr. MILLER: Every member heard me. You cannot put it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George has indulged in so much cross talk that nobody could have heard him.

However, Sir, I beg that you do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

Mr. MILLER: I signified my intention to speak on Head 36 and I will speak on it. *(Loud Asides)*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are still in Committee. Will both hon. members please sit?

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on Head 36.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am making an appeal to hon. members. After all, what does the hon. junior member for St. George want recommitted?

Mr. MILLER: Head 36.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to object to its recommitment. 6.40 p.m.

The hon. member disrespected you today and now he is pleading for rights. I am not going to sit here and allow any hon. member to do whatever he likes for the whole day; I will not sit here and allow any hon. member to laugh it off, joke it off and then call somebody a dictator. The hon. junior member for St. George did whatever he liked to do today; he talked about pulling down something and now he is asking for rights. I will say that he does not deserve to have this matter recommitted. *(SIDES)* If somebody tells me that I cannot do what I say, well then, let somebody touch me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am going to vote with the hon. junior member for St. George because he did say that he wanted to speak on this matter and he should be allowed to speak on it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Who heard him?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I heard him and my colleagues also heard him, and therefore I am suggesting that the hon. member should be allowed to speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think that the hon. member should be sent out of this House. If you want to have an election, well then, you can have an election.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter are on their feet. (The hon. senior member for St. Peter took his seat.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to you to allow the hon. junior member for St. George to speak. I am suggesting that we should agree to the Head being recommitted so as to allow the hon. member to speak. As far as I am concerned, I heard him say that he wanted to speak on this matter and I challenge the Clerk to say that he did not hear the hon. member say that he wanted to speak. *(SIDES)* Don't worry with me; the hon. member was standing on his feet. Again, I am suggesting to hon. members to

allow this Head to be recommitted and allow the hon. junior member for St. George to speak.

CHAIRMAN REPORTS PROGRESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would really like to appeal to the House that if this sort of behaviour continues, I will have to move the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: That will not be necessary because I will adjourn the House automatically.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Hon. members are not children and they are expected to exhibit a certain amount of behaviour.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. senior member for the City is making a point of order, he will have to be allowed to make it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has satisfied himself as to what he was saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The behaviour of this House is not worthy of the behaviour which should be exhibited in this House. I am suggesting that hon. members should have some respect for themselves. There is a gallery here, people are looking on and what must they expect?

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House is not drawing attention to the presence of strangers in the House because I may have to take certain steps.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 be now suspended for the remainder of the sitting. If we were to go on with this sitting without the suspension of those Standing Orders, we will have to take the suspension of the sitting at 7 o'clock p.m. and we will have to resume at 7.45 p.m. of the clock. I am therefore suggesting to hon. members that they should remain here and finish the business on the Order. I beg to move therefore that those Standing Orders be suspended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: There is disorder in this House which is almost grave.

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 be now suspended for the remainder of the Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

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

The question that HIS HONOUR do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

1 - ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that 1. Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Grounds, Livestock and Transport

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 be re-committed.

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

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

6.50 p.m.

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (6) Industrial Schools - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the note says it is necessary to increase the amounts voted for livestock and transport by \$1,000 and \$30 respectively due to an increase in the number of livestock and an increase in the cost of feed as well as in the cost of petrol, but I am wondering if the Minister in charge could tell me whether in connection with transport they are using a lighter unit which would use less petrol. I remember we were considering a change of vehicle and he will find it on the files. I am anxious to find out this because I had a lot to do with this myself. I would like to know if he has changed the unit within the past year.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Would the hon. member repeat his question? It has not been very audible over here.

Mr. MILLER: The note says that there is an increase due to increase in the number of livestock and the cost of feed and the price of petrol to the tune of \$1,000, and I can remember that there was some discussion to change the size of the unit used at the station and have a light-framed English model as against the heavy American one. I should like to know if that is operating.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the hon. member's question at this moment, because I do not have available to me now the appropriate information. If he wishes it, I will give him on another occasion as soon as I can.

