

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st July, 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, J.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*) and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 14th July, 1964, have been printed and circulated, and unless there is any objection, these Minutes will be confirmed. (*A Pause*)

Hearing no objection, I declare these Minutes confirmed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected monthly Indicators - February - March, 1964;

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1964;

and finally, The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1964.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:-

Statement of Accounts of the Housing Authority for the year ended on 31st March, 1963 with the Auditor General's report thereon.

PETITION

Mr. SEALEY: On behalf of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I beg to present a Petition from Esso Stan-

dard Oil S.A. Limited praying this Honourable House to pass a Bill authorising the said company to build and establish and maintain a Jetty in the sea near Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy.

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,315 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1964-65 No. 17.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: (On Behalf of the Hon. Premier) Resolution to approve the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1964.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 10 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is now ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 5 asked by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown, is now ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give hon. members notice of the fact that the Government is proposing that on next Tuesday the House should deal with the Reply to the speech given by His Excellency the Governor. I hope the House would come prepared to deal with that matter, especially the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Resolution of which notice was given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Esso Standard Oil S. A. Limited to erect a Jetty in the sea near a parcel of land at Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy.

Mr. LOWE: To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

Will the Minister please state whether it is a fact that certain garages have been allowed to effect repairs to Government owned vehicles although such repairs could have been done by the workshop at the Department of Highways and Transport?

2. If the answer is "yes", will the Minister please state if a directive was issued in 1955 to all Government Departments, that all repairs to Government owned vehicles must be done by the Workshop at Highways and Transport?

3. If the answer is "yes", will the Minister please state whether this directive has ever been rescinded?

4. If the answer to (3) is "yes", will the Minister please state at what time and for what reasons such action was taken?

5. If the answer to (3) is "no", will the Minister please state how much repairs now fall to be done by outside garages and what are the names of the garages concerned?

6. Will the Minister please state what action he proposes to take in the circumstances?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Mr. S. E. SEALLEY, seconded by Mr. L. E. SMITH, the Bill to authorise the Esso Standard Oil S. A. Limited to erect a Jetty in the sea near a parcel of land at Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy, was read a first time.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a copy of the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st March, 1964. 12.25 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the House is currently engaged in debating the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals laid by the hon. senior member for St. John earlier this month, and it is proposed to continue the debate today. In accordance, therefore, with this decision, I am moving the suspension of the appropriate Standing Orders for the remainder of the day's sitting in order to permit of the debate taking place immediately after Government Business has been concluded. I therefore beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day therefore 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 island.

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 14

GOVERNOR — LEAVE PASSAGES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, you will note, Sir, from the Resolution which is before the Committee, that it is a Resolution for the purpose of providing the sum of \$2,400 to meet the cost of passages for His Excellency the Governor and his wife to Great Britain, in accordance with the Note to the Resolution, hon. members will see that His Excellency is desirous of visiting the United Kingdom shortly in order to attend to urgent private affairs. Due to the extension of his term of office until October 1966, His Excellency's passage is not payable by the United Kingdom Government nor will he qualify for leave with full passage paid until late in his extended term of office. This sum of money is being sought to meet the cost of these passages on the understanding that the Government will not again be required to pay leave passages for His Excellency the Governor during his tenure of office, which will be until 1966.

In other words, this payment is actually being made in advance. In the normal course of events, the passing of time would have permitted His Excellency the Governor to go to Great Britain with leave passages paid under the existing Regulations. However, since His Excellency wants to go to Great Britain now on urgent private business before his term of office has reached the point where he would have been automatically entitled to this leave passage, it has been necessary to provide by special Resolution the amount which is required for his passage to Great Britain. Having done this now, we will not be called upon during His Excellency's term of office to do it again.

Hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution that during His Excellency's period of four years and eight months' service he has only taken the following periods of leave owing to the exigencies of the service. Those periods of leave are: ten days in 1961 and one month in 1962, a total of one month and ten days after a period of four years and eight months' total service. There is one other point which I would like to make which might facilitate hon. members in resolving any doubts which they may have entertained in connection with this Resolution. His Excellency is eligible right now for 130 days' leave, and the period during which he will be away at this time is only 70 days. That should bring him down to some time in October, about the 10th or 11th of the month, about which time he should return here. His Excellency has been invited, apart from his private business as the guest of the Festival Committee in Edinburgh to see the Barbados Police Band in action during their appearance at the Edinburgh Festival of Music. In addition to his private business, His Excellency the Governor is using the opportunity to take his leave now and to accept the invitation as a guest of the Festival Committee in Edinburgh at a time when the Police Band of the territory of which he is the Officer administering the Government, is appearing as a participant in this Festival. 12.35 p.m.

This, incidentally, is of course quite an enormous symbol of prestige and achievement for the Barbados Police Band to be invited to participate in a festival as renowned as the Edinburgh Festival is. In view of all these circumstances, Sir, and as the Governor has not yet completed the minimum term of service which requires us to pay leave passage, it was not legally possible to pay the passages for himself and wife within the context of the Civil Establishment Order, 1952, therefore the only means of giving effect to His Excellency's request for payment of leave passages at this time was by permission of the Legislature which this Resolution seeks to effect.

I think, Sir, that that explains quite adequately the paragraph on this application on the part of the Governor and explains why this request should be entertained, and why it therefore seeks to get the approval of the House of Assembly for permission to advance to the Governor and his wife this amount of money. As I said, it is actually in fact paid in advance, because there will be no additional

expenditure at all in this direction for leave passages for the entire remainder of His Excellency's term of office.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the explanation given by the Hon. Leader of the House is very vague in my opinion. The Addendum reads as follows:-

"His Excellency the Governor is desirous of visiting the United Kingdom shortly to attend to urgent private affairs. Due to the extension of his term of office, until October, 1966, His Excellency's passage is not payable by the United Kingdom, nor will he qualify for leave with full passage paid until late in his extended term of office."

Now, Sir, I would not expect the Minister to tell this House what the private affairs of the Governor are, but he is still asking for public funds to pay for private business. That in my opinion does not coincide, because when we vote this money, it will be public funds to do private business. If the Governor is not qualified, well, he is the Officer....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, it is beyond the point of tolerance. I have been at pains in the most simple ABC fashion to explain the background of this Resolution; and to hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph get up and say that we are advancing public money for the Governor's private business after what the Resolution says and what I have said is honestly beyond the point of conception on the part of any normal, rational human being. It is absolutely silly. His Excellency does not confide in me nor would he be expected to tell me his private business.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: His Excellency does not confide in me nor could the Government be so rude as to even dream of asking what private business he is going on. What I said is that he is entitled during the remainder of his term of office to claim leave passages. All we are doing is advancing the money from the Treasury. Something has arisen in his private life. He has already accumulated 130 days' leave. As a matter of fact, when he took ten days in 1961, he could have taken 70 days. He did not; he preferred to remain and administer the affairs of the country. The point at issue is this: it costs \$2,400 for his wife and himself to go to Britain now. £500 for a Governor is an appreciable sum, and he has asked whether the Government would advance him the cost of passages for himself and his wife, and later on when it really accumulates and is due to him, we will already have advanced it and would not have to advance it again. Could you want anything more simple than that?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you said that is a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is a point of order, and in my opinion I will tell the hon. member for St. Joseph that the Hon. Minister has defined it. He has relieved you of the trouble of even thinking further.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member got up and said the same thing I said. I said I could not expect the Hon. Minister to tell this House the Governor's private affairs, and he got up and said the same thing. Before the Hon. Minister allowed me to finish, as usual he got up and tried to interrupt.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I am not having him say that I got up and tried to interrupt anything. The hon. member accused the Government of taking up public funds to pay for the Governor's private business. It is most reprehensible, and it is an absolutely unfair and unjust accusation; so therefore I had to do the refuting.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am going by the Addendum. The Addendum states that His Excellency is desirous of visiting the United Kingdom shortly to attend to urgent, private affairs. Well, the money we are voting here is not private money; it is the funds of the public. Would we not be voting public funds for private affairs?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear once more that all we are doing is advancing public funds to the Governor to which he will eventually be entitled for this purpose. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that we are giving the Governor public money to go on private business, but I am saying that we are advancing public money to which in the normal course of events he will be entitled. 12.45 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We have Standing Orders of this House which safeguard the integrity of the Crown; and even with respect to where hon. members are joined in debate, the best construction must be placed on the matters concerned. It is against the Standing Orders of this House to drag the Crown in controversy. I think, therefore, that the hon. member should restrain from doing that. From what the hon. member has said, the imputation is that the Queen's representative in this territory is somewhat acting dishonourably in the proposals. That is an imputation which can be put on it and I think from that point of view, the hon. member is out of order. The argument which he may use to establish his point is a different matter, but he should withdraw that quotation because it is dragging the Crown into controversy.

