THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

## SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday 7th January, 1964.*

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. *BRANCKER*, Q.C., *(Speaker)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH J.P.; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. G. G. *FERGUSSON*, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing)*; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)*; Mr. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Social Services)*.

*Prayers were read.*

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 10th December, 1963, I understand, have been circulated amongst hon. members, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare those Minutes duly to have been confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 30th September, 1963, in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) Order, 1964.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation) Order, 1963.

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

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st October, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of $59,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 39, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of $16,440 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 40 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1964".

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the lease to Da Costa and Company Ltd. by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land situated immediately to the north of the headquarters of the Barbados Fire Service and containing approximately 1,385 square feet or thereabouts.

On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 149 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is now ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 148 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is ready.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Also at today's meeting we are going to ask leave to deal with the Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1964," and also the Resolution for $59,000 in connection with the cost of the repair of roads which have been taken over by the Department of Highways and Transport, the principle of which has already been approved by this Honourable House.

12.25 p.m.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: WHEREAS the small shopkeepers of this island, and especially those in the country districts, are forced to go out of business due to the competitive prices of goods offered to the buying public by the supermarkets in Bridgetown,

AND WHEREAS this state of affairs is mostly evidenced by the practice of the small shopkeepers having to buy goods from the merchants and Commission Agents on a wholesale basis, and much higher in price than the retail prices of these supermarkets,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House invite the Government to cause the wholesale merchants and Commission Agents to sell these small retailers goods at the same prices as they are selling to the owners of supermarkets, thereby making it possible for small shopkeepers to retail their goods at the same price to their customers.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:

Is the Government aware that there is widespread dissatisfaction existing among the majority of sugar workers, due to the withholding of the balance of "windfall" money that is due to them?

2. If the answer is "yes", will the Government, in the interest of the sugar industry, instruct the authorities responsible for the withholding of the same money, to pay it out immediately, and before the beginning of the 1964 reaping season which is soon to be commenced?

Mr. YEARWOOD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that two major fires have recently occurred in heavily built-up areas in the parish of Saint John and that the efforts of the Fire Service were greatly impeded in each case because of the lack of a water hydrant?

2. Will the Minister treat as an urgent priority the provision of at least one water hydrant in every village or other built-up residential area in the said parish?

Mr. YEARWOOD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the hazard caused to both pedestrians and motorists through the overhanging of canes on to public highways throughout the Island after the canes are fully grown?

2. Is Government aware that this hazard is greatest around curves and at major stops?

3. Will Government take immediate action to lessen and, if possible, remove this hazard by seeing to it that canes are not planted within a distance of six feet inward from a point 20 feet from the beginning of any curve or major stop on a public highway?

## STATEMENT BY HON. G. G. FERGUSSON *re* MANUFACTURE OF CONCRETE PRODUCTS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Statement *re* the manufacture of Precast Concrete Products by the Resident Architect, New Hospital for the Department of Highways and Transport.

The Statement is as follows:

*Investigation has disclosed that it is more advantageous* and economical for certain concrete products used by the Department of Highways and Transport, including slabs and pipes, to be produced at the concrete precast workshop at the New Hospital project than by the Department of Highways and Transport. It is therefore proposed to have the items produced at the New Hospital Site.

The implementation of this scheme involves the utilization of funds allocation for the New Hospital on items produced for the Department of Highways and Transport, since in the first instance the vote for the construction of the Hospital will be used for the purchase of materials and the payment of labour entailed in the exercise. Subsequently, however, the full expenditure involved will be met from funds provided under the respective votes of the Department of Highways and Transport. Ultimately there will be no additional expenditure under the New Hospital Vote.

The Accounting procedure involved will be that settlement of bills, submitted by the Resident Architect in respect of work undertaken for the Department of Highways and Transport, will be effected by the payment of funds by that Department into a Suspense Account operated by the Accountant General. In due course these funds would be used in furtherance of the Hospital Project as necessary.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and while in Committee of Supply that it be an instruction to deal with the Resolution for $59,000 of which notice was give this morning.

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

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

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

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 35 WINDPOWER EQUIPMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $30,000. As the Addendum sets out, this Resolution seeks to provide the sum of $30,000 to meet the cost and installation of certain equipment for carrying out experimental work on the utilisation of wind power in the Scotland District.

The project is being undertaken on the advice of the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board and of the Brace Research Institute of McGill University and is a pilot scheme designed to prove the technical capability and economic efficiency of the use of wind power in certain areas in the island as a supplement to the existing electric supply. The Brace Research Institute has agreed to undertake the technical responsibility for the installation, to provide Consultant's services and to advise on the detailed servicing and operation of the plant.

The capital cost of the project includes the purchase price of an aerogenerator and associated equipment, freight charges and installation costs. The recurrent costs will be included in the 1964/65 draft Estimates.

In addition to that, Sir, I think it is my duty to give the Committee a little more information on this novel project.
12.35 p.m.

The project involves the use of about 20 kilowatt generators to produce power for use in pumping water and in providing electricity. The estimated cost of the installation is $26,400 and the cost of maintenance is estimated at $120 per annum. The depreciation is calculated at the rate of $1,680 per annum and interest on the capital invested is estimated at $1,320. The cost of the production of this electricity is 2.6 cents per unit; the cost of electricity supplied by the Barbados Light and Power Company including distribution costs is six cents per unit. Assuming that 120,000 kilowatts are required to be consumed by consumers, the

price of the Barbados Light and Power Company is $7,200 per annum using the diesel engine. If as much as 120,000 kilowatts are required, it will turn out that this scheme will be a beneficial one. If less than 60,000 units are utilised per annum, it will appear to be cheaper to instal electricity from the Barbados Light and Power Company. The project is a pilot scheme which is designed to prove the technical capability and economic efficiency of the use of wind power in certain areas in the island, and not to take the place of electricity supplied by the Barbados Light and power Company as such.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of the power requirements, some hon. members will probably ask why we are spending money in this way. I will say this; our agricultural policy is one of diversification and this policy will involve the replacement in certain areas of sugar cane by certain produce where it is not profitable to produce sugar cane. Where it is not profitable to grow sugar canes, we will grow other crops such as pangola grass. Our agricultural policy involves the replacement of sugar cane by other crops where it is not economical to grow sugar cane; we will replace sugar cane in such areas by more profitable and intensive agriculture, and we will require a stronger supply of power for such things as irrigation, pumping, watering of livestock, watering of market garden produce, threshing milling, grinding and chopping of animal food, milking machines and sterilising plants. In addition, the project will be providing electricity for domestic requirements both at Sedgepond Plantation and at the Hill Plantation, both of which are Government Plantations. It will be possible to supply electric current to the people in the Sedgepond area. Experts have gone into the matter and it will be sponsored by the Government. In locations where places are exposed to the Trade Winds and which are suitable for this power utilisation, we are carrying out this scheme to prove the capability and the economic efficiency of the use of wind power.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to give something of the background of this matter. The recurrent cost will be $120.00 per annum, and if there are about fifty of these schemes electricity will be supplied for one half of the island. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 37

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of $2,268 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 37, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

In this Resolution there are two Heads of the Estimates which we will take separately.

HEAD 33 - CIVIL AVIATION

*Head 33 - Civil Aviation - was called.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, there is Item 35 (New) "Replacement of van". If hon. members refer to the Notes they will see that they read as follows:-

1. One of two Volkswagon vans which was used for airfield and lighting inspections, has had a major mechanical breakdown and a Board of Survey recommended the installation of a new engine at a cost of $1,500. It is however proposed to purchase instead a new vehicle at a cost of $2,200 duty free, as this would be more economical in the long run.

2. A provision of $2,228 is therefore now being sought under Head 33 - Civil Aviation to meet the costs of the new vehicle and of effecting insurance in respect thereof for the remainder of the current financial year.

I beg to move that Head 33 stand part of the Schedule.

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

*The question that Head 33 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

HEAD 47 - SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

*Head 47 - Subsidies and Grants - was called.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, in respect of this Head, the note explains that an amount of $675 is provided under Head 47 Item 50, to meet payment for technical journals and publications supplied by the International Telecommunications Union.

It is now necessary to supplement this amount by $40 in order to meet payment of an outstanding account for publications and journals supplied to this Government during 1962.

I beg to move that Head 47 - stand part of the Schedule.

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

*The question that Head 47 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of $2,268 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 38

Hon. A DaC. EDWARDS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of $14,030 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 38, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

There are three Heads under this Schedule which we will take separately.

HEAD 39 - MEDICAL (5) DISTRICT HOSPITAL SERVICES

*Head 39 - Medical (5) District Hospital Services - was called.*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman in respect of Item 7 "Uniforms" the sum of $58.00 is required. A bill for four pairs of shoes which were ordered from Messrs. Cave Shepherd & Co. for Nurses during the 1962-63 financial year has not been paid. These shoes were for Nurses at the Oistins District Hospital.
12.45 p.m.

The bill did not arrive in time for payment to be made, and the provision in the Estimates, 1963-64 is all committed. It is therefore necessary to seek this supplementary provision of $58 so that the bill for those four pairs of shoes might be paid.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the sum of $3,000 was provided under Head 39 (5) Item 8 - Drugs and Dressings - to meet the cost of drugs at the Oistin District Hospital. The drugs from the Oistin District Hospital are supplied by the Barbados General Hospital. In 1961 and 1962 no remittances were made to the Barbados General Hospital for the payment of drugs which were had by the Oistin District Hospital, and in addition to that there have been great increases in the attendance at the Oistin District Hospital. In 1961 the number attending the hospital was 384, and the number attending the Outpatients Clinic at Oistin was 963. In 1962 the number increased at the District Hospital to 502, and

at the Outpatients Clinic to 1,091. By the end of October, 1963, the total number of attendances at the hospital at Oistin was 555, and the total number at the Outpatients Clinic was 1,089. This great increase was not anticipated when the Estimates were dealt with, and therefore it is absolutely necessary to seek supplementary provision if the services at the District Hospital and the Outpatients Clinic are not to be broken down.

I therefore beg to move that Head 39 — Medical (5) District Hospital Services — stand part.

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

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

*Head 39 — Medical (6) Health Centres — was called.*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the sum of $1,806 was provided in the 1963-64 Estimates under Head 39 (6) Item 59 for the upkeep and maintenance of two cars at the St. Philip Health Centre. One of these cars was bought in 1957 — a Vauxhall — and you will appreciate that a car bought in 1957 would call for a great amount of repairs and servicing, etc. in 1963. Because of the necessity to purchase many spare parts, the vote which was provided in the Estimates becomes inadequate.

I should point out here that a Board of Survey has been carried out and it has been discovered that the Vauxhall car is uneconomical to run. It has done over 66,000 miles, and it therefore needs replacing; but in order to meet the expenses already incurred on this vehicle in spare parts, it is necessary to have a supplementary provision of $700.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $1,700 was provided under Item 58 — Travelling — to the Medical Officer of Health and the Senior Public Health Inspector. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the post of the Medical Officer of Health at the St. Philip Health Centre has only been filled a few months ago. It was vacant for quite a long time; hence the amount of travelling which the Medical Officer of Health would have been called upon to do in 1963 could not have been accurately estimated. Now that both of the posts are being held by officers, we have found it necessary to increase the provision which was made in our 1963-64 Estimates.

At the end of October, 1963, the expenditure under this Item amounted to $1,206.39 leaving a balance of $493.61. It is estimated that supplementary provision of $120 will be required to meet travelling expenses to the end of the financial year.

At the Enmore Health Centre, Mr. Chairman, there has been extension to the building and there has also been the installation of an air-conditioned unit in the laboratory which was absolutely essential. This has pushed up the expenditure for light and power tremendously, and therefore it has been found necessary to have a supplementary provision of $500.

A Board of Survey has recently condemned a still which was used in the laboratory at the Enmore Health Centre, and as one is urgently needed, we cannot wait until the new financial year to provide one; hence supplementary provision of $500 is needed.

I beg to move that Head 39 — Medical (6) Health Centres — stand part.

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

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

12.55 p.m.

## HEAD 40 — OLD AGE PENSIONS

*Head 40 — Old Age Pensions — was called.*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, under Head 40 in the 1963-64 Estimates, provision was made for 10,050 old age pensioners for which the total of $1,254,240 was voted. There has been an average increase in the number of old age pensioners at about 12 every month, and on the 31st October, 1963, the number of old age pensioners stood at 10,076 as against 10,050 at the beginning of the financial year.