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (6) Industrial Schools - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for \$174,154 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing in Committee of Supply of two Resolutions, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR
VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 1964.

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.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Legislature to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1964. The purpose of the Regulation, Mr. Speaker is to revise the rates for hiring motor cars as set out in Part 1 of the Second Schedule to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952, as amended by the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1961. These rates relate to the hire of cabs over specified distances and on an hourly basis.

Prior to the Deep Water Harbour, Mr. Speaker, most of the traffic used the Baggage Warehouse as the departure point for tourists, and most of the rates were calculated from that point of departure. In view of the Deep Water Harbour and tourists and passengers operating out of this area, it is necessary to have the Deep Water Harbour included and have fixed rates calculated from that point of departure. Also with the amount of new hotels provided in this Island, to specify rates from the Airport or from the Harbour to specific hotels would require too long a list and would become a nuisance in cars; therefore it is necessary also to zone those areas from the Airport to specific points in the Island as well as include the Deep Water Harbour. There is very little change in the fares, Sir, and they are calculated on distances. This just specifies zoning areas instead of specified names of hotels and guesthouses.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
7.00 p.m.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising this Resolution at all. I think when I speak that I am voicing the sentiments of many taxi owners. We are proud that the Government has come to our rescue. I am sure that you will agree with me that within the last 15 years, the price of tyres, gasoline and motor cars has gone up four times what they used to be, and the fares which taxi owners receive have remained the same. You will also agree with me that taxi owners in the Island have actually tried to do all they possibly could to assist the Taxi Owners Association. I have sat on various Boards such as the Transport Board, the Tourist Board Association, the Hotel Association and so on, and I can tell you that some of the taxi owners have actually driven their cars free of cost so as to assist the tourist industry and it was agreed that we all should join up and get among ourselves to consider a reasonable figure for the various fares which we should charge.

Sir, I am not criticising this Resolution at all; but since it is that Government is doing all it possibly can to

promote tourism, we the taxi owners would like to ask the Government to relieve the consumption tax on hired cars. Taxi owners do all they can to facilitate tourists and give them the cruises which they are accustomed to give and they should be able to change their vehicles more often. I am not asking for a reduction in the purchase tax for private owners; I am asking for a reduction in the consumption tax on hired cars. In Trinidad, you can get a motor car for about \$900 cheaper than what you can get it for in Barbados. I am not talking of those persons with posh Ramblers. I am dealing strictly with hired cars. Taxi owners should be relieved of part of the purchase tax. Sir, you will notice that when a taxi owner has finished paying for his car it is not any good, and the only thing he can do with it is to turn it in to a garage for about the sum of \$200 and start paying for another car. That is due to the amount of hacking which they have to do to get a job. In St. Lucia, you can also get a car for about \$1,000 cheaper than what you can get it for in Barbados.

Sir, I am not asking for a reduction in the purchase tax of motor cars sold to private owners. I am asking for a reduction in the purchase tax to taxi owners and I hope the Hon. Premier would take this into consideration.

I think it may be necessary to limit the number of taxi owners. I think the time has come when you should have a limitation in the number of taxis. As it stands now, you get people buying a car and entering the taxi service and you find that the taxi owners who have been depending on this business for many years cannot get one decent job. You get many of them who have no where to live and are sleeping in their cars.

These Regulations were made by a few owners of recognised garages of which your humble servant happens to be one. I am asking that you take this matter into consideration and grant these taxi owners a relief of a part of the purchase tax. As I have said, the taxi owners are rendering assistance to the tourist industry and I am asking the Government to come to their rescue.

Mr. BOXILL rose.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas caught my eye first.