Mr. SMITH: I am not drawing any person into anything at all. I am not even stating whether I am in favour of the Resolution or not. As I see it, hon. members on that side of the Table are always trying to interrupt me, and they try to do so at all times.

What has happened? I have only quoted the Addendum and that has caused them to interrupt me. I can clearly see and understand that the term of office for the Officer administering the Government has been extended. Because of that, I would think that that officer might have had plans laid out to suit his term of office and, therefore, the extension may cause him now to frustrate his plans and he may not be in a position to make them right or wrong in this country; therefore, he would have to pay a visit to his homeland to change up his plans, as I would say. That is how I would take it.

Well, that is all well and good. If he has to go to his homeland to do that and it is no fault of his own whatsoever, well then, I do not know who is responsible for the extension, who has asked for it, if the Officer has asked for it, if the Government of Barbados or the British Government has asked for it. I am not saying that you should not pay his passage or do something about it, but I am saying that the wording of the Addendum is wrong and it is not clear. If the Hon. Minister had said that due to the extension of the period of the Officer administering the Government certain things which have to be done by himself personally necessitate his going on leave at the moment and that he was not at fault — it is the person who was responsible for the extension, I am sure — then no hon. member on the floor of this House would object to what this Resolution is providing for. No hon. member would object to the payment.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We did not propose to pay the Governor anything. The hon. member has said we are paying the Governor. All that we are doing is advancing him this, and this is passage money to which he is entitled.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this really shows a sign of weakness on the part of the Government. On what is the hon. member continually interrupting me? I am not out of order. If I were out of order, or misquoting the Hon. Minister, well then, he should interrupt me; but what he is

doing now is only a sign of weakness. However, he would dodge until he dodges out. The Hon. Minister has a perfect right to reply. He can make his notes and reply when the time comes; but everytime he is getting up on a point of order and I am not out of order.

I am a member of this Honourable House. I have been elected here by the electors of this country; therefore, I am stating my views whether they are right or wrong, and he will have to sit and listen to me and when the time comes he can make a reply. (*Loud Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph alone.

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying, Sir, any reasonable thinking person would have to admit that something would have to be done on the part of the Officer administering the Government, and we will be acting within our rights to vote the necessary amount for his passage. However, as I have said, I do not know who is responsible, whether it is the Government of this country or somebody else, but we will have to pay it.

Here it is, the Officer administering the Government expects to go home by a certain time, and he has made certain plans to suit that time; but with this extension of his service, he will have to frustrate them. If the Hon. Minister had pointed that out, I would not have been able to get up here and say anything at all; but the Hon. Minister goes on to say that the Officer administering the Government has also been invited to visit or watch the Police Band of Barbados somewhere. That makes me to feel that we are voting this money for the Officer to go and sit down and witness the Police Band, doing what he is accustomed to witnessing and hearing here. The Hon. Minister has also put that into it. What would one think, now that the Hon. Minister has put that in his statement? One would think that you are voting this money for the Officer administering the Government to go there and sit and listen and to hear what he is accustomed hearing here. That is why I say it is vague. Nobody at any time objects to a Resolution of this sort. Nobody would object to the Officer administering the Government attending to his private affairs. We will have to see to it. But what we have heard from the Hon. Minister in charge is that the Officer administering the Government has been invited to witness and to listen to the Police Band which has come from Barbados and which he is accustomed hearing and witnessing.

This Resolution is too vague. I am not going to oppose it except on the grounds of the vagueness of it; but we cannot object that the Leave Passage which is due to the Officer should not be paid at this particular time. We would have to pay it. But we have to object to it owing to the vagueness of it. Then, we have the simple remarks which have come from the Hon. Minister. They could not be more simple than they were.
12.55 p.m.

He is going to listen to the Police Band which is going from this country.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have the hon. member putting words in my mouth, words which I did not use. At no time did I talk any nonsense about the Governor going to listen to the Police Band. I said that the Governor has been invited by the Festival Committee to be an honoured guest at the Festival of Music in which the Barbados Police Band will be participating. I did not say any nonsense about the Governor going to listen to the Police Band.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what is happening now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has completed his speech and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was in this Chamber before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I regarded it that a point of order takes precedence over another hon. member speaking, and I expected that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had not completed his speech when the point of order was made. I thought that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was also rising on a point of order. I do not see how you, Sir, could conclude that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had completed his speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it appeared to me that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph took his seat just as the hon. senior member for St. Philip was rising. (*ASIDES*).

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Actually, Sir, I do not see that there is anything wrong with the Resolution. If it had not been for the last paragraph in the Addendum, any hon. member would be perfectly in order in questioning the validity or the wisdom of passing this Resolution. What is the position, I give as my reason for voting for this Resolution today that this Officer is entitled to leave passages, and his term of office has been extended. We have been notified of the extension of His Excellency's term of office. It would appear, therefore, that if an officer is appointed, be he Governor or anybody else, and he has been given an extended period of office, he must have made some arrangements that at that given period he would have some business to do. Whether it is a matter of private business or not does not weigh with me; what matters with me is that His Excellency is entitled to leave passages. It is stated here in the Addendum to this Resolution that:

"In the circumstances, the sum of \$2,400 is sought to meet the cost of passages for His Excellency and his wife on the understanding that the Government will not again be required to pay leave passages for His Excellency during his tenure of office."

That means that during the extension of his term of office in Barbados you will not have to do this later on, if you are doing it now, or that if you do not do it now, you will have to do it later on. All we are doing in this Resolution is accommodating somebody, and it is nothing more than what we would do for an ordinary Civil Servant.

I am quite satisfied about this matter from what has been stated in the Addendum to the Resolution. The Government has said that it will not again be required to pay this passage. What the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was saying would apply if another Resolution like this were to be brought down here in another two years' time. In that case, the hon. member would be able to say that we are breaking faith with this Chamber. I do not see that there is anything wrong in this matter and therefore I am voting for this Resolution. I criticise the Addenda to Resolutions when I find that they are not in order, but the Addendum to this Resolution is quite straightforward. As has been set out here, the Governor has had two periods of leave, one being a period of ten days when he went on the business of the "Little Eight", and the other a period of one month when he went on business connected with this country.