This necessitates, Mr. Chairman, a supplementary provision of $9,500. It is to be appreciated that some of these pensioners would have gone off the book by way of death, and therefore it would be unnecessary to ask for supplementary provision for as many people as has been added to the register. We estimate that this sum of $9,500 would be adequate enough to meet the requirement of this vote up to the end of this financial year.

I therefore beg to move that Head 40 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think that I should take this opportunity to draw attention to this particular item, more so at this time when so much nonsense is literally trotted about, so as to analyse the position with respect to the old age pension which we are facing in Barbados.

Now, to those who believe that the problem which we are now facing is an easy one, let us examine what is the position today. We have here a scheme for 10,050 people and it is costing this country $1 1/4 million. From the Stockman Report we have a fascinating story. In that Report on page 11 paragraph 23, it sets out that the number of old age pensioners at that time, which was $9,500, represented about 90% of the total population over the age of 68 years and the amount paid to them was about $900,000 prior to 1961. From April, 1961, from which date the rate of pension was raised to $2.15 a week, the amount paid rose to $1,085,000 a year, and as from 1st April, 1962 when the new rate of $2.40 came into effect the estimated annual expenditure will rise to about $1,200,000. The average amount paid to each pensioner is roughly equal to the maximum amount of pension allowed under the Act, and it seems possible that the requirement that the pension should be reduced when the pensioner has some means is not being very strictly applied.

Mr. Chairman, I read that to show that to reduce the age to 65 years and even to keep the rate at the amount of $2.40 a week — anyone can clearly see that the bill to this country is not going to be $ 1 1/4 million but a lot more than that. When you look at the Estimates, you will see that there are 16,000 people between the ages of 60 years and over, and from that you will see that your increase, even at 65 years and over, cannot be less than another 50% on the old age pensions alone — and that is a classic example that this country will have to look for nearly $2 million to provide a person over 65 years with a pension of a meagre $2.40 a week.

Now, Sir, I do not want to say that $2.40 a week is enough for an old age pensioner, but what I do want to say is that the bill on this country would be much in excess of the $1 1/2 million which we have to look for now; therefore I hope that those who recommended that it is time that we should not utilise all of our disciplines and reserves will realise what the old age pension at the present level is costing the country now to provide a meagre subsistence for some of our old people. I hope the Hon. Minister concerned will be clear enough in his thinking that with the analysis given he will be able to analyse this matter and see what the true position is. I say that because there are some people today who are not really taking these things seriously and they believe that the running of a country, or being a citizen of a country, does not require any thinking whatsoever. This is a classic example to show what a meagre $2.40 a week to an old age pensioner would cost as against the full requirement of social security. It means that this bill is going from $1 1/4 million to something like $1 3/4 million at this rate of increase without even reducing the age or increasing the amount to these persons concerned.

*The question that Head 40 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $14,030 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. 36

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for the sum of $10,500 is merely to meet the cost of the employment of temporary staff during the current year. You will see from the Addendum that in view of the extraordinary expenditure which had to be met from Head 9, Item 13, Temporary Staff, during the year, it is inevitable that additional funds will be required during the remainder of the year.
1.05 p.m.

We are asking for $10,500 additional funds to supplement the amount which has been already provided. I should like to say that more than usual care has been taken to ensure that the employment of additional staff has not been due to any indifference or laziness in any of the Government departments. The appropriate officials have been duly satisfied that it has been necessary to employ this staff where it has been employed, and that the requirements and the duties to be carried out in the various departments necessitated this additional staff. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 39
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, as I have intimated to hon. members, there are two Resolutions which were brought down earlier today and which we would like to deal with now because there is some degree of urgency attached to them. The first Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of $59,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64 No. 39, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. Mr. Chairman, if you look at the Addendum to the Resolution you will see that by Resolution No. 70 of 1963 the Legislature approved and sanctioned the placing under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport certain highways or portions of highways of the Northern District Council. The Governor-in-Executive Committee has made an Order placing the highways or portions of highways under the control of the Director of Highways and Transport.

In the current Estimates for 1963-64, the sum of $93,656 has been provided under Item 42, "Parish roads" of Head 32, Highways and Transport. In view of the fact that it is proposed that the Department of Highways and Transport should now be responsible for the roads which were formerly under the control of the Northern District Council, it is now proposed that this Item should be supplemented by the sum of $59,000 to meet the cost of the reconstruction of the highways taken over from the Northern District Council for the remainder the financial year. This sum will be met from the savings under Item 49 "District Councils" of Head 47 of the Estimates, "Subsidies and Grants". *(ASIDES).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear what the Hon. Leader of the House is saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The proposal is that the Government will grant this additional sum of $59,000 to the Department of Highways and Transport and then this sum will be reimbursed from a similar sum which has already been voted under the Head "Subidies and Grants" for the District Councils during the current financial year. This is a very simple matter; we are turning over to the Department of Highways and Transport the responsibility for the roads which were formerly maintained by the Northern District Council. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1963-64 No. 40

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The final Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of $16,440 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1963-64 No. 40, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. There are two Heads under this Resolution which will be taken separately.

HEAD 3 - LEGISLATURE

*Head 3 – Legislature – was called.*

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Item, "Refreshments" the sum of $4,440 is being asked for to provide payment for the refreshments which were consumed in this Chamber during the current financial year. The position is that the normal expenditure under this vote was over $15,000 a year. The decision of the Government not to provide refreshments as a matter of course at every meeting will have resulted in the saving to which I have already referred. What we have done is that when there were unduly long sessions, that is to say, when we met at midday and went on until late in the afternoon, we provided lunch for hon. members, and the total cost of refreshments provided during the current year up to now including so much for about nine more sittings between now and the end of the financial year, will be in the vicinity of $4,400. This means that we would have saved approximately $11,000 or more by the method which we adopted during the current year. It is only when the sitting of the House would be protracted enough to warrant the provision of refreshments will that be done, and I am sure that hon. members will appreciate the fact that we have saved this appreciable amount by the method which we have adopted. When we begin our sitting late in the afternoon, no money was used for refreshments. This sum of $4,400 will take us through to the end of the financial year. I beg to move that Head 3 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Explanatory Note to this Item reads as follows:-

"It has been necessary on many occasions during the current session of the Legislature for the House of Assembly to sit for long periods and it was considered desirable that meals should be supplied on these occasions for members and the staff of the House....."
1.15 p.m.

"It is expected that there will be further occasions during the current Session on which it may be desirable to provide similar refreshment."

Now, Sir, I am going to vote for this Resolution, but you will remember that last year I had to remind the present Government that they were so fast in cutting that the only thing they did not cut were the legs off the lunch table. This was one of the planks of the present Government's platform when they were campaigning, and I can remember very well one of the speakers saying that the members of the House of Assembly were drawing as much money per year to put them in a position to buy their own lunch, and if

the electors elected them to power they were going to make sure that they did not continue to vote money for refreshment in the House of Assembly. That was one of the promises on which the electorate of this country elected the present Government. They were assured that this vast amount of money would be saved and they would be able to do something else with the money for the benefit of the poor people of this country.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the election programme of this Party is now an official document of the House, and I would advise the hon. member to demonstrate any part of the statement which he has just made. I think the hon. member is a bit confused. You will remember that when this Government assumed office, we were confronted with an enormous Bill of over $4 million, and economies had to be effected in order to pay the bills which they had engendered at election time and which that Government to which the hon. member belongs found itself.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order; that is a speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the only person who can rule that it is not a point of order is you, and not the hon. member. I am on a point of order and I will not sit down until I am finished. I know the hon. member is always distressed about the curtailment of provisions, especially relating to starches and matters of that kind; but the elimination of this Bill for $14,400 was done by me as Minister of Finance and I said at that time that if hon. members wanted meals, they could pay for them, but if we were calling on the people in the country to tighten their belts, then we in the House should set an example, and I eliminated the vote for refreshment on the introduction of the Estimates in 1962. We saved $14,400.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member cannot sit down and yell that is not a point of order. He has made misleading and untrue statements on the floor of the House which I am correcting, and I intend to do so. We saved $14,400 during the financial year 1962-63. On such occasions as the House sat for any period of time, the members were supposed to pay for meals and a caterer came in and hon. members paid.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is making a speech and it is not fair to this Committee, Sir, to allow the Hon. Premier to get up and make a speech when a member was on his feet making one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made a statement and the Hon. Premier is correcting that statement.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, that could never be so. If you are going to allow the Hon. Premier to mislead you, that is your business; but I know my stuff when it comes to Rules of this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member does not know his stuff when it comes to speaking the truth, unfortunately, and I am merely saying that the Statement that he attributes to this Party during election time.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, have you heard the remarks of the Hon. Premier to me? He said that the hon. member does not know his stuff when it comes to speaking the truth. If you have heard that, I am objecting to those remarks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will you ask him to sit down?

Mr. SMITH: I am objecting to those remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I am asking you to ask the Hon. Premier to withdraw them.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that the hon. member does not know his stuff when it comes to speaking the truth. That is not unparliamentary. You made a statement which is untruthful, and it would be very strange if you can make statements which are untruthful in the House of Assembly when you do not have the temerity to make them outside.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that is a reflection on hon. members of this House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, he is not on a point of order. Will you ask him to sit down?

Mr. SMITH: I am telling you the hon. member must withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members sit? I do not think the statement used by the Hon. Premier personates the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and I would not accept it as a reflection.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it is not what you accept. You will have to rule on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule that it is not a reflection.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the hon. junior member for St. Peter still thinks he is Speaker of this House, and he is getting there inciting the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who really does not understand Parliamentary procedure, and he has been doing that ever since this Government came into power. We will have to put up.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, the Hon. Premier has made mention of my name as having.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I said the hon. junior member for St. Peter; I never called his name.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member has made mention of me. He is in a bit of a quandary now and he will find himself worse off. The Hon. Premier has made mention to me saying I am inciting the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to stress his claims. In my considered opinion - and I am speaking on a point of order, with due respect to your ruling, because rulings of the presiding officers of Parliament can be subjected to decisions from a substantive motion moved by a member of the Honourable House, if the hon. member was not in his right and has had to sit down because of your ruling, he has done the right thing. Nevertheless, the Rules of this House and their practice and usage remain, and I am confident that the Hon. Premier did make a reflection on the hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of privilege, the hon. member wants to challenge the ruling of the Chair, and this is the very point I am making. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is a self-appointed, self-opiniated custodian of the Rules of this House. We have a new Chairman and a new Speaker, because this Party is not satisfied that during his tenure the high standard that should have prevailed was in operation. That is why he is there and will get little further.

1.25 p.m.

Do not let us have him there sitting down to be pontificating to the hon. member, to be disloyal to the Chair, to be rowdy and vulgar and unparliamentary. Let us get this position clear. Let us understand who is running this country. We are running this country, and when we appoint a Chairman, he is the Chairman. This House would not be inflicted by his presumptiousness. It is these things for which he has been the stooge.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am now claiming in my own right that the Hon. Premier is now making a personal reflection on a member of this House - and that member is myself. I am therefore asking you to ask him to desist from making those reflections and to tell him that if he does not desist he will be breaking the Rules of this House. I am in sympathy with the rowdy behaviour which he has complained of because I can never exhibit that same rowdy behaviour as he.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member makes a mistake by thinking that by using his sea water English he can

hide untruth and corruption, and that is why I prefer to be rowdy and truthful rather than to have shabby behaviour of being untruthful.

Let us in politics rid ourselves of this shabby behaviour which gets this Island no where, but which is a guise for corruption and untruth. Let me tell the hon. member that we are not going to sit down here and tolerate rulings of his. People have to understand very clearly that we are not going to tolerate any interference in our running of this country.

I am saying that I am the person who said that members should pay for their meals because I felt it was not right to call upon people to tighten their belts when we ourselves did nothing about it. The Hon. Speaker pointed out to me that hon. members on the other side were partaking of their meals and neglecting or forgetting to pay for them. The Speaker told that to me. I exclude the hon. senior member for the City because I know that he does not partake of any meals here. I also happen to have personal knowledge that the hon. senior member for St. Michael was not in that category.

Let us get the position clear. If they want to say that we are now coming back in and voting money for refreshments, it is because they were not paying for their meals and it was not fair.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. When the Hon. Premier says: "they refused to pay for their meals", would the Hon. Premier be more specific? Two hon. members on my right claim that they do not eat in here. Would the Hon. Premier be more specific?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would be a little more specific, I apologise. They refused to pay for their meals or anything else, and if I had to go to the Law Courts I would say who they were because I was told who they are.