Mr. BOXILL: Sir, while I must commend the last hon. member who spoke for what he said, there is one point which he has overlooked. If the Government were to allow taxi owners to purchase cars cheaper than the general public, although it is a good idea, what we must not fail to see is that there is the possibility that the private owners would be also able to approach taxi owners to buy cars for them because they would know that taxi owners would be able to get them much cheaper. Of course, this is a matter for the Hon. Minister and the Cabinet to go into. The taxi owner can buy a car and run it for a week or so and then hand it over to the person for whom he bought it.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Do you think that the intellectual Government which we have now would allow that sort of pork-knocking to go on? Do you think this Government will allow a taxi owner to buy a motor car and then deliver it somebody else? As a matter of fact, you will have to be a recognised garage owner to be able to buy a car at this price to hire.

Mr. BOXILL: That is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had to listen to the hon. member but it is not a point of order.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should fully realise that during the war when I was in the Navy which was stationed in Trinidad, a Captain in the Navy had the privilege of bringing in a new car and I am telling you as a fact that he used to bring in a new car very often. As a matter of fact, he was the first captain whom I knew about that nearly faced imprisonment because he was bringing in new cars often and then selling them after keeping them for a week or so. Battoo Bros. were running them,

There is nothing to stop a man from buying a car and claiming that he is a taxi owner. As I have said, I commend the hon. senior member for St. Michael for what he has said, but it is a matter for the Cabinet and the Minister in charge to think on the matter seriously before they undertake to do so.
7.10 p.m.

I think the hon. member referred to the trade tax first. I want to say that despite the fact that the price of tyres and gasoline has gone up as well as the price of accessories, the taxi drivers have still been able to keep the fares down to a minimum. The only rise in price which has been made has been in the ordinary rates and that increase has been long over due. I have seen some smart "Alecs" who want to get to Sam Lord's Castle and when the ordinary rate is \$3.00 an hour they would ask to be taken to the Crane, and as soon as they get to the Crane they discard the taxi driver altogether. That would mean that a man would drive a tourist from here to the Crane in half an hour for \$1.50 when the scheduled rate from Bridgetown to Seawall Airport was \$5.00. Under the arrangement, you would drive a man for an hour, and after an hour he could get out of the car. That is why the rates for taxis have been altered.

I was saying, Sir, that the taxi drivers have done a wonderful job towards the promotion of tourism in spite of the high cost of accessories. The first person whom a tourist meets is the taxi driver and he is also the last person that the tourist meets. From letters which have been received, I would say that the taxi drivers have done a commendable job although sometimes some of these taxi drivers try to be exploiters. However, Sir, they are at a minimum. The taxi drivers have kept down their fares on the one hand, but the hotel prices seem to be spiralling on the other hand. That is only by the way. I must commend the Government for the expeditious way in which they have dealt with these Regulations and, as far as I have gathered from each and every taxi driver, they seem to be of one accord. They are very happy.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that it would be a good idea to have the schedule of fares printed on two boards. One of these boards should be kept at the Deep Water Harbour so that the passengers who arrive by boat can see them, and they will not be fleeced by taxi drivers. The other board should be erected at Seawall Airport for the benefit of those passengers who arrive by air.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sounding a rather discordant note in this matter. It is not a discordant note because I want to be in opposition to the matter, but I may say that while I agree with the Regulations which the Hon. Minister of Communications has brought in today, there are one or two things which I would like to mention. The first thing is that we have reached a stage in this country which is somewhat like the stage at which we were away back in the 1930's when people were coming from the United States of America with a little money, and at every door you would find a bus stopping and buses would be running on every street. Every man who had a few dollars thought that the only means of making a living was to buy a lorry, turn it into a bus and get a route on which to run it. The then Government in power thought it best to save people from themselves, and they carried out some sort of control and earmarking, and they set out the various routes along which the buses might operate. While you cannot set out any routes where the taxi business is concerned, I see the necessity for a change by virtue of my business whereby I come into contact with people who have found themselves in difficulty. These people offer to purchase a car for \$6,000 or \$7,000; they pay down the only \$3,000 they have raised either in one way or in the other, and by the time that they have finished paying the \$6,000 or \$7,000 the car is nothing but junk or old iron and they have not got any more money.