As to whether His Excellency is going as a guest of the Festival Committee in Edinburgh that is nothing to do with his getting leave passages now. That is how I look at the matter. His Excellency is not invited to go out of the island primarily for that occasion. As the Governor of Barbados will be in England, and the Barbados Police Band will be there, he is invited to be a guest of the Festival Committee. If the Addendum had stated "We are being asked to vote this money for the purpose of sending up His Excellency as the guest of the Festival Committee", then I would join with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and say that we do not think that this is absolutely necessary, because His Excellency could hear the Police Band here and that somebody else could go. However,

Sir, that is nothing to do with the matter, and therefore I do not agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on this occasion. The hon. member has said that he is not voting against this Resolution, but I do not see that any fuss should be made over this matter at all. It has been stated in the Addendum that this money is being voted on the understanding that the Government will not again be required to pay leave passages for His Excellency during his tenure of office. In the circumstances, I am voting for this Resolution. I did not see that the hon. senior member for St. Peter had risen before me because if anybody had risen before me, I would have taken the stand which the hon. member took. If I had been denied the right of speaking next, I would have taken that stand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Nobody rose before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It seemed to me that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had taken his seat and the Hon. Leader of the House had risen on a point of order. It seemed to me that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had already spoken. That is how it appeared to me, 1.05 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not a time waster. I have too much of an important job to do, although it appears that the House of Assembly is an excellent place where people can waste time, and unfortunately some of us are paid for it. It is no wonder that the public sometimes gets such a dim view of politicians and what we do, because we exhibit here from Tuesday a lack of real understanding of these issues. I do not want to say anything more than that. I do not regard a member rising to speak as anything important. All I say is that I am old enough to know that even an ordinary aspect of cleverness is not good enough, more so when it comes from people not capable of being clever. I am not going over the question of the Hon. Minister rising on a point of order and the hon. member not taking his seat again. That was so, and what was going on could have been seen; but you must allow people to believe that they are fooling you, even if they are fooling themselves. Moreover — it does not matter to me whether it is the Leader of the House, the Premier or a Minister — to rise during a debate in Committee on every opinion that is expressed by a member is not a point of order, because you have the right to reply as many times as you like in Committee. This has, however, given the hon. junior member for St. Joseph an opportunity to delay the matter, and then the Leader of the Opposition has added to that, because both of them talked nonsense on the matter. They just do not know anything about the laws that we have passed apparently and so do not understand why things come before us.

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about being entitled. If he were entitled, we would not have to pass a Resolution; it is because he is not entitled that we are passing the Resolution, and that is where I say we must correct this stupidity that goes on all the time. We do not have to pass Resolutions to give public servants leave passages; we put them in the Estimates and they are voted. I do not like this padding. The Head of the Administration is a good Administrator; but from what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, one can see why one stupid statement follows another. If you went by what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, this Government would be landed with a Bill from all the Civil Servants who under leave passages would apply for them; and because they were going to get leave passages two or three years from now, advancing it to them now would be something. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not know anything about it, but wants to criticise the Government on everything, and the Government itself does not know the answer to give on a very straightforward and simple matter. The position is that you therefore get a three-cornered argument with nothing in the centre.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, it is a simple matter in so far as the Head of the Administration is concerned whose term of office has been extended. Had his term ended, it would not be a question of leave passages; he would be then entitled to return to the United Kingdom on a contractual

basis. Every officer and his wife who comes here on contract has the right to go back to the place whence they came; therefore the extended period means that if the Head of the Administration had returned at the end of this period, the question of leave passages or of passages being paid would not have arisen, because there are two types of passages. There are leave passages to which officers are entitled, and ordinary passages that bring you to the job and take you back. I do not know if in the case of Governors coming out to a country the United Kingdom Government is responsible, because as he is coming from various parts of the world, the United Kingdom Government should be responsible for his passage to the territory in which he is going to take office, and it has a different valuation, because one must consider luggage and all these things when he is taking up his appointment, and when he is returning at the end of his term of office, he would be entitled to his passage.

Now, the hon. member talks about the Addendum. The Addendum states that His Excellency is going to attend to urgent private affairs, and if the Hon. Leader of the House had allowed the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to make his speech, it would have been a short, simple speech that could be dealt with promptly; but they allowed him to utilise much time to say the same thing, because the hon. member started attacking this Resolution on the grounds that we were providing money for the Head of the Administration to go on private affairs and we were voting public money for him to do so. Nothing could be more ludicrous. Not only is it ludicrous, but the hon. member tries in these Resolutions to reduce the debate to the lowest possible level and to drag down some persons in the debate by giving the impression that we were utilising public funds for the Head of the Administration to go on private business. Instead of the Hon. Leader of the House allowing the hon. member to continue to make that atrocious statement so that he could deal with it, he crossed the member to say that he did not say so. The Addendum says that he is going on private business. If the hon. member is desirous of saying that we are paying his passage to attend to private affairs, let the hon. member enjoy that, because that is his opinion. Why worry about a man's opinion on a point of order? I would not waste time rising on a point of order when I have the right to speak on this. I would say that it is extremely uncharitable in these circumstances to find that the Head of the Administration has done this and that there is a member in this Chamber resisting what we are doing. In view of the circumstances the House is asked to vote leave passages to which the Governor is not now entitled, but he will be entitled to it when his term of office expires; however, you are advancing this money to him. Since he is not entitled to it, that is why the House is asked to vote this money, because if he were entitled, the House would not have to pass a Resolution. He has not done the term of office that would entitle him to it. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Legally) The hon. member is trying to correct me, but I can correct the hon. member. There is no question of being entitled legally or illegally. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Morally) There is no question either of being entitled morally or immorally. There can be no moral side to what you are entitled to.

1.15 p.m.

The point here is that the reason why this is being brought to the House is because his term has been extended from the period that he would have returned to the United Kingdom and the extended period which he has to continue in office does not give him the right to go and draw leave passage from the Treasury; therefore, the only way to get it is for the Government and this House to advance this money. You are not entitled; but your contract makes your position liable for leave passage when you join the service. You are only entitled to it. Eligibility and entitlement are two different things. The Head of the Administration is liable, but not entitled until such time as he has worked for it. Every officer who is in the pensionable service is eligible to a pension, but he is not entitled to that pension until he has served the pensionable years of service. Because the Head of the Administration is eligible for leave passage, the Government is advancing the amount of money. It means that if he does his service before he is entitled, he would

not have been entitled to leave passage, but to a return passage to the place from which he came.

Sir, I say that because on these Civil Establishment Orders hon. members should not drag them into politics. This one is a little different in character in that this is an advance which you are making, and that is why I would have liked it to be more clearly stated. I agree that in these circumstances, the Head of the Administration is deserving of this treatment which we are giving him; but it should be made clear that notwithstanding what we do today, officers generally in the service must not regard this as a precedent, and that they can come and say now that "If it has been done to the Head of the Administration, what are you going to do about us?"

There are officers who would now come and use the Governor and all members in this Chamber for political purposes.