Now, as I have said, the position was that the Speaker pointed out to me as Minister of Finance that we were holding sessions for an inordinately long time and it was difficult to know members who were willing to eat meals and pay for them. Whereas before, we would get a full turn out of members.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I had not finished speaking but you are allowing the Hon. Premier to get up and make another speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is developing his point.

Mr. SMITH: That is not fair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the only reason why you have not called the hon. member to order is because you know that he does not know any better.

I was about to say that the Speaker pointed out that it was unfair to the caterers that they make provision for 25 members and only six members come in to dine. It then became impossible to get anyone to supply hon. members with refreshments even if there was an undertaking given to pay for the meals. That is why this provision has been made. That is all I have to say.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, when one becomes Chairman, he must not be heavier on one side than the other. Because the Hon. Premier may be in a position to tell you to go, you should not allow him to take advantage of the entire House and me. You have allowed him to break the Rules of this House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member knows that the only way that he can criticise an action of the Chairman or of His Honour the Speaker is by a substantive motion. He knows very well that he has no authority to comment on a decision of yours.

Mr. SMITH: It is not a decision; you have not made a decision when you allowed the Hon. Premier to get up and talk all over his face.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Whenever I am in the Chair, I will rule regardless of what happens.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member knows that it is unparliamentary.

Mr. SMITH: It is unparliamentary for you to get up and talk as you like.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise here because no person has risen on any point and I, too, see no reason why I should rise on one. You have a lot of quasi-Chairman around here who should even learn to dress properly if they want to come in at meetings.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet. Will both hon. members sit? The hon. senior member for St. Peter rose - so it appears to me - because apparently the hon. junior member for St. Joseph seemed as if he had finished speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose on a point of order because it did seem to me as if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had finished.

Mr. SMITH: When the hon. member rose just now, he did not mention any point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member seems to have got excited because he was made a Vice-Chairman of his party last night.

Mr. SMITH: Be off, Sir.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is appointed by the same man who told him that he is going to make him beg his bread. 1.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members take their seats?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rose on a point of order because the hon. member took his seat; he not only shouted across the table as if he were in the Spa shouting across to Mellowes Hill; he said that you could not do so-and-so and he said that he had been the Chairman too and he accused you of your acting when you were acting as Chairman. I want to say, Sir, that nobody has shown more distinct partiality to the Party to which he belongs than he, and some of them even went into a Court and swore to things which were not true.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would not worry to reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am not surprised at the behaviour of the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, what Daniel has now come to judgment? The hon. member's behaviour has been conspicious for its disorder and now the hon. member is sheltering under these things. I am saying that he should apologise to the Chair. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking on this Resolution. *(ASIDES)* Mr. Chairman, are you hearing the hon. member?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that I have stood up in here many times and heard the Hon. Premier criticise the last Government for spending so much money on lunches.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. That is not true.

Mr. SMITH: I am saying it and nobody can stop me from talking in here. I have been elected in here just as anybody else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the Hon. Premier make his point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how the hon. member could persist in telling a deliberate untruth like this. I said it in this House - it is irrelevant, anyhow - but why should the hon. member build up a case on something which is untrue? He cannot criticise the Government; let him criticise me. What I said is that we should tighten our belts and set an example to others. I said that on the floor of this House; of course, the hon. member cannot tighten his belt, he cannot get any belt to fit him.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier can say what he likes, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter can say what he likes also; but I heard the Premier say what I have just said in Branchbury in the parish of St. Joseph. Let him deny that now. The Hon. Premier and his Cabinet know that we are supposed to sit late; they know that we are supposed to have long sittings of this House. They knew that they would have to bring down a vote of this kind for some sort of refreshments for hon. members and the staff of this House, but they wanted a majority and they said all sorts of things in order to get that majority. The Premier said that we spent the money of the poor people in Branchbury but it was not taken up there. Now the Hon. Minister of Trade has introduced a Resolution in which he is asking for money to pay for what they said they were not going to do.

The Hon. Premier referred to the question of tightening our belts, and he said that the people over here did not pay the gentleman for his refreshments, but that is not true. I know from the gentleman who did not pay. I can quite clearly see that it was the Premier's intention that the gentleman should bring in his stuff and give it away, and because he did not give it away, he has not got the money which was to be paid. It was a member of the D.L.P. who brought it in here, but now the money is to be paid for it, it has gone to somebody else. If anybody cares to go into Probyn Street, he will know who did not pay the gentleman for his lunch.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the person who cares to go into Probyn Street to know who did not pay for his lunch will not be able to say that Lloyd Smith owes him anything for that. I may say that as to what used to be served, I could not use it. I cannot eat everything; I am like the hon. senior member for the City. This is one of the things on which the present Government has backed down. Mr. Chairman, I may say that they are going to back down on a lot of things. This Government is like a motor car which has been built with all reverse gears. However you strike a gear, the car will go backwards. I do not know who is the manufacturer, but anybody will know who is the manufacturer after listening to certain speeches which have been made both on the platform outside and on the floor of this House.
1.45 p.m.

This Government's gears are all reverse gears, and no matter what driver gets into it, whenever he strikes a gear and releases the clutch, it goes back. It is going to go back all the time because it is built that way.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this Resolution because I am getting a better lunch than I ever did, but I still have my doubts as to the cost of those lovely, soft chicken legs and so on served out there. I am suspicious of the small amount for which you are asking. The gentleman over there could not raise these chickens, and that is why they pushed him out; but he is going to push them out too. (Mr. WALCOTT: Sit down; you are talking a lot of foolishness.) You cannot make me sit down. In my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, I said I was going to vote for the Resolution, because I would be dishonest, and I am not a dishonest man. I love to stick to a principle and I am going to vote for it because the lunch is good; it is too soft. I used to go down Broad Street and pay for my own lunch, but I want anybody to know that as long as it is provided, I am going to take it. The Premier used to go home, and now he stops short. However, Mr. Chairman, it is not fair to tell the electorate in this country one thing and do something else.

*Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. HUSBANDS, rose.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My eye caught the Hon. Leader of the Opposition first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter who wanted to speak and myself were the only two members in this Chamber many years ago who did not agree with members having lunch at the expense of the taxpayers. I made it quite clear that my objection at the time was not because from a physical point of view I could not partake. As a matter of fact, it was pointed out to me then that if I wanted to partake, the necessary arrangements could be made for me to have what was prescribed for me by my physician. I took that stand in those days when we met from 12 noon until 4 o'clock and the like, and as time went on and this House went into midnight and on one occasion until next morning, I changed my view and thought it was necessary to have some sort of refreshment for hon. members. However, the vote in front of us for $4,440 to me looks like a tremendous saving on what it originally was. If I am not mistaken, and I speak subject to correction because I have not got the Estimates before me, I believe the cost of feeding used to be in the vicinity of $14,000. I am one of those persons who feels that the older one gets, the more experience you have and the more you learn. What difference does it make if in a campaign the Premier, the hon. senior member for St. Peter or myself for that matter advocated at the time that members should pay for their lunch? I do not hold a man up because he has made some pronouncement on a particular occasion, or if he has become dogmatic on some particular item, and, after it has been shown to him by reason that he should change his mind, that he changes his mind. One of the greatest United States Presidents said that men who are not subject to change with reason are not suitable to be in public life.

I am voting for this Resolution, but I do not say that to mean that I am the most independent member of this House. I am voting for it, but I must take exception to the remarks made because I am defending four members of this House. The Hon. Premier made it clear that he exempted me because I did not take lunch in this House. I merely come in and exchange greetings and pass jokes with members of this House. My colleague, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, is not altogether physically fit to take meals in this House and has never done so, and I am absolutely sure and would be prepared to offer 1,000 to 1 or 1,000,000 to 1 that he would not attempt to take meals and not pay for them. With regard to the hon. junior member for Christ Church, when it was brought home to us that there would be no lunch, he made tentative and necessary arrangements for his lunch. I think the Hon. Premier made it clear that the hon. senior member for St. Michael who lives just a stone's throw from this House feels much better taking lunch with his better half and family than in here; so if the hon. member in generalising said that certain members did not pay for their lunch, I hope the Press publishes that members over here — and he exempted me and the hon. senior member for St. Michael, and he should also exempt the hon. junior member for Christ Church — are in a position to pay for their lunch and would never attempt to credit or take lunch without paying for it.
1.55 p.m.

As regards the hon. junior member for the City, he lives nearby and the type of lunch that he can give himself at his home, he cannot get here. He is also on a diet; therefore, if the Hon. Premier in generalising made those remarks, I am sorry if we should be included.

I go further than that. I do not think it was necessary for the Hon. Speaker to have made those remarks. It became very apparent to all of us that something would have to be done about the matter. I can speak on this matter without fear or favour. It was not necessary for the Speaker to draw this to the notice of the Hon. Premier because it was more than apparent to hon. members.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not understand the hon. member. I gave the reason. We actually had a crisis one day. The Government informed the Clerk that the House would be sitting late and when 7.00 o'clock came and 8.00 o'clock came, there was no food and when he got in contact with the gentleman who was to have supplied it, he said that he was not coming and he specified to me later on, though he said that he was not going to state the names of any of the members, why he did not come. I am making a statement of fact, and if each one of them gets up and want to have a revival meeting and say "not me", it is so. Hon. members were kept until 11.00 o'clock that night and the caterer refused to turn up on the ground that he was not paid.

Sir, fortunately, I was able to balance the budget this year and, therefore, the same impelling circumstances which brought about the curtailment do not actually exist now. It was not that the Speaker had to bring it forcibly to my notice, because the caterer had refused.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have now been able to say a further word, and my colleague and I must defend the members of my Party. My colleague never eats in here at all. That makes the position clear so far as we are concerned. I am still going to say what I said just now. It did not seen necessary to me soon after we had been in here to see that and the Hon. Premier made it clear on the floor of this House that he was not prepared to have lunch at all and that hon. members would have to pay for their lunch.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

*Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.*

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 o'clock p.m., the sitting of this House stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

2.00 p.m.

*On re-assembling,*

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that you instruct that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you for drawing that to my attention.

*The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.*

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18, in order to finish Government Business.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, such a question may only be proceeded with under Standing Order No. 62 after I have obtained an expression of the general assent of the House.

The Hon. Leader of the House has intimated to me that he would like to finalise the matter which was in Committee of Supply before the sitting was suspended for luncheon. Does the Hon. Leader of the House propose to deal with any other matter?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir, I wish to give notice of two Resolutions, to lay a Statement and to finalise the Resolution which is before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House proposes to deal not only with finalising the matter before the House which was in Committee of Supply, but also to give notice of two Resolutions and to lay a Statement. I think the Hon. Premier is seeking to lay the Statement. In view of Standing Order No. 62, may I have an expression of general assent of the House so as to permit the question to be put that certain Standing Orders be suspended? *(A Pause.)*

So far as I can gather, there is general assent of the House and with my consent, which I now hereby give, the Hon. Leader of the House is given the permission to move the suspension of the relevant Standing Orders in order to proceed only with the matters which he has mentioned.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

STATEMENT BY HON. PREMIER *re* CONFERENCE OF HEADS OF GOVERNMENTS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to make the following statement in connection with the second Conference of Heads of Governments of Commonwealth Caribbean Countries:-

The Premier of Barbados has agreed to meet with the Prime Ministers of Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago and the Premier of British Guiana for the second conference of Heads of Government of Commonwealth Caribbean Countries which will be held in Kingston, Jamaica, during the week commencing 12th January, 1964. The Chairman of the Conference will be the Prime Minister of Jamaica or his nominee.

2. The agenda for the conference will include *inter alia*, the following items:-

(a) The West Indies Sugar Industry – Future of
(b) The International Conference on Trade and Development
(c) Expanding trade between Caribbean Territories in Agriculture, livestock and forestry products and protecting regional production from competition of products imported from outside the region.
(d) Mutual assistance in the event of disaster striking any of the territories.
(e) Review of Development Plans for the area.
(f) Civil Aviation within and outside the region
(g) Meeting of Commonwealth Parliamentary Association – June 1964.
(h) Review of Foreign Policies pursued by the Territories.
(i) Representation in Latin America.
(j) Uniformity of Immigration Procedures.
(k) Attitude of Home Government to West Indians in the U.K.
(l) Participation in Regional Police Training College.
(m) Establishment of a Caribbean Examination Council to set, mark and standarise the G.C.E. Examination for High Schools.
(n) Co-operation and interchange of information in regard to Libraries, Archives, Museums and Archaeology.
(o) Establishment of machinery for implementing the Resolutions of the Conference of Commonwealth Caribbean Countries of July 1963, on economic and technical aid.