In some instances, Sir, they mortgage their homes, and in other instances they may win some money, and the first thing they think of is going into the taxi business.

This will not be popular when I say it, but it must be said. What I wonder is whether the Taxi Owners' Association should not get together with the Ministry of Communications in this matter and do what was done in the United States of America. That is to say, you assess your tourism, you assess your need for hired cars in the island and I am wondering now whether it is not necessary for us to limit the number of taxis in this island. Nobody can say that I am trying to stop people from earning a living; what I am doing is trying to protect the people from themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I have passed through the days when I have seen men return here from the United States of America. They were local people who were in possession of substantial property and they went into the business of operating bus services because it seemed to them that such a business was a very flourishing business. But, Sir, the next thing you know was that the properties which they owned were soon gone and at the same time they had no bus which they could operate. That is what I am saying; that is where I am trying to protect the people from themselves.
7.20 p.m.

The same thing is happening today and you can save people from themselves. I throw this out to the Taxi Association, and not only to them but to the Government. I am not saying that you should limit the Taxi Association only; that is nonsense. I am saying that whether it is Dear, my colleague or whoever it is, you should limit them as in the United States to the number of taxis which the business in the Island can afford. I should like the Minister to take what I am saying quite seriously, because I have been watching this situation closely. People come to me every month to help them, but I am a real estate broker and you can never influence me to go into certain things. For instance, you could never influence me to go into the fishing business like the Hon. Minister. I know nothing of it, and I only go into things I know of.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think any Hon. Minister of this Government is in the fishing business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You could never influence me to go into the taxi business, but I would suggest to the Hon. Minister that this matter should be considered if people must be saved from themselves.

What the hon. member who spoke last said is correct. A taxi driver means a tremendous lot to the tourist business in this country, and like the waiters and help in hotels, the time has come when not only a person having a licence to drive a motor car should be considered a taxi driver. We should look to countries to which the Minister himself would have an opportunity of going. For want of a better word, there should be some sort of examination; I do not mean a technical examination from the point of view of a school examination. Can you imagine me going to Puerto Rico and getting into a taxi with the taxi driver not knowing how to describe the various places of interest to me? It is as interesting and beneficial to tourism, therefore, to have a class for taxi drivers run by persons who are fully acquainted with the historical background of the Island. I can think of the Minister without Portfolio being the person to give the necessary assistance by lecturing to taxi owners, so that when they pass Coles Cave, St. John's Church, the Crane or Sam Lord's Castle, they would be able to relate to the tourists something of their historical background. That would make so much for the comfort and enlightenment of the tourists. I am sure, Sir, that the Minister who has travelled appreciates what I am saying. The taxi driver is the first man to think of in the tourist industry and not the hotel waiter, and he is also the last man. He goes to the Baggage Warehouse and to the Airport, and takes passengers along Hastings Road, and if he is trained he knows either the man is an Englishman or a Canadian and he will be able to relate that this country has never changed from British hands, that they are now passing through Hastings, and that the names are all taken from places in England and things of that sort. A taxi driver is not a man to sit there and have people answering questions; he is to be talking to the tourists when they are in his car and therefore selling Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister that we do want a school for training where taxi drivers are concerned. I was reading in one of the magazines advertising Barbados where people refer to certain taxi drivers and their politeness. We felt very proud and happy to see a taxi driver exhibit honesty in finding a wallet in his car and returning it. Things like that do good for Barbados, but on the other hand, I should like to hear the Minister on a matter of this sort, because it is important. What the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said about the taxi driver being the first and last man is of paramount importance, because he can either sell this Island or prevent people from coming back. Of course I know, as the hon. member has said, that there are some smart Alecs who come to this Island, but they are in the minority.