The longest debate which took place in this Chamber was when we were going to provide a car for the Governor. Outside of this House, members had made comparisons with the Governor, that is to say, when the Government made provision of £500 for an increase in the governor's salary, they said that other members of the Service were only getting four cents; and therefore, how can you give one man £500 and you give another only four cents. So, you can very well see from so doing that you were treating the name of the Governor in a derogatory manner.

When you start out by doing this, do not think that the Civil Servants are not going to look at what is being done. Somebody in the Civil Service is going to say that the Government has done this for the Head of the Administration; someone will come along and say that the Head of the Administration has gone away on private affairs as a result of this Resolution, that they have not had leave for the last four or six years, and they would like to have similar treatment to that which was given to the Head of the Administration.

Now, Sir, I do not protest against anybody using that argument, but you are going to get it being used because there are some people who like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would say that, addition to this, the Governor is likely to go and watch the Police Band.

I would say this. This money is being voted to send the Governor away. I am not against the Governor going to see and listen to the Police Band of Barbados anyhow. Far from that, the present Head of the Administration, in my view, is the Officer who is holding the highest position in this Island and his demeanour, conduct and otherwise, are qualities which hon. members of the House should endeavour to emulate. The Head of the Administration is efficient, unassuming and a humble man holding high office, and he has brought credit upon the office of Governor in this country. I would say, although I am not a monarchist, that in these troubled and conflicting periods it is good when you have an Administrator who can hold the balance of the community together and who does not allow the affairs of the country on the one side to overplay the other.

I will say that the Officer presently administering the Government is a man; but that does not in any way prevent me from saying that in agreeing to this Resolution, I am not agreeing on the grounds which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about because I am not agreeing that the Head of the Administration is entitled today to it. He is eligible for it, and the background is one with which you must sympathise. He is eligible for it. If he was entitled to it, you would not have to come to the House for it. There are members of the Service going away on leave passages. They are entitled to it.

However, Sir, I do not agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph dragging this debate in the mike on a simple issue like this, because I am sure any person holding the high office of Governor in these circumstances in which you have to advance leave passage, would be worthy of the post, and you do not have to make any long-winded

and scurrilous speeches on the flimsy ground that the officer is going away on urgent business. Leave passage permits you to go away on private business because you are not performing public business when you go on leave. It was stated in the Addendum that the Head of the Administration was going on urgent private affairs.
1.25 p.m.

It is a pity that the Head of the Administration had to come to the House with this thing because if I were in the position of the Head of the Administration, and a debate like this had taken place over a matter like this in which I was involved, I would have to tell the Government to allow the money to remain in the Treasury and I would go on my own. The only problem about it is that the Officer would not be any better off, because it means that leave passage is not a grant of money but a ticket, and if he pays it now, it is not to say that he will be reimbursed when the time comes. He would not be entitled to further leave passage in 1966, and therefore, from the point of view of this Government, it is not being asked to do anything more now than it would be asked to do in 1966. Therefore, instead of doing it in 1966, in these extraordinary circumstances, they are advancing this money.

Lastly, I would like to say this. If this thing had been done to another officer who is going away in different circumstances from those in which the Governor is going, we would not have heard this debate. The Governor cannot vote for anybody, and that is why, in one way or another, you can always attack anything which takes place with the Governor. As to anything which takes place with thousands of people in this island, you do not hear anything. If this were something about sending away a canecutter or something in which thousands of people were involved in this vote, you would have heard something different. Everybody would say that you could take the ends of the Treasury and give them away because it is thought that when you do that, you would always be able to get back in here.

I should like to say that principles are more important than expediency. My view is that the Governor is eligible to leave passage, and it is reasonable that we should grant this money in order that the Governor would be able to return to the United Kingdom with his leave passage. His term of office has been extended; and regardless of who has extended it, it is unnecessary to include that, because that is below the dignity of the Chamber in discussing this matter relative to the Head of the Administration. It is uncalled for, unworthy and unwarranted.

Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. Chairman, I am so seasoned a politician that even the pontifical and dogmatic style of the hon. member who has just sat down in referring to hon. members talking nonsense, would not make me rise on a point of order. I said, and I repeat, that a period of four years and eight months' service would entitle His Excellency the Governor to this treatment. It seems to me that this is only an advance; and what I was satisfied about, as I have already said, is the last paragraph of the Addendum to this Resolution in which it is stated that we would vote this money as an advance now in view of the term of office of His Excellency the Governor — a period of four years and eight months. I have never raised the question about the extension of his service and who should pay this money or not. It would appear to me that those who are responsible in the Government would know about the Governor's going to Britain and whether it was a question of leave passage or return passages, it was not necessary for me to go into that. I thank the hon. member who thinks he is enlightening me on this subject. I am never worried about getting up on a point of order, but this is a trifling case. It is no revelation to me to tell me about the eligibility of a person. It is clear as a pike-staff that at the end of this period of four years and eight months' service the Governor would be entitled to leave passages. I am a seasoned politician and I am not worried about this matter. I am satisfied that the Government must know that it is their duty at the end of five years to provide this money, and therefore His Excellency the Governor having his period of service extended, I do not question that at all. I say that they have satisfied me that his period of service has been ex-

tended, no matter who has extended it, and at the end of two years they will not be asking us to vote this money again. I did not think that any reasonable member of this House would have any objection to that. I will not, at this time of my age, rise on a point of order or anything like that; I thank the hon. member who has just sat down for his enlightening me, if he thinks he has done so.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to say one word on this Resolution. I thought that all hon. members of this Chamber would have voted for the Resolution without making any comments. When you look at the Addendum to this Resolution and you see that the Governor of this island had served for a period of four years and eight months and he only had one month and ten days' leave, I did not see the need for this debate today. All I see in the debate is that one hon. member is replying to another hon. member and they are actually wasting the time of this House. This is a matter of accumulated leave, and as far as I can see, hon. members are only making a mountain out of a molehill. I am supporting this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to speak on this Resolution at all, but after listening to hon. members, I think I should say something about it. I appreciate what has actuated the Government in bringing down this Resolution. Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I regret that the Head of the Administration had to approach the Government in a matter of this sort. I do not know what actuated the Head of the Administration to ask the Government for this sort of assistance, if I may term it so. I do not agree, however, that it is not the sort of precedent that we should not take any cognizance of. I do not agree with that at all. The Head of the Administration is the most responsible officer in this country; and apart from his pleasant virtues of which we know whenever a Resolution is presented here, it is presented without debate. The Head of the Administration did not expect to have any debate on this matter.
1.35 p.m.

I would say that there must have been some feeling of understanding that prompted the Government to act in the manner it did in bringing down this Resolution, but I can easily foresee that there are in the Public Service other officers who might find themselves on some occasion under certain circumstances that are rather peculiar and under which they may need similar aid. They may need to leave this Island before their next normal term of leave is due — and any normal thinking member can visualise that — and I do not agree with any hon. member who thinks that he should not take any cognizance of the fact that this is a precedent which is not a harmful one. I believe it is one that under similar circumstances this House would grant a similar privilege, and I repeat that there is many another responsible public officer in Barbados who might some time in the future find himself in peculiar circumstances which may warrant the granting of leave before such leave is due. I appreciate the gesture, but I am also saying that I do not appreciate the gesture because it applies here and now to the Head of the Administration; I would appreciate it even if it came to a minor officer.