2.40 p.m.

3. The Barbados Delegation to the Conference will be:-

The Premier and Minister of Finance
The Minister of Education,
The Financial Secretary,
The Permanent Secretary to the Premier,
The Administrative Assistant, Economic Planning Unit,
The Personal Assistant to the Premier.

FURTHER GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted at this stage, I should like to give notice of additional items of which notice was not given earlier today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed to give those notices.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of $25,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 42, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of $231,300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1963-64, No. 41, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: 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.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the motion is put, I should like to say that before the House went into Committee of Supply to deal with the grant of the sums of money which appear on the Order Paper as Order No. 1 under public business it was made an instruction of the House when in Committee to deal with the Resolution for $59,000; but it was not made an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Resolution for $16,440 which was, as I have been made to understand, the subject of discussion.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That Resolution came in subsequently to the Resolution for $59,000. I now ask leave to add to the motion that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal also with the Resolution for $16,440. What has happened is that when I made the motion at first this other Resolution had not come down to the House.

*The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Resolution for $15,440 as well as the Resolution for $59,000, 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.*

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1963-64 No. 40

*Head 3 — Legislature — Refreshments.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were in Committee before the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking on a Resolution for the sum of $16,440 in connection with refreshments for members and the staff of the House. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I made an attempt to address you on this matter, and I was hoping that we would be able to bring back this discussion to some sort of normalcy. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has the art of getting a debate from the highest point to a very extremely low level of thinking, no matter how one may try to resist that. I was a bit shocked to think that this Resolution which deals with something in the Legislature could be regarded in the light in which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph attempted to show it. I remember that as far back as 1949 I made a statement in this Chamber that I did not consider it feasible that at that time when hon. members were being remunerated for their services, we should continue with the old practice of providing lunch for members of this Chamber. That statement was accepted by some people. I have been in public life long enough to know that you have to meet people like those in Africa who are Nomads, who drift from country to country and you have political Nomads who drift in politics in the same way. Whenever a matter like this is discussed, no matter what was said originally, these people do not have the courage of their convictions. However, Sir, this matter was continued by some groups with whom I was associated and I am very pleased to say that I do not have the honour of being associated with them any longer.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not here at present but he was making the point that this was the plank of a political platform. I want to say that no man in his senses could regard this matter as any plank in any political platform; this is something which is made as a matter of opinion. I have said that I never agreed with lunch being provided for hon. members of this House. I said that but at the same time I realised that there were certain practical difficulties. His Honour the Speaker himself has to remain in this Chamber for long periods; sometimes he has to remain for a restricted period during which he is kept in the Chair and the same thing applies to you, Mr. Chairman. There is no Trade Union with which the Staff of this House is associated and therefore there is no means of bargaining with members of the House. I was a bit hard with these members of the staff of this House who have to work for long hours on Tuesdays. It is not possible for them to have a lunch break, and even if they had a lunch tin it is not possible for them to have a dinner tin, nor is it convenient for them to have their dinner sent to them from their homes. I argued that as it was a previous arrangement that meals were provided for the members of the Staff of the House, therefore something along that line should be done for them.

The question was: How are you going to supply the members of the Staff of the House with their meals? Some of us, if we have friends coming here, would like to entertain them and I find that in other Parliaments provision is made for that. I have seen in Africa, for instance, that there is a canteen where hon. members can purchase their refreshments and they can entertain their friends in the Lobby of the Chamber. I would like to see some of these facilities being made for this Chamber for that purpose so that we might be able to have a little more freedom and a little more choice in the entertainment of some of our friends on the occasion when they pay visits to this House of Assembly.

2.50 p.m.

I think it would have been better to say that we have no provision for that, but so much capital has been made of this idea that I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wanted to make a debating point in another matter. The hon. member is not here, but I am inclined to believe that when he came in today with a question he was so obsessed with the content of that question that he felt the Government might have backed down to give some of the detractors of the Government and Union another opportunity to say they have made the Government back down, whether or not the change is a change based on sound reasoning. People do not regard it as a change, but as timidity and that you did not know what you were doing. I would say to the Hon. Premier that the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph cannot be taken seriously. He has found a new love; he has now been elevated to the position of Vice-Chairman of a Party and it looms before the hon. member's mind. I have been watching his exercise in here for some time. He is like some people who see something dangling before their eyes. He sees himself as some future Minister, because ministerial rank seems to go more with potential politicians in Barbados than even to serve people in the Assembly; and when they see this potential Minister's post dangling before their eyes, they cannot contain themselves and make the same speech. The hon. member has now returned to the Chamber. I would say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has the art of getting a debate down to any level, no matter how high it was. He is like some people who can do the limbo; they can get the stick down to any level and when they cannot get to any level, they will stoop and go under it. I believe he stoops sometimes in these debates and gets them to his level. I think it was unfortunate because if you say that this was an electioneering plank of the Government, you are reducing

the people in Barbados to a low mentality where somebody is going to return you to the House on the basis that members of the House of Assembly should not be fed. I feel that too many of our politicians today want an 18th century political audience, because if you really expect that you can go to a person asking him to elect you on the basis that members of the House of Assembly are not fed, that is stupid.

I think what should be analysed, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the Government has saved an amount of $10,000, and the hon. member quite jokingly showed me today that he was eating some meat that was very soft indeed. I think he needs it because I do not believe his digestive organs are tough enough to be able to assimilate anything other than lean meat, and what he interjected to my view was a little bit below the belt in that he indicated that the caterer who has been a supporter of the Party was a bit offended now that a change has taken place and he is not now paid, and he is the type that would set out to do damage to his erstwhile friends. I believe what motivates too many people in public life today is: 'what I can do for you in public life that you will do back for me in order to give me a reward!

I do not think the refreshment debate should have reached the level of what the attitude of the caterer would be if he did not get the job of catering, and I do not think our concern was that. Our concern was that you were going to supply refreshments, and whoever does it would be paid for doing it and you would expect him to do a good job. When I came to this Chamber first, there was a caterer next door who did the job for many years, and after some members complained about the quality they were receiving, it was felt that times had moved on and the caterer was changed. That is always the prerogative, I feel, of members of the House. I am one of those members, as you know, Mr. Chairman, who do not indulge on a matter of principle, and not on the question of the fitness of my stomach. Fortunately, I can eat anything any time anywhere, but as a matter of principle, I refrain from taking lunch in the Assembly, because I consider that since 1949 I should not be a burden on the taxpayers by having them provide me with lunch one day per week. I have to provide it when the House is not meeting, and I will continue to do it even when the House is meeting. I know there are other members who are not in the same position — and I do not mean financially. There are members living in the rural areas like the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who leave home early on mornings and come to Bridgetown and would find it a bit difficult if the session goes until 8 o'clock in the evening. Some people can miss a lunch or take a sandwich, but some people who are accustomed to eating dinner find it difficult not to do that and suffer the penalties physically. There is no question of the Government using this as a plank to get people to vote for them, because the hon. member said that he heard the Premier say that in Branchbury. I have said all over the Island that I do not believe in members being fed, and I feel that if I vote for this today they can say I said it in Branchbury and yet I have voted for $4,000 to provide lunch. You vote because there are certain exigencies that compel you to do so. I do not feel — and I have spoken to the Premier myself — that the Staff should work these long hours without refreshment in view of the fact that it was a condition of employment; and though the Premier does not agree, and though it was not stipulated in the conditions of employment, this went on so long after they were employed that it became a condition of employment to feed them, and I felt that not being members and having no choice it was a bit rough, and anything that could be done to relieve them should be done.

I believe that members might take umbrage that you make provision to feed members of the Staff, because members of the Legislature may look at their position in relation to members of the Staff, and not look to their position that these are really the employees of the House and you were providing them with something they were entitled to; but members may say: "If you do that, what is going to happen to us?" As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has rightly said, he would not vote against it because from all appearances one can see that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not a person by appearance that would spurn the hospitality of good food, and I do not think that any person as affluent as he is need be in that unhappy position, because from his whole nature, both his temperament — jovial — and in his size — jolly — these are combinations that can enjoy these refreshments. I would not expect the hon. member to say he would not vote for it, but I do not think it would be fair for him to project the idea that it was used as an election gimmick to get in here.

Now that the hon. member has come back, I will say so that he can reply to it that he has fallen in love with a new position. I believe like all new loves you become a little bit infatuated and say things you really do not mean. When he made the statement that this was something said to get people to put the Government in power, I would say he had a very low impression. If the member said it in St. Joseph, I do not think that St. Joseph is any place for a political judgment more than anywhere else in the Island, because they have not so demonstrated that they can do anything different from anybody else in certain aspects of parliamentary behaviour or parliamentary representation that you can say that the people of St. Joseph are the salt of the earth and the others are no good.

3.00 p.m.

It is a clear indication that after someone said that, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that he did not agree to the idea that members should be fed. I said it too.

The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown, who is his colleague, does not partake of the lunches here, but I do not believe that he thinks that lunch should not be provided for members. My point of view was a strong one and I was very pleased indeed when the Government decided to cut out lunch. There are a lot of little frills which I think should be cut out and the money which is saved from them can be utilised in more useful pursuits.

Sir, I would appeal to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, in debates like this, if he wants to get the thin edge of the wedge at the Government, to choose the appropriate occasion. I would say it was not fair for him to do so at this time. I would put it this way. It was not true what he said at the beginning that it was part of their Manifesto and it was their platform plank.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I never mentioned the word "manifesto" anywhere at all in my speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: At some time it is difficult for some hon. members to remember all that they said, but if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would remember, he started off by saying that this matter was put to the people and he concluded by saying that it was used as a means of getting people to put you in power and now you have backed down from what you have said as you have backed down from other things. He does not understand that he cannot say that this was the manifesto of the Party because it was a political manifestation for the coming elections owing to one of them saying this thing. What I want to point out to him is that I can come in here and introduce something as a financial matter which has nothing to do with the manifesto, and that is why I say that he wanted to get the thin edge of the wedge in at something else, and was so anxious to get that wedge in with respect to backing down that he used the vote "Refreshments" which I do not think he had any right to use.

I doubt very much if this is the only vote which has come since the Government has got into power because as far as I remember, some refreshments have been served in here on a lot of occasions before.

I believe the caterer had a hard job in getting his money. As I was not a partaker of the meals, I did not enter into the feast giving but I saw members very enthusiastic and I was amused to hear that payments were not willingly coming forward as the response was to using the meals. If I am right, I heard from one source that the Hon. Premier himself was forced on one occasion to pay a bill personally in order that the person who served the meals may recoup all his expenses. I do not think it should be the case that the Hon. Premier should be called upon to pay a bill even

if the members who ran up the bill were his colleagues. If that is to be the role of a Premier along with other things which he has to do, the price is extremely high.

I will appeal to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to let us have things like this, which I regard are not serious debates, which are not debates of policy, on a higher plane. When it comes to providing meals, I would like to see members of the staff adequately provided for so that we can get the maximum of efficiency for them when they are called upon to work here for long periods.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I am not expressing any lengthy remarks for or against people providing such convenience for members of the House. I am not engaging myself in inflicting on the House any argument on that at all, but I am positively against the manner in which this vote has been introduced in here. As a matter of fact, on the very first day this new House was opened, I was shocked to hear and learn of certain scheming and insulting remarks which had been offered by people in certain responsible quarters in regard to the discontinuation of providing meals for members of the House.

As I have said in the beginning, I would not inflict any long argument about providing or not providing such convenience to members of the House of Assembly, but I must say that such a vote is introduced in a manner that I am very sure that certain members do not even know that refreshments have been provided for again to members of this Chamber. It seems to come in a sort of sly or what I would term underhand manner and I personally object to that.

Sir, I am voting against this matter because I deprecate the manner in which refreshments have been re-introduced in this Chamber. As far as providing refreshments to members of the staff and employees, I am all in agreement with that. I have no quarrel with that: but as a matter of self-pride, I personally do not, and have never, partaken of any refreshments since that statement by the Hon. Premier. I have no reflection on other hon. members who have acted otherwise. That is their personal business.

Sir, I am happy however — and this is the beginning of a happier note — while listening to the Hon. Premier to hear him say that he had no intention of denigrating members of the Opposition, and any information given to him regarding unpaid bills does not affect members of the Opposition whether they be members of one Party, of another Party or Independent members.
3.10 p.m.