I hope, Sir, that the Minister will take what I have said in good faith. I do not want you to say that a man must own a Chevrolet or a new car, because you have regulations where they must pass a test at Highways and Transport. You have two Acts, I believe, under which taxis operate. You can either hire directly from the livery stables or garage, or you can take a taxi on the street, and it is not good enough, therefore, just to be going on in this *ad hoc* way. There are some people who find themselves with money and go ahead and buy a car, and few of them can afford to pay the comprehensive third party insurance. When their cars reach a certain age, they can do very little. My main point, therefore, is that the Minister must go into these statistics and have a limit on a number of taxis as is done in New York, Puerto Rico and all big countries. If we do not limit the number of taxis, it means that people will be throwing money down the drain. Is it wise to allow this matter to go on in this way? You should go into the Act as it stands — what is known as the old livery Stables Act — and find out whether there are not cars registered which you can telephone and hire, or whether you can go on issuing licences for persons to operate taxis.

7.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to hon. members who are carrying on conversations so to conduct their conversation that the Reporter would be able to hear the speaker and not any undertones or overtones. I apologise to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, but I want to be assured of an accurate report.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour very much. Let them carry on their conversation; I am speaking to the Hon. Minister in charge of this and, as a matter of fact, I do not think that those who are carrying on a conversation understand what I am saying. They are not capable of understanding it and that is why they are carrying on such conversation. The Hon. Minister in charge would appreciate the stand which I am taking in this matter.

Sir, the last point which I want to make is this. I am not a prophet; therefore, I could not anticipate what these Regulations would have been; but I do not agree to just putting a tariff sheet on a Notice Board at the Deep Water Harbour and the Airport. These Regulations, as I have seen them, can be printed on a small card and, in my opinion, if it is good for other countries, why cannot it be good for Barbados? Not only should these Regulations which set up the prices should be stuck up on the back of the front seat of a taxi, but also the driver's picture.

Mr. BOXILL: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why should I give way?

Mr. BOXILL: I rise on a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas invited the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to give way which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition does not have to do; but if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas means to rise on a point of elucidation on which he may rise, it must of course be a point of elucidation.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has slightly misquoted me, not deliberately, when he said that he

is not agreeing to placing the tariff sheets on boards at the Deep Water Harbour or Seawell Airport. I can assure him...

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sit down.

Mr. BOXILL: You cannot tell me to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Thomas complete his point of elucidation.

Mr. BOXILL: As I was trying to make out — and it would be a good thing if some of the hon. members of this Chamber would learn that they are not greater than some of the other hon. members.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that a point of elucidation?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member put his point as briefly as possible.

Mr. BOXILL: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am the person who talked of placing these tariff sheets on a Board at the Deep Water Harbour and at the Seawell Airport. The hon. senior member for the City said he disagreed with that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say so. I said that not only should you have these Regulations stuck there on the notice board, but you should also have them printed and stuck at the back of the front seat in taxis.

Mr. BOXILL: If the hon. member did not say so, I understood him to have said that there should be a small tariff book placed in the back.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the hon. member did not hear what I say, he should sit down.

Mr. BOXILL: Sir, I will not be interrupted by floor members telling me what to do. What I was pointing out to the hon. senior member for the City is that there will be these small tariff sheets printed. That is why they have tried to make these things no bigger because by the time a tourist got through reading them, they would not see any part of the Island. That is why it was reduced to this size.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is doing the work of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. I did not say that I disagreed with that; I said that I did not agree with that being done alone. Evil communication corrupts good manners, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was speaking with the hon. junior member for St. George while I was addressing the Chair; therefore, he was not paying attention to what I was saying. I said that I would like to see these tariff sheets placed on the back of the front seat of the cars along with the picture of the driver, and these tariff sheets should also be placed in the hotels. You cannot expect that they should only be stuck up on a board at the Deep Water Harbour and at Seawell Airport where people would just see them and forget all about them.