Mr. Chairman, I have never taken advantage during my years in this Chamber of using the Governor's name to any advantage. If a matter which substantially concerns the Head of the Administration comes before this House, I am expected like any other hon. member to make a fair comment on it, and am entitled so to do, and I am prepared so to do. I will not at any time besmirch the name of the Head of the Administration either inside or outside of Parliament. I am one who never had to apologise for having done it here or outside, but there is no harm in saying that I would have this sort of sympathy — or whatever one may call it — extended to another officer who may find himself under similar circumstances. It may be frightfully necessary for him to leave the Island for an operation before the time of leave is due, and this Government or any Government should be mindful of the need of granting such leave again in advance.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, after reading this Resolution, I think it is properly worded, and hon. members

will see that everything is clearly set out. This Resolution seeks the sum of \$2,400 for leave passages for His Excellency the Governor and his wife. The Addendum reads as follows:-

His Excellency is desirous of visiting the United Kingdom shortly to attend to urgent private affairs. Due to the extension of his term of office, until October, 1966, His Excellency's passage is not payable by the United Kingdom Government, nor will he qualify for leave with full passage paid until late in his extended term of office.

During his four years and eight months service in Barbados, His Excellency has only taken the following periods of leave owing to the exigencies of the service —

- (a) 10 days in 1961,
- (b) 1 month in 1962.

In the circumstances, the sum of \$2,400 is sought to meet the cost of passages for His Excellency and his wife on the understanding that the Government will not again be required to pay leave passages for His Excellency during his tenure of office.

Now, Mr. Chairman, sometimes one word can cause a whole world to be set on fire. This Resolution states that His Excellency is going away on his private affairs. We know that he must have had his mind made up because his term of office would have expired at this time, but he has been granted a further term of office, and therefore he must go and attend to his business. The Addendum sets out the position quite clearly, but sometimes too much light can blind certain people. I am sorry that this debate has taken place on this Resolution, because I do not see anything in this Resolution to be worried about. Those members who do not approve of it can vote against it; but I am sure, Sir, that when this Resolution is put to the vote, there will not be one member to resist it because it is properly worded and in order. His Excellency is going on his private business, and I look forward to his return. I know that this money will be voted for an officer of such dignity. I wish that hon. members would realise what is dignity, because they would not exaggerate. I am in favour of this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, and will vote for it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I offer no apology for making a further contribution to a debate which has already been very protracted — unwarrantably so — and which, Sir, in the level of its tone and the number of issues raised during it, reflects very little credit on this Chamber. One would have thought, Sir, that part of the debate heard in here today would have been inappropriate even in a Debating Society of fourteen year olds. All the Resolution said was that His Excellency the Governor had to leave the country urgently on private business, that his period of service not yet qualified him for the payment of leave passages, and would we advance leave passages. Under the Civil Service Leave Passage Regulations, 1952, an officer has to complete a term of service of three and a half years.
1.45 p.m.

His Excellency returned here from leave passage paid to him in August, 1962; so it would not be until some time in February, 1966, that he would be again entitled to leave passage. The Resolution clearly sets out that. It says that he would not qualify for leave passage paid to him until late in his extended term of office, and we are asked to advance the sum of \$2,400 so that he would be given leave passage.

It has taken almost two hours of talk which in most cases was unnecessary. The hon. senior member for St. Peter raised the question of establishing precedent which, of course, other members of the Civil Service might be entitled to. I think if you are creating a precedent of this sort, the circumstances must warrant it. In this case, I submit that with respect to any future applications, the circumstances would have to be carefully investigated and would have to warrant it before similar concessions are granted.

In this case, the Governor did not ask for his term of office to be extended. Presumably he must have made certain commitments if under the normal circumstances he would have gone home. These commitments still exist, and under the circumstances we are asked to advance him the leave passage. It is very simple.

I never thought that this Resolution would have provoked this type of discussion which we have had on it. On the question of rising on points of order by myself or by any Minister of the Government, I am not prepared to sit here and hear myself misquoted and my remarks twisted and do not get up and correct them. The hon. senior member for St. Peter actually made the allegation that in our interrupting by points of order, we were contributing to the waste of time in the House. He then went on to state that when an hon. member makes simple statements, just as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has done, we should let him go on to make them and then deal with him. What he means is this. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph gets up and makes the most senseless statements, we should say nothing then. Imagine the hon. member getting up and saying we are voting public money to do private business! He goes on to repeat that. When he sits, up gets the hon. senior member for St. Peter and lambasts him.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter likes to do that. Well, he does that and then when he sits down, up gets the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on the back and shoulders of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. He then tries to say what he can do with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and you find that they are dealing with one another. Therefore, at the point of a misstatement or a misinterpretation you must get up and nail it then, and it must, in my opinion, make the debate shorter. It cannot protract it.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph got up and said that we are voting public funds of the Government for private business. If we had not stopped him on that, the hon. member would have spoken for about four hours this evening. You would have heard how very hard it is for the workers to get this and get that. You would have heard completely unwarranted remarks by the hon. member, and then you would hear the remarks that I sat here and allowed him to do this. We would have heard that we gave the Governor money to go and listen to the Police Band, and on that theme alone the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have taken two and a half hours.

Nobody but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said a single word about sending the Governor to listen to any Police Band. All I said was that the Governor was invited as a special guest by the Festival Committee. I thought the hon. member would have been delighted to know that the officer administering the country was in Edinburgh and was in attendance when the territory's Police Band was performing at an international show because it would be a terrific tribute to the country for the Police Band to be participating at the Edinburgh Festival. This Festival attracts Tom and Dick from all parts of the world, and a musical organisation capable of taking part in this show is something of which we should be signally proud. If the Head of the Administration or any hon. member of this House was in the place to coincide with this event, we would have been pleased to think that the country was represented by that person. I could not believe that anybody in this Chamber would have got up and twisted this thing to say that we are sending the Governor to listen to the Police Band. It is beyond conception. If I had sat here and said nothing and let him go on and amuse himself and indulge his fancy for another hour or two, that would be without any justification whatsoever.

I only mentioned this to show that it is absolutely stupid to say that a member should not rise on a point of order or any other point which permits him at the time to prevent an hon. member from wasting the time of the Chamber.
1.55 p.m.

I do feel that people like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should not come in here in the frame of mind to pick holes in places even where it is impossible to pick holes. It is not always the time to do what he thinks is securing a debating point, but he should pay proper attention to what is before the House. That, Sir, will obviate the necessity either for making points of order or correcting misinterpretations or prolonging debates unduly. Whether or not the Officer who is administering the Government was efficient, capable, a credit to the country or was carrying out his duties in the most extraordinarily satisfactory manner, the principle behind this matter is that perhaps the unexpected extension of his term of office prevented him from attending to matters to which he had earlier committed himself; but, in the ordinary course of events, His Excellency would have been entitled to leave passages. All we are doing now is to advance him this payment with the perfect understanding that neither he nor the Government would be so stupid as again, during his term of office, to come back here and expect that any similar concession will again be allowed.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 15

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$27 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65 No. 15, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

This is a very simple matter. As the Addendum explains:

"A voucher for \$26.98 was submitted to the Accountant general on the 6th March, 1964, in favour of a firm which failed to claim payment before the end of the financial year. This amount is a revote of the funds which lapsed and is to settle the outstanding account."

The support of this Chamber is solicited in order to enable the Treasury to settle this outstanding account.