I have made no such revelation. But, Sir, I find it impossible to vote on this occasion in a positive manner, or rather, in an affirmative manner and I am not at all sanguine about the manner in which this vote has been re-introduced. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is worthwhile our debating on the convenience of such a provision. I do not like so much talk about food in this House. The time may be when all hon. members may see to it that provision for the entertainment of their guests may be made by them on a more dignified footing, but that time has not yet come. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion of my remarks I am telling hon. members that I am voting against this Resolution and that is because of the manner in which the vote for refreshments has been re-introduced.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution which is before us now requires a vote of $4,440 to meet the cost of Refreshments for members and the Staff of this Chamber. There is something which moved me when I heard the Hon. Premier exclude the hon. senior member for the City from this matter. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is now entering up on the fifth or the sixth year since I entered this Chamber and I ate in this House for six months. I deem it that I can do without eating in the Luncheon room of this House whether I remain here from 1 o'clock in the day until 1 o'clock in the morning. What made me cease from partaking of meals in this House is the fact that a Resolution was brought down to this House for the sum of $6,000 which was for the purpose of increasing the amount which was previously voted and which amounted to $14,000. Mr. Chairman, it shocks my modesty to think that Ministers who were getting a remuneration of $800 per month and $90.00 a month for travelling allowance plus an entertainment allowance, should want to give one man more than $14,000 for the supply of refreshments for the staff and members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that that $14,000 was a gift to that man. I preached that in here and also on the platform outside, that this sum of $14,000 which was being paid for refreshments in this House could better be spent in building roads or repairing schools; I said that it could be spent for the benefit of the community rather than be spent for refreshments for the staff and members of this House of Assembly. I thought that that was an advantage which was being taken of the poor taxpayers. I am the least among the apostles: and if I find it possible to do without refreshments, then I feel that all hon. members should be able to do the same. I preached that at the last Election and I will preach it again if I have to do so; I have preached that we should come in here at a respectable hour when we would have taken our breakfast and return to our homes at a respectable hour to take our dinner, instead of waiting until 12 o'clock Noon to come here. When we come here at 12 o'clock noon, we should come here with our breakfast in our stomachs. We have just left our homes and if we sit here for two hours, have we got to eat again? Are we babies who have to look for breast milk? Mr. Chairman, we are men who can pull the yoke over the hills.

I thought that we could spend this $14,000 to better advantage. As long as I have the privilege of remaining in here, I will not cross the Dining Room of this Chamber, not even if I want somebody in there. If I want anybody in there I will wait until he comes out. If the Hon. Premier or the Hon. Leader of the House deems it fit to have long Sessions of the House, as I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter say — as a matter of fact, I believe that when any one sits here until 10 p.m. of the clock he will need something by way of refreshment; and if the Hon. Leader of the House or the Hon. Premier deems it fit to bring down this Resolution for $4,440 to meet that situation, I do not say anything about that; but what I do say is that these refreshments should not be provided in the middle of the day. When we have long sittings of this House I feel that any hon. member will want to have a check, but not me, "Homie" Corbin, because I will be checking home. I have said that I will never eat in the Lunch Room of this Chamber again.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which does not need any long discussion. I want the public to understand that it is not only the hon. senior member for the City who does not partake of any refreshments in here. "Homie" Corbin does not and will not partake of any refreshments in here as long as I am in here. I eat my meals at home and I will return home and eat them. Anyone who comes here to eat should have a check on his appetite. I do not like the idea of big men leaving their homes and coming here for refreshments. With this sum of $4,440 being provided to meet the cost of refreshments during the late sittings of the House, I say that I agree to this expenditure but I hope that it will not be increased anymore.
3.20 p.m.

I hope that I will not see this $4,000 increase at a later stage, because if it does at any time, I am going to speak against it whether the Premier or the Leader of the House brings it, because as I am the least among the apostles, if I can do without it, anyone else can do without it also.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to detain this debate this afternoon, as whenever a Resolution of this sort has come before this Honourable and ancient Chamber during my time in the House, there was always a lot of debate on it. As you know, Sir, when the Government came into power, refreshments were stopped and other arrangements were made, but due to words which came from the Premier's lips today, I am just replying to them. He said that there are certain members who owed the last caterer bills and that is why the meals were

stopped. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has defended his members, and I will stand here this afternoon and say that I never crossed the dining room for a glass of water, much less to owe a bill; therefore I would have to stand here this afternoon and make my position very clear. I do not even know what kind of meals were ever served, and if I wanted a glass of water I referred to the Speaker or the Clerk's Office. With those few words, that is all I have to say this afternoon. I am not debating the food question as this money is going to be passed, and it is a known thing that whenever you have a Bill before this House for refreshments, you will get this sort of thing. With those remarks I have cleared the air as far as I am concerned.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that from every conceivable point of view it is in extremely bad taste that this debate should have taken place on the matter before the House, and I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is to be blamed for the degeneration of the debate to the point to which it descended earlier in the day. It seems to me, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has one single ambition when he comes here on Tuesdays, and it is to hold up his Party to ridicule, to humiliate it and to expose in every conceivable fashion the sins of commission which it committed during its term of office. The Resolution before the Committee today is for the sum of $4,440 for providing refreshments for hon. members and the Staff for an entire year. I pointed out that up to 5th November the expenditure incurred was a little over $2,000, we have had five or six meetings since then, it is estimated that there shall be a further nine between now and the end of the financial year, and the projection, Sir, is that we will need about $4,400 to cover the entire cost of expenditure for refreshments for the financial year.

Now why I say, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph seizes every possible opportunity to ridicule his Party is because if you refer to the Estimates of expenditure, you will see in the last year they were in office the expenditure under this item was $13,039; so all he has done today is to expose the extravagance of his Party while in office in this particular matter. There is a difference of over $9,000 between what they spent and what we are spending, and as has been pointed out, this expenditure has been incurred only because there has been an appreciably large number of meetings. We estimated there would be 51 by the end of the session, but some have been very protracted sessions and it was found absolutely impracticable for hon. members to leave here in the time allowed either for lunch or dinner and go outside and get refreshments and return in time. You get a single half hour for lunch and three quarters of an hour for dinner, and it is absolutely impossible for any hon. member to leave this Chamber and either go to his home, except perhaps in one or two cases like the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who lives not far away and the hon. senior member for St. Peter who invariably when he does that comes back after the session has started, and it would be absolutely impossible for the Staff to leave here and return to their homes and come back in the allowed time. On the last occasion when we adjourned the House as you will recall for members to go and get lunch and come back - just about four weeks ago - on resumption there was no quorum; and therefore, Sir, in view of the impracticability of having members go outside and get lunch or dinner and come back, and in consideration of the needs of the staff in this respect, the Government has decided that when the sessions are unduly protracted, some sort of lunch will be provided. There is neither tea nor dinner as in the case of the former regime, and the resulting saving is in the vicinity of $9,000 or $10,000 a year. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up today to debate at length on this Resolution, all he was doing, Sir, was to demonstrate to the Chamber and the public the absolute inconsideration of his Party when in power with the public purse, their extravagance in matters of this sort, and also to demonstrate simultaneously our system of saving money by the method we have adopted. In every instance in which he attempts to address the Chamber, he holds up his own Party to ridicule and criticism, and if his ambition is, as I said, every Tuesday when he comes here merely to indulge in this exercise, I suppose eventually we will have to thank him for it, but we have to reply because it involves us in a considerable waste of time which can certainly be spent in other directions, and at the same time as at the present time he succeeds in reducing the level of the debates in the Chamber to a point of which even he eventually must feel ashamed.

Mr. Chairman, nobody in this Chamber wants to think that we are going to come here to spend, as we have today, close on two hours debating whether or not hon. members who are going to spend fully nine hours - because we come here at midday and leave at 8 o'clock or 9 o'clock with merely two short breaks of half an hour at 2 o'clock and three quarters of an hour provided in the Rules at 7 o'clock - should do so without some kind of refreshment, and therefore it will mean either changing the Rules of the House, extending the time allowed for lunch and dinner, hon. members leaving and going home or to a restaurant and returning and remaining in here, perhaps, until midnight to finish our work. It would mean the employing of additional staff, because not even the House of Assembly would want to suggest that the staff should work from 12 midday to 12 midnight with just two short breaks. All things considered I think the debate on this matter has been most unfortunate, completely unnecessary; and certainly we hope that in future members of the Opposition who feel it incumbent upon them to attack in season and out of season any Government proposal will choose their ground with better care and thought.

3.30 p.m.

I merely want to say in reply to one or two remarks by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew that while on the face of it some of his observations may appear to be consistent, in many cases hon. members do not leave their homes and come straight to the House. For example, this morning members of the Government had a Cabinet meeting from 9.30 o'clock; so even the hon. member himself would not expect people to leave their homes at 9.00 o'clock and come in here to attend a full sitting of this House, say, until 7.00 o'clock tonight without eating something. If hon. members left their homes at 11.30 o'clock and came here at 12.00 (noon) his contention may be well founded. Therefore, it is not either irrational or extravagant for the Government to vote, as it proposes to do today, the sum of $4,440 for the entire year's refreshments, particularly when it is to be remembered the amount which was voted before.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I did not intend to say anything more on this Resolution, but listening to the hon. senior member for St. Philip when he said that it is my ambition every Tuesday to come in here and expose my Party, I have to reply to that. The hon. member has got it wrong. It is my ambition to come in here and expose his Party. The last Government had an Opposition to contend with which was, in the true sense of the word, an Opposition. Many Tuesdays the Opposition which is this present Government, did not allow the then Government to finish one Resolution. They talked and talked and talked. In other words, they filibustered and kept us inside here until all hours of the night; therefore, you would have to spend more on refreshments.

This present Government does not have any Opposition. Tell me the Opposition which it has when everyone is hand in glove. Everyone of them is wrapped up in one another and defends each other. There are some who even do not let the Government reply. I know of an occasion when members of the present Government had me in the Chair from 12.00 o'clock one day to six o'clock the next morning. I was in the Chair all that time right through the night, and if I did not drop my commonsense on the present lawyer, the sitting would not have ended then, because it was their intention to keep me in the Chair until the next day at the same time that we had commenced the previous day.

Very many sittings since they have come into power, they came in here at 12.00 o'clock and went on until 4.00 o'clock or 5.00 o'clock in the evening; the very latest is 7.00 o'clock; but the last Government came in here at 12.00 o'clock and had to go on until 11.00 p.m., 11.30 p.m., 12.00 midnight and even sometimes 2.00 o'clock and no work was done. Members of this Government are responsible for so

much spending on refreshments during the time of the last Government. Why? Because they kept back the business of the House. Every single one of them got up and talked and then went out and ate and then came back in and spoke again; therefore, they are responsible.

When the hon. member says that I am exposing my Government or my Party, he is entirely wrong. I am exposing them now because they were responsible for all that money which was spent on refreshments. We could have done the same thing as they are doing now. Why we could not? Right or wrong, everything which this Government does is correct to other members of the Opposition.

Now, the Hon. Minister, as Leader of the House, is accusing me of exposing my Party. That is not so in the least. Everyone knows that when the hon. senior member for St. John was in the Opposition during the time of the last Government and I was in the Chair, I could take a good nap. That hon. member can talk anybody to sleep and wake them up again and send them back to sleep. The same thing can be done by the Hon. Leader of the House. Everyone of them was a first-class talking machine. I believe machines would give out sometimes, but they were better than any talking machine. When it comes to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, all that I could say was "Oh, dear".

What is happening now? A few of us - not the Official Opposition - are responsible for opposing any measure. Bear in mind that if you think that the Government is right we do not say one word; but if they are wrong, speaking for myself, I try to show them where they are wrong and then I sit down. It was not so during their time in the Opposition because if it were not that they filibustered, they spoke very long; everyone of them got up and spoke.

I am saying now that they were, comparatively speaking when you are thinking of the Opposition which the last Government had and the Opposition which this Government has now, a powerful Opposition. The Opposition which the Government has now is no Opposition; therefore, they do not have any right to spend even as much as they are now spending on refreshments because the time of the House is not wasted as it was during the time of the last Government. Especially was this so during the election year. They jumped up at everything and they did everything, and from the House they went in the lunchroom. The present Government was responsible for a lot of the money which was being spent on refreshments during the time of the last Government.

3.40 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, do you see what I told you, Sir? The hon. member comes in here at every meeting of this House and exposes his Party. He said today that during the term of office of the last Government the Opposition was so powerful that the debates were protracted and the Sessions went on for fairly lengthy hours, but now they are in the Opposition and we are in the Government. In the final analysis I would ask: Who put us in the Government? It was not his party, but the people of this island. The people were so satisfied with the stand which we took when they were in the Government and we were in the Opposition that they are so impotent that they have not got the strength to oppose us. The hon. member has told us that we were right, the public knew we were right and in recognition of our being right they returned them in such numbers that they cannot be in any opposition to us. I knew quite well that the hon. member would have put his foot in it; he exposes the bankruptcy of his party's policies or the manner in which they were so unpopular as a result of what they did, that the public was only too glad to sweep them out of office.