Sir, I feel the time has come when you have to protect people from themselves and place a limitation on the number of taxi owners in the Island, whether he be the small man or the big man. The Hon. Minister can get the necessary statistics. If you are going to have every other person buying a car and calling it a taxi, it will make it difficult for persons to make a living in the trade. If you are going to let a person, just because he has some money to invest in a car go in the taxi business, you will prevent people from making a living. I am sure the Hon. Minister will agree with me that the suggestion which I make is worthy of consideration.

7.40 p.m.

Just as you are having a class for hotel workers in the tourist industry — well, Sir, as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said, the taxi man is so important to the tourist industry that he is the first man the tourists meet and he is also the last man that the tourists meet. As a matter of fact, he is the man who has to talk to the tourists and he must be the man to do what the hotels are interested in in this country; he must be able to sell Barbados and therefore he must be a very knowledgeable person. It is the

duty of the Taxi Owners' Association to interest persons in the industry which we are trying to improve. There must be people in our midst who know local history and who know the routes so that in a period of three months, say, with two lectures per week, they would be able to instruct taxi drivers on places of interest, the historical background of the country and the like.

It is surprising how dense some taxi drivers are. Some of them cannot give you the historical background of a plantation or of the sugar industry. I am saying, Sir, that a taxi driver should be able to give a tourist the origin of the sugar industry in Barbados. You have people who are in our midst who can lecture to the taxi people. I have had to work as a bell boy and I know how pleasant it is to be able to carry on a conversation in that sphere. You must be able to carry on a proper conversation with somebody from whom you are expecting to receive a tip. When a taxi driver gets to St. John's Church yard with a tourist, he must be able to say: "Here lies the body of Prince Paleologus" and so on. I have had something to do with some Canadians. I have taken out a Canadian to Lower Estate Factory; he had never seen a sugar factory and he wanted to discuss the origin of sugar cane in Barbados. He wanted to discuss how it got to Barbados and when it started. I say that nothing would be better than for you to take the several taxi drivers in this country and have them lectured to so that when they carry people on a tour of the Island they will be able to give them some history of the place.

The last point is this: I do not like to see taxi drivers driving about people in a shabby condition. A man should be in a long-sleeved shirt or jacket and he should have his tie and cap or whatever it is. You will realise that it is your taxi, and the more courteous you can be to your customer, the better it will be for this Island. The points which I have raised here are necessary to be raised. The taxi drivers are as important to the tourist industry as your hotel workers; they can force people never to come back to Barbados. As the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has said, and I repeat, the taxi drivers are the first people the tourists will meet and they are also the last persons whom the tourists will meet. I say that this man should be commended on the action which he has taken because his action is a credit to Barbados and to the Taxi Owners. You should call up this man and commend him because he has done a great thing. This man found a wallet in his car and he took it to the person. That is something commendable. As I say, Sir, these Regulations are absolutely necessary and I wholeheartedly support them; but I do say that we should select somebody for the purpose of lecturing to these taxi drivers so that when they are taking out the tourists they can tell them something about Barbados.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long in speaking because you can scarcely hear what I am saying. The hon. senior member for the City has raised the question of limiting the number of taxis, but Sir, this is a very small country; it is very thickly populated with a lot of unemployment, and I feel that by limiting the number of taxis you would be contributing to the unemployment which we have at present in this country. The hon. senior member for the City also mentioned that you must protect people from themselves. That is very good in one way; but imagine, Sir, that he said that some people mortgage their places, they come out here from America and invest their money in buses and now they are broke.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not hear me well. I said that things were not controlled when people did that sort of thing. Then the Government came in and controlled things, giving routes to certain people by way of concessions and so on.

Mr. SMITH: That is so, Mr. Speaker, but it will be very hard to limit the number of taxis. I know that an ordinary chauffeur had sold his house and bought a car; he then rented a house. Eventually he was in the happy position of buying back a home.