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 ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 16

JUDICIARY - SPECIAL JUDICIARY EXPENSES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,400 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65 No. 16 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

This sum of money is to pay the cost of special expenses on the part of the Judiciary. The Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows:-

An appeal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court has been made in the Supreme Court case of the Sugar Producers Federation of Barbados versus Phillips *et al.* The Full Court normally consists of the Chief Justice and two Puisne Judges. In this matter, however, the Chief Justice gave judgement and a present acting Puisne Judge, whose substantive post is that of Director of Public

Prosecutions, appeared for the Defendants. Thus two judges are disqualified from sitting on the appeal.

In addition, a request has been made for the substantive action to be heard. As the judges who hear the appeal may be disqualified from hearing the substantive action this gives rise to the necessity for a third additional judge.

In the circumstances it is necessary to appoint three acting Judges of the Supreme Court, some or all of whom may have to come from overseas. Supplementary provision is accordingly sought to the sum of \$1,400 to meet the cost of passages, subsistence allowances, hotel expenses, local travelling and other necessary expenses.

These three Judges may or may not come from outside the country. If all three of them are not from outside the country and the total vote is not required, what remains of the vote will, of course, lapse in the Treasury. 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.

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

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the appropriate time to move the suspension of the sitting. I therefore beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m. of the clock.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m. of the clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.05 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. senior member for St. George for drawing it to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that there are answers ready to two Oral Questions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as you were notified, there are two answers ready; but neither of the hon. members who asked them is in his seat, and there is no point in moving that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that there is on my left no hon. member present at all. What does the Hon. Leader of the House propose now to do?

Mr. HUSBANDS and Mr. COWARD entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I propose to revert to Government Business. Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has taken his place, I will go on to Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: In Question Time, answers had been laid *inter alia* to Question No. 10 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government in view of the circumstances surrounding the Transport system of this Island consider the advisability of giving early consideration and publicising to the Report recently handed in by the Committee appointed by Government to examine and report of the said system?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"The Report of the Committee appointed to examine and make recommendations on the Transport Service of the Island is now being examined by the Government. It is proposed to publicize the Report shortly."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Minister for his Reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another Question to which the Reply has been laid, but I observe that the hon. member in whose name that Question stands is not in his place.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution *re* the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the fiscal year 1964-65. When the House was adjourned on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House seconded by the Hon. Minister of Education that further consideration of that Resolution be postponed, that was after the hon. junior member for St. John had completed his speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS and Mr. HUSBANDS rose.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I will give way to the hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving way. Like all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, I have read the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals which were laid by the Hon. Premier on 30th June this year, and I too would like to make a few comments on this Statement and Budgetary Proposals. As you know, Sir,

when this time comes around, we sometimes with much trepidation await what the Minister of Finance will tell the House and the country of the financial state of the colony and what tax proposals he is prepared to seek to impose. Most of us expected that new taxes might have been imposed, and we were a bit relieved when we read that there were no new tax proposals to be imposed on the country. That does not leave me very happy, because although there is presently a great surplus, the Hon. Premier in his Statement has informed us how that surplus is going to be expended, and that we can at the end of a year or so expect to find a considerable lessening of that surplus.

2.55 p.m.

Therefore, on the next occasion when we are here to listen to a similar statement, we expect that there will be some new taxation because the country cannot maintain and expand its services unless taxation is got; therefore, we are glad that this country has recovered from a period of stagnation. The Hon. Premier told us that it was an inheritance of this Government to be faced with a deficit, but in a matter of two years there is a surplus accruing in the vicinity of \$4.6 million.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Official Reporters are having a little difficulty in hearing the hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir, I repeat that in this Statement, we are told that the country has made a considerable recovery financially. Beginning with a deficit, matters financial have so improved that there is a surplus approaching \$4.6 million.

Indeed on the top of page two of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, there is a breakdown given which shows that for the year 1960-61, on the credit side there is \$3.3 million; for the year 1961-62, on the debit side, there is \$1.5 million; for the year 1962-63, on the credit side \$1.3 million. That is revenue over expenditure and for the year 1963-64, \$4.6 million.

Now, Sir, I am not going to risk the sort of interpretation of these Budgetary Proposals which may be considered as just political, although I have a very strong temptation to do so. But what I am concerned about is the recovery. It must have been due to something and to some extent, the explanation has been given that owing to fortuitous circumstances, there is this material surplus. It actually reads thus on page two:-

"It must be admitted that the extraordinary increase in the revenue is due to fortuitous circumstances, and that there is no assurance that these will be repeated in future years."

Is it just fortuitous? We know that the price of sugar on the free market was a considerable boost to the Island's economy, but I am surprised that there is no mention - at least I do not remember seeing any mention of it - of what revenue which may have accrued through the Deep Water Harbour. However, it can be rightly described as fortuitous. The Deep Water Harbour was opened before this Government came into power, and it is one of the assets of this country; therefore, it must have yielded a considerable amount of income and it ought to have lowered the cost of living. Those things are great assets to this country; yet I have heard no mention of them. We cannot continue to hope that these fortuitous circumstances will remain, and the Hon. Premier has said as much too, because he says that there is no assurance that these will be repeated in future years.

I have heard some very, very drastic criticism by members of an Opposition Party when the Minister of Finance at the time in what was considered a Budget Speech described the economy as buoyant. They said that it was not so. I am afraid that we do not know what to expect; and if we are relying on fortuitous circumstances as it were, the economy may still be described as buoyant. I do not think that it is the sort of guarantee that we can afford to sit on and feel smart about.

Mention has been made in the Statement about the diversification of agriculture. This Government has lauded the plan which has been run under the caption of "Buy Local." I am not so happy about this "Buy Local" campaign myself, because I have heard of a certain plantation in the parish of St. Lucy which has now turned to the diversification of agriculture and has proposed to sell these green vegetables at low prices: but in order to conform with the prices controlled by Government, they have actually to raise on the prices. That is not good. Every housewife knows that, whenever she has to depend on green vegetables that are grown locally, she is at a very great disadvantage as compared with green vegetables which are imported into this country. One of the first concerns of the Government must be to feed the people at the lowest possible prices, thereby to control the cost of living.

3.05 p.m.

One of the first concerns of the Government must be to feed its people and to control thereby the cost of living. I think if what I have heard is true about this plantation in St. Peter, the Government has got to keep a very sharp look-out, now that they have a Marketing Board, that the prices offered by that Board do not put the consumer in any financial difficulty. I think that the matter to which I have referred needs some examination by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture; it would do a lot of good, and therefore the consumers in this country should see to it that by developing a "Buy Local" Campaign, the population would not be put to any disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard very little about this Campaign and it seems as if it is dying a natural death. We still have to import foodstuffs from Canada: and when we turn to the local market for similar supplies, we can decide to 'buy foreign' and not locally.

We do not see any new income tax proposals. The Premier in his Statement has had to explain a statement which he made some time recently and which was referred to in the local Press. The Premier explained that they were taxing the rich to the limit of their capacity to pay, whilst the people who complain most are those who pay no direct taxes at all. Barbados is no exception to that very general rule. I think that of all taxation, income tax is the fairest one, and the people who earn money pay proportionately. We have no excess Profits Tax in Barbados. Companies Tax is just another form of income tax and Trade Tax is just another name for income tax; it is just a tax on trade. The reason why I say that is this. There are certain people who are able to avoid the payment of income tax, but there are certain other people who cannot hope to evade the payment of income tax. I refer to those whose salaries are evidently known to the employers and they pay income tax. They pay a fair amount of income tax. Some people make their returns themselves, and there are those who get their returns made for them. We have the particular sort of self-employed person, and a lot of money is lost in that direction. I do not see any plans being made to investigate that particular category of taxation. I think that quite a lot of money goes abegging by way of taxation.