Mr. Chairman, it is not true to say that because we were a powerful Opposition we were responsible for the amount of money which was spent for the provision of refreshments. The fact is that the contractor who supplied the refreshments had a contract to supply quite a number of meals every day. The contractor supplied lunch at 2 o'clock, tea at 4 o'clock and dinner at 7 o'clock, and that state of affairs existed whether the duration of the sittings of the House demanded it or not. In fact, Sir, there were numerous occasions when we ate dinner and went home. It is not true to say, therefore, that the protractedness of the debates or the potency of the Opposition necessitated the provision of three meals daily when the House was in Session; it is merely the circumstance that these things were ordered and they were provided. We did not elect ourselves to office; I might remind the hon. member that the public elected us to office, and therefore they must have been satisfied with the validity of our contention that what they were doing when they were in power was not in the best interest of the community and therefore we tried to stop them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the House says that every time I put my foot in it; well, Sir, I will say that every time he puts something else in it. I cannot say what it is. I will say, however, that the people put them in power because of the promises which they made. I therefore throw down this challenge to them; if they get back in power, if they get back in, I will walk out.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is assuming that he will be re-elected; he has a very fertile imagination. That is all I can say.

*The question that Head 3 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative.*

*A division was taken as follows:-*

*AYES: Honourables E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. CORBIN, YEARWOOD, BOVELL, WALCOTT, HOLDER, SMITH and LYNCH - 11.*

*NOES: Mr. HUSBANDS - 1.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven hon. members voting "Aye", and one hon. member voting "No". I declare that the "Ayes" have it. This Resolution has now been passed.

## HEAD 22 - PREMIER - CABINET AND GENERAL CONFERENCES AND DELEGATIONS

*Head 22 - Premier - Cabinet and General - was called.*

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the next Head of the Schedule is Head 22 - Premier - Cabinet and General - and under this Head the sum of $12,000 is being asked for relative to Conferences and Delegations. From the Note in the Addendum to the Resolution, hon. members will see that the sum of $50,000 which was provided in the Estimates for the current financial year to meet the cost of attendance by Government representatives at Conferences and other visits abroad has proved to be insufficient in order for the Government to fulfil its commitments properly. The additional sum of $12,000 is, therefore, being sought in order to supplement the vote. I need only say that it is normal, at least since I have been in this House but especially during the last six to seven years, for this particular vote to be supplemented and the commitments of the Government in this respect warrant the provision of this additional $12,000.

As is well-known, Sir, a proposed Summit Conference of the Caribbean is scheduled to be held in Jamaica on the 12th of this month; it is the second of its kind to be held this year, the first having been held in Trinidad in July, and in addition to that, the Government is committed to sending a delegation to Brazil later on this year in connection with the discussion of certain Airline rights in which the Government is deeply interested. There is to be put into effect a new International Agreement in which the United Kingdom Government itself is deeply concerned, and the special interests of Barbados require the attendance of a delegation from this island to attend these talks. The Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing will lead this delegation. The result from these talks will provide this island,

we are quite sure, with the provision of additional Airline facilities with great consequences to the promotion of our tourist trade. Mr. Chairman, in view of this and other commitments and the extra commitments which have already been undergone during the earlier part of the financial year, this additional sum is now required. I beg to move that Head 22 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, here we are again. This was one of the talks at Election time, that when the last Government was in power, the Ministers used to fly all over the world and spend endless sums of money in doing so. Now, Sir, we have already spent $50,000 on Conferences and Delegations and now we are being asked to vote another $12,000. I really thought that when I heard the promises made to the electorate and the abuse which was showered on the last Government that they were spending all the money flying all about – I really thought that the present Government would walk to these places instead of flying to them. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if some of this money has already been spent, having regard to what was said by the Hon. Minister when he was negotiating.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but he wants to know whether some of this money has already been spent. I will inform him that the amount which has already been voted is $50,000 and the expenditure on Conferences and Delegations to date is $44,459.
3.50 p.m.

In view of our commitments for the remaining three months, this amount will be required. To date only $44,000 have been spent.

Mr. SMITH: Now $50,000 were voted and the sum of $44,000 has been spent already, leaving us with $6,000.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, $44,000 have been spent and there are commitments outstanding of $4,415.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, I have to be very careful with this Minister, because he is very slow in coming out with his figures. I was going to say that he still had $6,000 in the till, but now he has very little. The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, thought I was going to travel in one direction, but the question I wanted to ask was whether some of this money had been spent on the Minister when he was negotiating to ship cassava to Germany, because we do not even have cassava sticks here, far less cassava. From the time I read in the newspaper that he was negotiating to ship cassava to Germany, I was looking around to get some cassava and I could not even get the sticks; so he must have spent some of this money in buying sticks. Among the promises made to people are cassava to Germany and a World Fair at Cave Hill. Do you know that a promise is a debt? Go on promising and do not honour the promises and see what will happen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the sum of $3,000 is going to be spent on conferences and nothing is reported when Ministers return. I know when some of them have already gone, and I hear when Rediffusion interviews them on their return; but when they come back here we do not know if they went half way or a long way, if they went and had a good time in a hotel or what they did. All I am asked to do as the people's representative is to vote the money when they call for it. It is not good enough only for us to sign a cheque for this money. As members of the House we should know everything that has been done when a Minister or member goes on these trips so as to encourage us. It is expected that they will spend an additional $12,000 before the end of the financial year. Yet we do not know what they are doing. I believe that they only put something in the paper or give an interview to make us feel good, but my feeling is that they have not done more than I would have done if I went outside. It is time for the Government to let us know something, because they accused the last Government for flying out and of living in the skies. What are they doing now? If you are not successful, please do not go back to the same place again. When we send you to throw out the net and you have not caught one fish, do not go back to that part of the sea; go to the other side where you think you will catch something. You accused the last Government of doing it, and I am going to accuse you at the next election, if I do not go to Heaven for spending all this money with the Airways.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is rather refreshing to hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph suggesting that Ministers should give an account of their stewardship when they leave the Colony and return, because there is not a single instance in which a Minister of this Government has left the country during our term of office, and not on his return made an appropriate release to the Press and public. I should like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to search his memory, and tell us, if he can, on how many occasions the Ministers in his Party's Government ever treated the public with this respect. Let him tell us if there can be found a single report in detail of the actual activity of any Minister in the past Government who left this country at public expense. As a matter of fact, Sir, this Government has now been called upon to provide money for expenses undertaken by a Minister of his Government presumably on public business on four occasions in one year in which there is no reference at all in the Government's files. Not only, Sir, did the public not get any report on his return, but you can search the Government's files endlessly in vain to try and find any mention or trace whatsoever of the public business on which the Minister went.
4.00 p.m.

This Government is now being asked to find the money which was spent by the Regional Economic Committee – a sum of $7,000 – to pay for the business done by a former Minister. Hearing the hon. member talk, you would believe that this was in excess of what they used to spend. Pick up any estimate at random and you will see what they spent. The hon. member gets on like a little infant. Either he thinks that we are completely stupid or that we have no knowledge of what went on in the past. It is true that the progress of this country would be referred to as a D.L.P. (After the Democratic Labour Party) but there were certain records kept before. You will find that every year they come in with the sum of $50,000 to be spend on Conferences and later on, they came back for an additional to the vote.

I have just picked up at random the Estimates for the year, 1959-60. That year, they had an original vote of $50,000 and then they came back for more money. In 1956-57, they spent $54,000, in 1957-58, $53,556; and if you go on, you will find that they always spent in excess of the original vote and all to their advantage.

We will do it, and we will be able to satisfy the electors that every cent spent, and every single trip made, redounded to this country. There was not a single barren trip made by any Minister in the present Government. Of all I recollect of his Government, the most outstanding thing in my memory about trips made by Ministers of the last Government, was seeing a Minister holding the head of a racehorse at some racing stable outside of London and the Minister in question spent three months out of this country saying that he was learning Hospital Administration. Perhaps, it was "Horse-spital" Administration. On each occasion when we sent out Ministers, they came back with a proper report and said what they had accomplished and what they had seen.

I happened to look at a file quite recently in which I found that the Leader of the party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs, in one year left this Island twelve times. That was the year in which you cannot find for what and why he left the Island on twelve occasions, and very soon this House would be asked to vote $12,000 because we are in honour bound to pay this money back to the Regional Economic Committee.

I am sure that we can give an absolute account of our stewardship to the people who matter – not the hon. member, but the electors of this country.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, it was revealing to hear what the Hon. Minister said. I have said in this House already that is why when I see somebody get on a cheap band wagon that I like to whip them. Before this Government came into power, I said that you should carry out a proper investigation in matters like these, just as the U.S. Government has done both in its Congress and in the Senate.

There are certain people who like to get on with a certain amount of skullduggery, and I have in my possession enough evidence to satisfy me that some people mess around with financial matters. The Hon. Minister has not called any names, but I am going to say this, and it is no secret. A former Premier of this Island had a habit of leaving the country frequently. I have been in the Workers Trade Union up to this day and an account cannot be given of $1,200 of its money. I had a check made of where money was repaid and I am prepared to go in Court and say what I know. He is a member of the I.L.O. Check up and you will find out.

Some people try to be sneaky with money. Somebody is paying your passage and you find that you are getting two passages paid while you are going on the same journey. I go to London three times a year. If I want to sneak money from my organisation, I can make them pay for my ticket although it has been paid for already by somebody else. I am not suggesting that these things were done, but an investigation should be made as to who paid for this and who paid for that before the Government is going to say that it is going to undertake these things.

A Government Minister can be very fortunate. I do not say this with any reflection on any Minister of the Government. He can get an invitation to go somewhere and the Government is committed to pay his passage but you never know what hospitality is given in the line of the same ticket. Do you know why I say that? There were some Ministers about here. They have not worked for three years and I take a simple analysis about them. If you have been employed for five years as a Minister, how much savings can you make in those five years to enable you to do certain things as I have seen done? Ministerial status came into being in 1954 and the last Government went on until 1961. That means a period of seven years. It will take either a very low standard of living to get those savings or very low standards that you can be a Minister for seven years and you can go without pay, that is to say, you get 0.0000 as a salary but on your investments and savings you can do without working for three years.
4.10 p.m.

Somebody says that you can play "warri". You can play a lot of things, but it is what you were playing when you were a Minister that can allow you to play these things now. People in these days must be very good that they can do these things but in the United States of America, as a matter of fact, an investigation would be carried out; they would want to see how much money you were saving when you were a Minister.

Notwithstanding the amount which has been spent on Conferences, I am still a little bit worried to know why it is that the Barbados Government does not participate in the I.L.O. Conferences. All of the African territories have been so forceful at the I.L.O. Conferences that it is these territories at the last meeting that have forced the South African Government to withdraw from the I.L.O. In my own province, I consider that the Barbados Government has the right of having an observer delegation at the I.L.O. in its own interest in having these persons exposed to the type of thing which goes on at the I.L.O. I consider that it is the right of the Barbados Government to be so represented. I go to Europe twice a year and it could be a trip to me in the sense of a trip; but I believe that a trip to me is another airplane journey. Too many of my colleagues have been in accidents, and I would say here that I do not think any member of this House has ever dropped to a depth of 2,000 feet in an aeroplane.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Were you afraid?

Mr. WALCOTT: There was no time for any one to be afraid. However, Sir, I feel that this Government should be represented at this Conference as a Government which is striving towards independence. Trinidad and Tobago are independent members of the I.L.O., and Jamaica is also an independent member of the I.L.O. I feel that the exposure which members get in a country will show a Government which is Socialist in its concept, that this is one of those Conferences which this Government should attend.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard politicians in the past speak critically of the Conference vote. In this House we wanted to know what are Conference votes. I think that we should be very frank about this matter. I asked my colleague, when he left here on the last occasion, how he travelled. He told me how he had travelled, and this is what I should like to say to any Minister of the Government: I feel that if the Government is sending out a delegation in the name of the Barbados Government, then that delegation should be accorded the best facilities which are offered. I do not feel that a Government delegation should travel from this island on the economy class; I feel that any Government delegation, as long as it is in the name of the Government, should be accorded a First Class passage with all the facilities which are afforded. I want to say that these First Class seats are put in aeroplanes primarily for Government people and for business people. I said many years ago that I think it would be *infra dig* to ask your Premier to be lining up and to be getting squeezed in the three-seat corner in the economy class travel, and then in Puerto Rico somebody brings in a fowl or pickled meat or something like that and you have your representative to the Conference exposed to that sort of thing. You may have an over-sized passenger squeezing you and you will find it a very difficult thing to get out if you want to go to the bath room.