Mr. SEALEY: Name two!
7.50 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: I would not stand for the hon. member to be shouting at me to name two persons. That is not decent at all and I hope you will correct him on that. He is breaking the Rules of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there is too much of this carnival spirit even in this Chamber today.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, if you limit taxis you will contribute to unemployment, because there are some ordinary chauffeurs who stay with one owner and become owners themselves. We cannot hold ourselves responsible for that, but we must see that the people of this country get a proper service, and I do not feel it would be in the best interest of the country to limit taxi owners. The hon. senior member for St. Michael asked the Government to consider giving off all or part of the purchase tax for hired cars. That would be a very nice thing because we would be having all hired cars. I too would buy one as a hired car, but because it is licensed as hired does not compel me to put somebody into it. If the price of a big car is \$7,000 for which the purchase tax would be in the vicinity of \$700, what is to prevent me from saving \$700 and licensing it for an extra \$100? If the Government wants to come back here, they can take the suggestions put to them of limiting taxis. There are people who although they may not be interested in investing in a motor car would still feel it is unfair to prevent a man from buying a car and licensing it as a taxi. We might as well move to Germany or Russia under those circumstances. Because Trinidad has done that, it does not mean that we should. The first time I went to Trinidad, I never drove for so long and so far in my life; I thought I would never get to where I was going. It took me longer to get from the Airport to where I was going to stay than from Barbados to Trinidad by plane. Trinidad is a big place with a lot of people and with oil; so you cannot think of doing everything that is done in a big country in a small place like Barbados. You can save people from themselves, but do not try to stop them from spending their money. (A VOICE: What about buses?) Buses are quite good because they carry passengers and things of that sort.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for protection from the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust there is no threat being made to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph by any other hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: I am counselling the Minister to take the suggestions into consideration and do what he thinks best in this matter, but he should try not to contribute to the unemployment of this country by limiting taxis. I would never be in favour of that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and his ideas seem to have been working in close conjunction with mine. I can well see the day soon arriving when it will be necessary to limit taxis in this country. We have discussed this on several occasions, and there will be more than one method in handling it.

A taxi driver, as the hon. senior member for Bridgetown states, is a very essential man in a community where tourism is concerned. I have spent fifteen years watching tourism grow, and I can quite agree with him that a taxi driver is number one tourist guide, and I think that by means of having small examinations one could determine the amount of taxis you should have. General knowledge and a certain amount of the geography of Barbados are what a tourist guide should know, because tourists are very interested in talking to people all the time. We should have classes for these taxi drivers by which they would learn the shortest possible route from any one place to another, and be able to give a certain amount of information on the history of estates and how sugar is made. I have had a meeting with Mr. Paul Foster, the manager of the Tourist Board and other members, the Commissioner of Police, the Director of Highways and Transport, and the Minister without Portfolio, and we have decided that this would be very interesting if Barbados is to continue to find itself among essential tourist countries in the West Indies.

I would say also, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some hard feeling in this Island when people must on occasions try to protect the poorest of the poor in this Island by seeing for them. Just what the hon. senior member for the City has stated about protecting people from themselves, is what I wrote years ago about the fishing industry. If today you built a boat costing \$5,000 in less than a year you could not get \$2,000 for it.
8.00 p.m.

It would not be exactly that bad off with motor cars because they can be sold for other uses; but today, we are faced with an identical thing in our fishing industry. You have a vast number of boats in the industry. People have sold their lands, their houses and every little thing and put it in a boat just because they could get a Government loan, and today, it is hard to say, but true, that none of them can pay back these loans. It is not because of dishonesty; it is because you have overbuilt the fleet and the amount of fish distributed is just what half of the boats should bring in so as to make the industry economical. You find that there are 450 boats doing the work which 200 could do. As I have said, it is uneconomical for the owners of these boats to pay back the Government. It is not through dishonesty, but they are not in a position to pay back because there is just so much trade and it must be divided between so many. That is one of the things which is really ruining the fishing industry and if the taxi industry continues as it is now, I will hate to think that I would have to tell some person that you have invested your money in something which cannot bring you any interest. Of course, it is hard to tell a man how to spend his money, but in all interests he should be told what is the position. When people are about to go in for these ventures and advice is given them, they should realise that people are telling them something in their own interest.