The Hon. Premier in his Statement says this:-

"While we favour the expansion of markets for the tropical products of under-developed countries, we oppose any reduction in the preferences which we enjoy in the United Kingdom and Canada and any modification of the commodity agreement for the sale of our sugar in Britain."

Every Barbadian will be in entire agreement with that statement made by the Hon. Premier. We all know what these preferences mean to us. We all know how they benefit us, and even if we become independent we will begin to see how independent we really are. There are those countries which got independence, and as soon as they got it, the Ministers were touring around the world, making trip after trip and then they began to see how independent they really were. The moment we begin to talk about independence we are really talking about dependence. This independence is a very expensive business. It takes a lot of money to have Ministers and Trade Commissioners touring the world or

the Commonwealth in order to see how they will direct their trade to the new independent countries. As far as we, in Barbados, are concerned, we know that for a very long time now, we will be wanting these preferences from which we benefit from the United Kingdom and other parts of the British Commonwealth.

In certain parts of this Statement there is some mention made of proposed proposals, I have referred to them in that way because we do not know yet what these proposals are, and therefore they are proposed proposals. We have the proposal to effect certain improvements at Seawell International Airport. Very little information is contained in this Statement about these proposals which are not yet before us.

In connection with matters affecting the Gambling Act and the Gaming Act in Barbados, this is what appears in the Financial Statement:

It is proposed to introduce a comprehensive revision of the Gambling Act, the Gaming Act and other ancillary statutes later in the year to control these practices. The Government has no intention of legalising Casino gambling in any form.

Mr. Speaker, that will remain a controversial matter. As far as introducing these modifications or amendments to our Gambling Laws is concerned, I do not see that any considerable amount of revenue will be coming in from that direction.

Now, Sir, we come to the Civil Service. I see, Sir, that members of the Civil Service are to expect a material refund of the moneys which they have been paying into the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund, 3.15 p.m.

This House has been particularly interested for a long time now in the operation of the Widows' and Orphan's Fund for members of the Civil Service, and there have been very long and protracted negotiations between the two sides. We are all happy to see that some arrangement has been agreed upon, and that Civil Servants can now look forward in the near future to a refund of such money. That is something which has been very long awaited, and it is good to have it now as a realisation.

Reference has also been made to the new Hospital which may soon be opened. That, with the additional staff expected, will of course entail an increase in current cost. With more beds and additional staff the new Hospital will be able to cater to more people.

With regard to sports, I do not think that deserves much comment from anybody. It says that "in accordance with our policy to encourage public support for international and intercolonial cricket, tennis and athletics, I propose that the following items be deleted from the schedule to the Entertainment Tax Act, 1953."

Mr. SPEAKER: From what page is the hon. member reading?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am reading from the second paragraph on page 4. Apart from its application to the sports mentioned herein, no strict control has ever been maintained on the entertainment tax. There is a lot of entertainment that goes on in this country that is not taxed at all, and apart from cinemas, I do not think the Government has ever collected much tax from public entertainment. Now the reduction in tax on intercolonial and test cricket matches, intercolonial tennis matches and intercolonial athletics might be of some advantage to the promoters. I do not believe that the prices are going to be any lower on account of the removal of this tax; so the profits will go to the promoters unless the prices are reduced, because as soon as a tax comes off and the fare remains the same, no one has to do too much mathematics to discover the profit to those who promote the sports.

We all know, too, Mr. Speaker, that the Deep Water Harbour and Seawell Airport have a good potential, and

the more we expand Seawell, the more we can look forward to financial benefits from Seawell. I have not heard many speeches in the House, but I have heard, in many of the speeches made over the wireless in connection with the Budget Proposals, hon. members make mention of the fact that there could be imposed some sort of tax on every tourist entering this island. One or two years ago - I do not remember exactly - I made the same statement on the floor of this House. Every year tourism is on the increase in Barbados, and tourism is a thing that is volatile. Tourists flock to one part of the world for a few years, and then they leave there and go somewhere else. While the going is good we should cash in, and I agree with the hon. member who said that some sort of head tax could be imposed on tourists who come to this island. Nobody paid any attention to this statement which I made one or two years ago, but I am issuing a reminder as I understand it is again a suggestion on the floor of this House. Now that tourists are coming in greater numbers, I think we should do all we can - quite apart from making the tourists comfortable - to cash in; and if we could take as little as a shilling to land at the Deep Water Harbour or Seawell Airport, I think not an unreasonable sum might be collected by so doing.

Going back to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, I see that the Government is well disposed to the principle of equal pay for equal work applying to teachers. I wonder what the position would have been as far as female teachers are concerned with regard to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund. Nowadays women are allowed to marry - it has been so for a long time - and continue to hold their jobs in the teaching profession. Some female teachers have to provide very substantially to the maintenance of their families, and I wonder what is going to happen with the Widows' and Orphans' Fund. Now that the male members of the service are getting considerable relief from having to pay money into the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, I think that the female teachers who are sometimes responsible for the home as the men are, might also be asked to contribute to the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, because an orphan is an orphan. This scheme is supposed to be implemented by stages gradually.

I see again some consideration being given to travelling allowances. The Government in its wisdom ought to see why they should offer assistance in allowances to Civil Servants who have to travel. I do not have any criticism one way or the other to offer in that direction. 3.25 p.m.

I am glad to see that the Government has recognised that for some time now - and particularly so when the last salary increases were granted - the stage was being approached for equal pay for equal work as applied to members of the teaching profession. They have admitted that when the Hon. Premier states that it must be remembered that fifty per cent of the difference between the salaries of male and female teachers was liquidated at the time of the salaries revision in 1961 and that similar policy of equal pay was implemented over a period of seven years in the United Kingdom.

That is an admission of his responsibility as Premier of this Island.

Altogether, Sir, I would say that this Statement seems to omit some very vital Government projects, and the Hon. Premier has told us that he is not going to quote from the Economic Survey of 1961 because, as he has said, it is not quite up to date. There is one handicap. He realises that he is suffering from accuracy in what economists call the gross product of this country, and he says that to be able to get a better accuracy in estimating, he would have to get the co-operation of private business firms.

I agree with the Hon. Premier in that. But I wonder what is the inducement to private firms to give such information to the Hon. Premier or to any Premier or any Government. Private firms in their conservatism for one reason or the other like to withhold any statement dealing with their financial standing because, naturally, they will be saying that if so much of their business is known, they might be placed in a rather invidious position regarding

taxation. If legislation can compel them to do so, it should not be the first means which you should use. Obviously, they would have to co-operate; but I do not know, it is very difficult for me to imagine that very much knowledge is going to be vouchsafed by the private sector of the country, as the Hon. Premier calls it, in enabling the Government to form an accurate estimate of the gross product. It is obvious. I do not think they are going to disclose anything which would be harmful to them. I am in absolute sympathy with the Hon. Premier and I would wish that the day would soon arrive when the Hon. Minister of Finance would have full co-operation of private firms in order to determine what is necessary here, but I am in no way very hopeful at the moment.