I am saying that Government is Government. When you get to the particular country to which you are going, you may not live in the same suite as other people, but I think that you should be given the same accommodation. I may say that at one time I said that I was too old to travel by the Constellation flight; I preferred to travel by the Jet flight. The hon. member on my right could not afford to raise any objection to the way in which he was travelling. *(ASIDES)* He did not raise any objection because the trip might have been cancelled. *(Laughter).*
4.20 p.m.

These are some of the things which quite seriously the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself have said in here. I hope it would not be misunderstood when I say that this Government should be represented at I.L.O. conferences. I would say to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that of all the people who travel, as a non-Government person I leave this Island as frequently as some Ministers, and in some instances more often, and I do not regard that there should always be these detailed reports. You cannot expect this colonial mentality all the time, not that you would not like to hear what a Minister has to say, but Dean Rusk does not have to report to the President whenever he leaves the United States, because you have to determine some of these things as of a routine nature. If he goes to a conference in Brazil dealing with international airlines, you do not expect him to go back and report that there is sabotage and that there are flights in and out of Barbados. All these details are not discussed. I know through these visits what it is to be exposed to people of different nationalities and different characters, and that is why I am glad that the Hon. Premier went to Israel. I came back from Israel and told the Minister of Trade of the development there and that what is required in Barbados is not the Minister or one person going to a place like that, but a big trade delegation should visit Israel and some of the countries which have something in common to our own and then put them to sit down and say this is what we have seen. The Premier has been there for a period of about ten days, but he will tell you that in a country with seven inches of rain in relation to other places with 89 inches of rain, they are selling more citrus in the United Kingdom and Europe than the other places.

On this question of expenses, Mr. Chairman, you cannot be in world politics today and be nibbling at if you are going to send one person to a conference or two persons. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has to join in these things and you should take a tripartite group sometimes. Even in Commonwealth relation matters, the reason why we do not know our fellow West Indians is because we have never sent a delegation to St. Vincent or Grenada or even Montserrat that is very small. You have to expose some of your members to these things which would have a psychological bearing on them, and if the Government puts the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on a delegation, a lot of his criticism would stop, because he would become more responsible. When you leave him to St. Joseph in his group and the Labour Party, that is all he is living for. (A VOICE: He went to London.) He went to London so long ago that he has forgotten it, and it is only a memory in his life, and not a very good one at that. When it comes to these conferences which the community regards as joy rides, I feel that it puts your country and members in Parliament on delegations into contact with people, and I feel it is necessary at this stage of our existence that the country should be exposed to different things. I am satisfied in my mind with the visit to Israel of the Premier, The Minister of Agriculture has just come back from South East Asia, and any person who goes to South East Asia and has met people knows that they are teeming with ideas. When you go to Ghana or Africa you meet people teeming with ideas, and when you go to Kenya you meet a youngster like Tom Mboya and you see the vitality of a country like that; so you cannot come back here with any bogus thinking which Barbadians have that the world is waiting in Broad Street. That is the sort of exposure you want people to get so that they can make a contribution in consonance with Twentieth Century thinking. Far from spending a few pennies on people at conferences, it is well for people who have a public responsibility to be exposed to these things, and I feel very strongly that Barbados as such has not been as close to many of the world things as it should be, because if we achieve independence tomorrow you would have to send brand new people to the United Nations where the size of the building in which they sit would have them gazing in the air and they would want to take pictures before getting down to business. All these things need experience so that you know how to lobby to get what you want, but when you send new boys nobody knows them. I have some experience and know what it has meant to me in my organisation, and I know what it would mean to Government when their members are exposed to these things.

The final thing I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, while on conferences is that I think the Government must make a positive step to instal something in this Chamber that is in keeping with commonsense, so that when we have equipment in this country, it is in keeping with commonsense.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. senior member for St. Peter had to make such a long speech on this supplementary provision for conferences. I suppose when we started off in this country with the idea of Federation and having these conferences, most of us became worried of the additional expenditure it entailed, but I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter is quite right when he said that I was among the first persons in this Chamber to express the view that if people had to go to conferences, more especially the Government Ministers, they should be represented in a way that would command respect. I still feel so, and it will be recalled for the benefit of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that I was on that side of the Table when I said I did not like the idea of the now ex-Prime Minister when he was Premier in this House having to go to London and dodge about to catch a train or a bus going some place, and therefore I suggested at the time that the vote should be increased, as well as the one pound — or whatever it was — a day given to him. I was one of his opponents in this House, and I said his allowances should be increased, because I wanted it to be known that I felt Barbados should be represented in the way that a country with some dignity should be.

It appears to me from the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter that my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, has offered some criticism on the question of this vote. There must be some criticism offered, and criticism is supposed to be good in this matter; but I would never agree to have anybody represent us at any conference with the extravagance with which I have had the opportunity of seeing Grenada represented at a conference. I had the opportunity of going to a conference, and I was privileged to see that while the Barbados delegation was willing to arrive in a taxi or in an ordinary car, one set of the Grenada delegation arrived in a Humber and the Leader came in a Rolls Royce, and he did not get out until the chauffeur came to open the door. I call that all stupidness and extravagance. Fortunately for us I was watching with a very keen eye and did not see that stupidity exhibited by our Premier. If you want to get in a Rolls Royce and change four or five times before everybody gets there, I will use my tongue on you. As far as I am concerned, I am supporting the Resolution, but this does not only apply to Ministers of Government when they are going out. Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I see no reason if you are sending out the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as a delegate why he should not be treated in a similar manner to a Minister of Government. If you are a Socialist Government, you cannot select one set of people and send them one way and send another set another way. If I am spending money out of my pocket, I can do as I like; but if you are spending my money, you cannot pretend to be Socialist and say you are going this way, but because another person has not been fortunate enough to grow as tall as some men grow he should be relegated to these seats, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said.

4.30 p.m.

I am not making any reference to any Hon. Minister.

Sir, I am supporting this Resolution, and it is absolutely necessary in these days of conferences for us to have this money; but I do not want to have any extravagant practices going on as have been practised in Grenada because it is absolutely stupid for one to be renting a car and running all about. I do not want to bring out something which I know about. If the Hon. Ministers of this Government were practising some of the things which we hear of such as, how much money was spent by certain Ministers, and some people only attending the conference for one day but were using a car to take them all over London, and some people renting cars but never attending the conferences, I would not agree to this. Renting those cars can be very expensive; something like £25 a day. I am not agreeing to any of that stupidness; I pay four bobs and drive in a taxi. I know that when we attended the conference we all did go in a taxi. After all, this is not a rich country. If you want a Rolls-Royce or to get in a car with a liveried chauffeur, you should not do that at Government's expense; but if you are travelling on a plane or a ship, I say that you should go under the best conditions, but when you get to your place of destination, do not engage yourselves in any extravagant spending. I am not prepared to have you driving about in a Rolls-Royce. I am prepared to pay the expenses of your living in a comfortable hotel and other reasonable allowances. As a matter of fact, I was the member who on the floor of the House suggested to the last Government adequate subsistence allowance and they brought it down. That was the occasion when my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, along with a Minister was given the opportunity of going to England as a first-class passenger, but I believe it caused some hard feelings between him and that Minister because when they came back some very insulting and insinuating remarks were made by that Minister about the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. However, I do not think that he will object to this Resolution being passed today.

As I have said, and as he has said, we do not want to have any kind of extravagance in this matter. We were told with absolute authority that money which was spent on some of these occasions was spent very extravagantly. As far as I saw, when I was present on the delegation that went to London, the now Premier used a taxi to get him to the Conference when some small islanders who have to depend on the British Government for their existence were using a Rolls-Royce.

Sir, I think these conferences are doing very much for these islands coming together, and I hope more of the back-benchers and persons outside of the Government would be given the opportunity of having an insight into these conferences and how things are going on.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, if what the last two hon. members have said is true, why should they have criticised us so much for spending on these conferences?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, If you want to know what members of the last Government did, we were told when we were in England and we were told by the Civil Servants themselves that they did not attend the conferences at all. As a matter of fact, I was shocked when they told me what members of the last Government paid for car hire for the two weeks that they were there. One of those persons actually explained to us. As a matter of fact, when we were using a taxi he suggested to us to use a car. If I think the Hon. Premier would be as reckless as a man from Grenada, I would not vote for this. However, I have seen from my own experience that he was perfectly willing to be like other people. I was told what actually went on at these conferences and the amount of money spent. I was told that at one of these conferences one man attended the conference and the others went and watched cricket and did not go to the conference at all. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture can back me up in what I say. The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that too. I repeat, these conferences are absolutely necessary and every opportunity should be given for some of the backbenchers to sit in at these conferences and, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, see something of the working of these conferences, whether it is held in Montserrat, Grenada or some place of that sort.

It is not a matter of criticising the last Government at all. If I tell the hon. member what I know, he would be shocked. I am not prepared to do that. I commit things to memory for a long time to repeat them when the occasion arises.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that I used a taxi. It is quite true. It was only after I went into Hospital that I told them that I would use a car, but I think it cost less than £5 a day.

The position is this: where we were staying was only about a mile and a half from the place of the conference and I was accustomed to walking three miles through the same district; so I did not see with half of the journey involved why I should go to the expense of using a Rolls-Royce. Of course, it is not appropriate that Government Ministers should subjected to the kind of indignities as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas suffered. This is something which I think should be taken up with the airline companies because we have not given any instructions that a Government Minister should travel third-class because it is not expected in the countries which you visit. They are not expecting a Government Minister to come out of a third-class hatch, so to speak, and I am very much surprised to know that you allowed a Civil Servant to book his passage that way.

I have no intention of travelling third-class, and if the people of Barbados want me to travel that way, they want somebody else to lead the Government. However, certainly I do not want to see anybody indulging in the extravagance as members of the last Government did.

Now that our opponents are out of the way, we are exposing everything. We have a Public Accounts Committee: and if we had such a Committee before, none of these things would have taken place. This Committee has been in operation from this year. You would not have got a Minister going off for three months to look at hospitals, but instead of that looking at race horses.

On the last occasion, when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries attended a conference, I asked him to pass through New York on his way back. It has involved this Government in an expenditure of perhaps $300 or $400 because his passage on that occasion was paid by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; but as a result of that expenditure, the Ambassador of Uganda to the United Nations would be here next week.
4.40 p.m.

I think the press release is being made tonight on the radio, and therefore I do not think it is inappropriate for hon. members to know about it. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture gives me the authority to say that he knows about it. The Ambassador will be here as guest of the Governor for about two or three days next week, and the object of his visit will be to recruit the preliminary thirty Stenographers which he wants. Do not let us have this nonsense; do not let us talk about our spending this money and no report is brought back or that nothing results. I think it best, since the House is in Session and the Press release is being made of the Ambassador's visit, that I can say this. Our real embarrassment is that we may not find the 300 Stenographers that are wanted. I do hope that we will get these thirty Stenographers next week; we have to take the necessary steps to recruit them by the time the Ambassador gets here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, we were told in London that we paid three or four shillings for a taxi in order to get us to Marlborough House to attend the Federation Conference whereas the Leader of a Delegation had a £25 car to take him about daily. I want to say, Sir, that in view of the results achieved by the Government Ministers travelling last year this sum of $50,000 is really a bagatelle for what the results of the Ministers' travelling means to this country. When you have conferences here the expenses involved on the part of this Government, the transportation to and from the hotels and the Conference room, the entertainment allowance and so forth, all of that is included in the vote. I should like to inform hon. members at this point that last year the Prime Minister of Trinidad went on a World tour as they called it. The cost of that tour was $434,000 and not one single voice was raised in the Trinidad Legislative Council about the money which was spent. In the Estimates of Expenditure this year for Trinidad, the amount given to the Premier for travelling abroad and for attending Conferences abroad was $234,000 and now the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is talking his nonsense about our spending a sum or sums of money which they spent to the same advantage.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to waste any time, but I certainly do not want this opportunity to pass without congratulating the Hon. Minister of Agriculture on the good news which we have heard. I want to say for the benefit of the Hon. Premier that we should know this good news which has been mentioned by him first of all. On a matter of this importance, it would not matter if we had spent four thousand dollars on this passage.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should just like to inform the hon. member that this is not for domestic workers.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that it is for Stenographers.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: These jobs would be jobs for Stenographers leaving the Secondary Schools of this island, which would be a different thing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, one of the biggest arguments I had with my son is that he objected most strongly to the idea of our sending out merely domestic employees to Canada because we feel that those who were students in the Dominion of Canada were looked upon as being in the same domestic class. Therefore he felt that something should be done to send out people other than domestics. I pointed out that we would have to accept what we could get at the time. Young people always feel that they can turn the world upside down.