Sir, I would just like to say that all of the points suggested by the hon. senior member for the City are under consideration and I hope soon to have them put into perfection. With regard to the tariff rates being printed and put on the backs of the front seats of taxis, there is no law for taxis to carry their tariff rates in a conspicuous place, and as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has stated, it would be inconvenient to have a big long tariff sheet. As he explained to the hon. senior member for the City, that is one of the reasons why zoning was established rather than it being calculated on each hotel. I can assure the hon. member that that is also being looked into.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 18th February, 1964, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, under Private Members' Business, I would like leave of the House to have Items 15 and 16 placed as Items 3 and 4 respectively on the Order Paper.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting because I do not think it is fair to hon. members who have business under Private Members' Business and whose items come before those of the hon. member to have them pushed further back. If the hon. senior member for St. Thomas brings those items up in front of the others, there is the possibility that time may win out and the items standing in the names of other hon. members may be taken off the Order Paper.

I am quite prepared that we should do Private Members' Business. We should come in here and we should not do like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who took the whole time today allotted to Private Members' Business for himself. We can come next Tuesday and get along with the business much faster.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not know that I delayed Private Members' Business. I was speaking on an important subject and I hope I did justice to it.

Mr. SMITH: I did not say that it was not important. While that is true, the hon. member took up the time. I hope I am not telling any lies on him. If it is so, I will withdraw my remarks. If we come in here next Tuesday quite prepared to proceed as quickly as possible with our business, we will be able to finish off those items in front of the hon. member's items and get to his. As I have said, it would not be fair to him if his items were in front of other hon. members' and they came in and wanted to push theirs in front of his.

The Order Paper is very long under Private Members' Business and we have not had the opportunity to discuss any of our business in recent weeks. Now that we are being given the opportunity, we should do justice to the Order Paper by letting the items stay in the order in which they are and discuss them one by one until we get to those standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. For those reasons, I am objecting.

As I have said, there is a possibility that by giving leave for the hon. member to bring his items in front of other members', thus giving him the opportunity to discuss them before other hon. members get to theirs, that time will run out and they will be struck off the Order Paper. As a matter of fact, quite a number of business under my name has been struck off the Order Paper because of time. It is also so with other items which stood under the names of other hon. members. I believe that may be the reason why the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is asking that those items under his name be brought up to Nos. 3 and 4 respectively.

Mr. BATSON: Is the hon. member imputing dishonourable motives of me?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph imputed dishonourable motives of other hon. members.

Mr. SMITH: So long as Standing Orders are such, there is the possibility of items standing under your name being struck off.

Mr. BATSON: I would like the hon. member to understand that I am in a somewhat similar position to him. I will not impute any ulterior motives of him, and if he looks at the Order Paper, he will see that Items 3 and 4 do not stand under his name; so I do not see why he should object.
8.10 p.m.

I cannot see why the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is objecting to my Resolutions being moved up when they are nowhere in his province.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going to move his Resolutions to the same position as that of other hon. members, then he would have to move that the Resolutions of the other two hon. members be moved further down the Order Paper. That is what I am saying. My reason for making the objection is that I may not have the opportunity of discussing my Resolution. I am appealing therefore to the hon. member to allow the position to remain as it is and trust to luck that we get through our Resolutions by next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Joseph withdrawn his objection to leave being granted to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to have his Resolutions moved up on the Order Paper?

Mr. SMITH: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, then, if there is one objection to leave being granted, that is enough to prevent the leave from being granted.