In this instance, Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow the opportunity to pass by without paying tribute to the Hon.

Minister of Agriculture for being able to get persons of the Stenographer class and of the Clerical class to Uganda. I know that Barbadians will take the opportunity of going anywhere. All of us, even the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, would pay tribute to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in getting this Ambassador to come down here. I know that the hon. junior member for the City, my colleague, will work hard to get these Stenographers out because his school is working along that line. Those of us who meet persons who are unemployed know that for every young man you have applying for a job of some sort, you have about four or five young women. If this opportunity is being offered to us through the assistance and the farsightedness of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I think that what is being done in this direction should be spread abroad.

I pay tribute to whom tribute is due; I render to Caesar the things which are Caesar's. I have only one suggestion to make, Mr. Chairman, and it is this: If the statement which has been made is correct – and I have no reason to doubt that it is correct, that is, that they want 300 Stenographers from Barbados, well then, the money spent in this direction will be well spent. These 300 girls will never forget this island of Barbados. I think that the Government should embark on a scheme where the Hon. Minister of Social Services could get these girls from the Fourth and Fifth Forms of these Secondary Schools and start our training scheme now.

4.50 p.m.

There are several people not in Government schools, and you should start a training scheme now and send the first 30 within three months and another 100 within the next six months. The Minister of Social Services, having been a schoolmaster himself, knows what it is to have these young girls going about asking for jobs. I hope he will express some views upon this. You can send 30 now and come here by next Tuesday, if necessary, with a Resolution and form some scheme by which you can train these girls so that you can be ready to send them out. I am very happy the Minister of Agriculture has been able to do this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I think I should try to allay the fears of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown by saying that it is the intention of the Government to have a special course for the training of Stenographers even if it means taking the emphasis from Greek and Scripture.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend entering on this debate at all, but in view of the references which have been made to the contribution which I have made, I think it is only appropriate that I should say a few words. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that I went as a delegate from Barbados to attend a conference in Malaysia. A short report of that conference has been prepared by me and it will be circulated to members of the Legislature very shortly. It was during my visit to the United States to attend in New York a Testimonial Dinner at Richard B. Moore, who is an ardent worker and a great friend of Caribbean people, that I had the opportunity of meeting ambassadors and envoys and representatives from various emergent nations like Ghana, Uganda, the United Arab Republic and so on, and it is as a result of attending that Testimonial Dinner that I ran into the Ambassador of Uganda and had lunch with him at the United Nations. The case of our unemployment in Barbados was put and I have been successful in securing 300 jobs for stenographers, and the first pilot scheme will be comprised of 30. The Uganda Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Kironde, will be here on 16th of this month to interview the first selection of girls whom we are trying now to get together, and we are hoping that the first sample will turn out to be successful in order to assist the hundreds of other young girls who leave school annually and who are going through typing and stenographic courses but find it difficult to get employment locally. We are striving to find employment for young girls who are leaving school and taking courses in stenography. I did not intend speaking, but as the Premier made mention of it, as a Party matter, it is something which will redound to the credit of the Government, and not to me personally.

*The question that Head 22 – Premier – Cabinet and General – 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 the sum of $16,440 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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 of six Resolutions in Committee of Supply, 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.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I will draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition Standing Order 29 (4) which reads as follows:-

"Every member of the House when he comes into the House is to take his place and not to stand in any of the passages or doors."

## THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the final matter with which we want to deal today is the Order with reference to the Resolution passed earlier in connection with the taking over of the Highways normally controlled by the Northern District Council. This is an Order to give the Department of Highways and Transport the necessary staff to cope with these increased duties. The Order is entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1964" and provides for an increase in the establishment of the Department of Highways and Transport by one post of Senior Highways Superintendent at a salary scale of $3,528 – $4,464, and five posts of Highways Superintendent at a salary scale of $1,872 – $3,384, and the above staff is required consequent, as I said, on proposals for the Department of Highways and Transport to take over from the Northern District Council 93 miles of parish roads situated in the parishes of St. Thomas, St. James and St. Peter; and to supervise the road construction work of the Housing Authority and of private developers.

The actual principle of this take-over was approved by the Legislature in Resolution No. 70/1963, and it has been found that the existing complement of staff at Highways and Transport will be unable to cope with the additional duties and responsibilities which the take-over will involve. Similarly additional staff will be required to carry out the duties in connection with the supervising of road construction work of the Housing Authority and of private developers.

5.00 p.m.

It is considered that if an officer were available to represent the Government at the construction of these roads the Government might not be saddled in future with badly constructed roads which result in a wastage of public funds to re-construct or maintain them.

The House earlier today provided the necessary funds by a Resolution for the payment of additional staff up to the end of the current financial year. This Order merely seeks to provide the posts to the Department of Highways and Transport in order to include the duties under reference.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to see this Order because I think the initiative was taken by some of us in the Northern District Council because of the inability of the Council to have the roads in that district properly done. It was a question of the staff of the Northern District Council not being properly equipped or fully qualified, and on the whole it was not regarded as a satisfactory way of how the roads were done.

However, there was one stipulation which was made when we handed the roads over to the Central Government – and this was not in any way meant to coerce the Government; but it was strongly suggested that in their taking over the roads those persons who were working with the Council and were still able and willing to work should be given due consideration. It was obvious that if the roads were to be undertaken by the Highways and Transport Department, some of these roads were roads which the Council could not do, just like that of St. John the Baptist. There is much work to be done when the Department of Highways and Transport takes over these roads and it would mean that they would have to employ more staff and when I say staff, I do not mean clerical staff only. I know, for instance, that the Northern District Council has supervisors, and I hope the Hon. Minister of Communications in his recommendations will see to it that when it comes to supervisors, we already have supervisors and persons who can be supervisors and we have sent up a list of persons who can be employed by the Department of Highways and Transport. In that list, there are one or two supervisors about whom nothing can be said.

I am saying here very strongly that those supervisors may not have anybody to press their claim, so I am asking the Hon. Minister to ask for the list which contains the names of those persons which were sent to the Minister. I am telling the Hon. Minister if he does not have that list with those names before him that he can get it because instructions were given that those names be sent up, and I hope that full consideration and priority would be given to those workers who, no doubt, should be regarded as efficient supervisors, and so on, as the case may be.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that this Resolution has come before the House this evening because it has given me a clear indication that this Government is willing to take over the full responsibility of maintaining the roads in the Northern area. The Government has already taken over the roads of three of those parishes – St. Lucy, St. Andrew and St. Joseph.

Sir, I can give you a background to this matter. I remember in former years we were forced to hand over the roads in those three parishes to the Central Government because we could not provide sufficient means of income to maintain those roads, and also because we could not construct a road in the proper way it should be constructed. We could not do half as much as we desired to do because of lack of money, and a lot of bridges in St. Andrew used to be washed away and we were not in a position to construct concrete bridges. As soon as we turned those roads over to the Highways and Transport Department, they were in a position to construct concrete bridges and construct roads as they should be constructed, and from that time the roads in St. Andrew have been kept better than we kept them. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, would admit that even in St. Lucy, which you represent, the roads are now kept so well that everybody can get out.

The Northern District Council found it impossible to carry on with the roads and to construct them as they should be, and so we asked the Central Government to take over the roads in the other three parishes – St. Thomas, St. Peter and St. James.

When we asked them to take over the roads in those parishes, I am sure that we submitted the names of all those who were working on the highways to the Ministry and asked that they be given priority in employment. I am sure when the Government takes over these roads that they will be better cared for and better maintained and they will be more lasting as a result. Some of the roads constructed by the Northern District Council in these parishes were cheaply and badly done, and as a result they could not stand the test, merely because the Council does not have the equipment to give the finishing touches to those roads. You will find that roads done by the Department of Highways and Transport stand up for any length of time, but roads which are done by the Council, instead of standing up for 16, 12 or 10 years, begin to deteriorate in a matter of three years. If we continue to keep those roads we would be spending the taxpayers' money and yet unable to give them adequate service. In other words, we were not in a position of repairing or constructing roads as they should be done. I am sure that under the Department of Highways and Transport, you will get a lasting job; therefore, you will save on your maintenance. I am sure that that Department has the equipment for the construction of those roads and that it will give a better job and as a result it would be better for the people in the whole area.

5.10 p.m.

For that cause I am glad that this Resolution has come before the House. I hope, Sir, with the hon. senior member for St. James that the Government will deem it fit to choose the people, especially those who have ability to deal with the construction of roads; I hope that the Government will deem it fit to employ the supervisors and the ablebodied workers on this work and so cut down the level of unemployment.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Resolution, I am extremely glad that the Northern District Council had the foresight to ask the Government to take over these roads. You may recall that when I first entered this Chamber I had made such a request because of the difficulties that were being experienced in this matter of road building. It is not a question that the men were not capable of building the roads, but it was because there was too much diversification among some of these little politicians. You see, Sir, every little politician wanted to be a little Premier within himself, and therefore he did not want to see that the roads are really constructed but rather to see how much things were within his purpose politically. I am therefore making this appeal to the Southern District Council. If they feel that they can build better roads than the Department of Highways and Transport, I cannot agree with them; and when I refer to better roads, I mean cheaper roads.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on this subject, I must warn the Department of Highways and Transport that they seem to be somewhat too lax. Employees are being paid to do a certain job and I feel that they should give of their fullest effort in order to do their best. If you have twelve men on a job you should not have one man working and the other eleven men being engaged in conversation. Sometimes money is voted for effecting repairs to a road, and the money is all exhausted before the road is even half way completed. That is because the road workers do not give of their best. They feel that it is the Government who is their employer and therefore they should not do too much work. They are expected to get too much for nothing. That is a very misguided idea because if they have to leave Barbados and go somewhere else to work, they will be surprised at the amount of work which they have to put in for the amount of money which they are getting. When they are doing a job nobody is expected to kill himself, but while you are not going to kill yourself you should not be killed by just walking across the street and not doing any work.

Now that the roads are being given over to the Department of Highways and Transport, I feel that they should pay attention to this matter. I have never agreed to the principle of the Northern District Council building one set of roads and the Southern District Council building another set of roads. The Bridgetown City Council does not build any roads and yet the members of that Council are elected. If the Councillors would stop trying to be dictators and premiers in their own right, then I feel that we could do a lot with what is allocated for the building of roads. In that way I feel that everybody in this island would feel a lot happier in knowing that they have done a good day's work. They will be able to say: "Well done! thou good and faithful servant". I do not know how some of these people can

really go to the paymaster at the end of the week and draw money because some of them have not worked.

When people open their mouths they refer to the poor man. I am also one of the poor men and I venture to say that there are thousands like me. We cannot be satisfied, because we have the votes of somebody else, to allow people to get away with murder in the way in which they are not working as they should be for the taxpayers' money. These people must remember that money is taken out of their pay; with the method which we have now, they must remember that they themselves are taxpayers, and that not only the rich, but also the poor are being hurt as a result of this manner of working on the roads.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who desires to contribute to this discussion before the Hon. Leader of the House replies? *(After a Pause).* There does not seem to be any other hon. member who wants to contribute to the discussion and therefore the Hon. Leader of the House can exercise his right of final reply. That is not obligatory.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the Second reading of a Bill to provide for the operation in the Island of a Company to be known as the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited and for various matters connected therewith.

However, I seem to recall that an undertaking was given that no other matter would be proceeded with today than those matters which have been completed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour is quite correct. The consideration of that Resolution brings the business of the day to an end.

SELECT COMMITTEE DISCHARGED.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Leader of the House makes the motion for the adjournment, I will take the opportunity of discharging with my thanks the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Bill to make provision for the regulating of banking and for purposes connected therewith.

The labours of that Committee have been duly completed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I also take this opportunity of acknowledging the receipt from the Accountant General of this island of his Financial Report for the month ended 31st October, 1963.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 14th January, 1964, at 12 o'clock Noon.

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

*The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 14th January, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

5.20 p.m.