This Government has been borrowing money for capital works and has been buying lands for public purposes, and this is where our monies are being expended. The surplus of \$4.6 million is going to be liquidated at the end of the year because he would have to stop the amount of borrowing. However, Sir, I look beyond this Budget.

In the summary of proposals at the end of this document - and I am very glad that the Hon. Premier has made a final summary - we can see that the Government has come to the conclusion that we are not going to be directly taxed; but do not forget that there is certain consumer taxation which is still going on. Those taxes have not come off. Let us not forget that the consumer taxation that was imposed twelve months ago, or thereabouts has not come off. They are still with us. We are not further taxed directly, but we have still got to watch the results of the Marketing Board to see how the cost of living is being affected.

Now, the Hon. Premier has made mention of the small traders and said that is a matter which concerns the interest of every hon. member in this House. He has noticed the number of supermarkets which have come into being recently and, as he sees it, the trend is that supermarkets are on the increase. I believe so too. However, he says that these small traders would have to conform with the times and put their houses in order.

This brings us down to this business. Where is the wherewithal to come from in order that these small traders would be able to compete with supermarkets or would be able to convert their businesses into supermarkets? That brings us right down to the Legislation which has been made mention of in the survey of 1964. Early in the year, I think hon. members of this House contributed to a debate on a Bill which brought into being some act to give wider powers to the Development Board. I think it was called The Barbados Development Bank Act. Unless the small trader is able to profit from the facilities from such an Act, I am afraid that he will not be able to get the wherewithal to transform his business and put it in a position to compete with these supermarkets.

This proposal, Sir, which deals with the removal of radio licence fee is a fee which nobody pays. Some people buy a wireless set and pay a licence fee for the first year or two, and then they never pay any more because the law is not enforced.
3.35 p.m.

The removal of that Licence fee does not mean very much. Then we have the imposition of certain charges at Seawell International Airport. These charges are justifiable because greater facilities are being offered at the Airport. As far as the other Budgetary Proposals are concerned, we have the refund of arrears of contributions paid by Civil Servants to the Widows' and Orphans' Pensions Scheme and the revision of the Leave Regulations and the terms upon which leave Passages are now granted. Well, Sir, I have been hearing about these changes for some years ago. There is nothing new about that. When we get near to independence, as we say, we will not be getting leave passages so as to leave the country. Then there is the increase in the rates of travelling allowances paid to Public Officers, and the reduction in the period of the implementation of equal pay for female teachers from five years to four years. We are only projecting ourselves one year ahead and so we

will see what the next year's Budgetary Proposals will be like. Obviously, unless these fortuitous circumstances come about again, that reduction will be something in the vicinity of one million dollars and any surplus may be reduced to a deficit.

Now, Sir, we have heard about a Planning Unit, but we have not yet seen the result of that. We have heard about new industries, but we are still suffering from great unemployment. The erection of houses has been going on at a snail's pace especially in the rural areas. Let us not shut our eyes to these things. I do not see any proposals for housing and that is a very important department. I speak for myself; and from my own observation, I say that housing is proceeding at a snail's pace in the rural parts of this island. We have got to be very careful. I do not see any stepping up of the programme in connection with housing. I hear stories which may not be authoritative and therefore I will not repeat them. I do not come in here and preach propaganda for electioneering purposes; I do my electioneering in my constituency and not in this House of Assembly. That is where I do it, and that is where I am content to do it - in my own constituency.

Mr. Speaker, there is more the sin of omission in this document than there is the sin of commission, and that is where I am at variance with this document. Much has been left out in this document, and what is included in it seems to me to be so little committed. That is my candid observation of this Financial Statement and these Budgetary Proposals. The Premier may say, as Minister of Finance, that if we tax the people they complain and if we do not tax them they also complain. I am not here to produce any Budgetary Proposals or to make any Financial Statement. We are here to receive the Financial Statement and to criticise it. That is our function in this House.

I understand that some hon. member made some mention of increasing the taxation in relation to licences for motor vehicles, since our roads are some of the best roads in the world. Let us not forget that consumer tax for motor cars, and what I say applies to all the goods which are in daily use besides vehicles. We have not got any release in certain sectors. I am very glad to hear that the Civil Servants have actually made a raid on the last Government for salary increases, and that they are relieved in two or more ways. I will not draw any conclusions which may appear to be critical from that, because it is so easy for some hon. members to take insults. However, Sir, that does not mean that I will not have my own conclusions; it only means that I will not voice my conclusions in order to save irritation.

Sir, to sum up my remarks, I should like to say that I regret that the Hon. Premier did not see fit to quote from the Economic Survey, but he ought to know what he is saying. I have made certain references as I read this Financial Statement, and I see that although the Premier does not quote, or does not advise us to quote from the Survey, some of the conclusions and some of the reasons for certain sections which are found in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals are the same as those which are found in the Economic Survey especially when it comes to crops, to the last two good sugar crops. On page 22 of the Economic Survey this is what is stated:-

"Two good sugar crops in 1962 and 1963, with especially good world market prices in the latter year, must obviously have boosted the Gross Domestic Product considerably."

Again, the same thing applies in relation to the year 1963-64.
3.45 p.m.

We do look at it, although he does not encourage us to quote from it; yet conclusions are arrived at for the same reasons in both documents.

Mr. Speaker, we have been given very little material, unless we went outside the terms of this document and outside the Budgetary Proposals, to talk about on this occasion. I am not the sort of person who would come in here and rant

about things which do not concern the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals; otherwise I could talk until tomorrow morning; but the meat is so lean that there is very little to talk about. I see more that is omitted than what is committed, and I think that as the Premier has concluded that summary at the end of the Budgetary Proposals, we can see for ourselves that what relief has been granted chiefly concerns the Civil Service and does not affect the greater part of the populace of this country.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when I rose almost an hour ago, I rose with the intention of replying to statements made by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. I hardly thought it would have been necessary for me to reply to comments made by hon. members, but after sitting and being bored for almost an hour by the hon. senior member for St. Peter - in the first place I was at a loss to understand what was being said, but I heard something about housing - I think as Minister of Housing I should take up the hon. member on that point. The hon. member said that more money should be spent on housing in the rural areas.

Now the last Government of which the hon. member was a member.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was never a member of any Government of this country.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member did not allow me to continue my statement. The hon. member was a member of the last Government Party.....

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, as a member of the Government Party, I did not have the responsibility of a Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is anticipating what I have to say. He was a member of the last Government Party until he was removed from the Chair, but he is saying that he did not have the responsibility of a Minister. Every properly run Government should listen to the representation made by any of its members, especially when those members are representatives of the people; and if more houses were to be built in the rural districts, they had quite a long time and enough funds with which to do it. They had even set aside making a contribution of \$163,000 to gratuities and pensions in order to use it in other ways, and also in building houses without doors. We have had to meet the \$163,000 when they took over which should have been paid by them, and yet we have remedied the situation by spending over \$40,000 on doors to houses which they had built. No privacy whatsoever was given to the people. They felt that the people should live like cows in a cowpen, or use bag blinds. We did not feel so. We felt that they should be given proper houses in which to live, and we have remedied that situation.

Now the hon. member referred to rural housing. I take it that the hon. member represents a rural constituency and should know something about the housing situation in the country. The hon. member should know that people in the country are not greatly interested in the houses which are built by the Government. As a matter of fact, if you carry out a survey of the occupancy rate of the houses in the rural areas built by the last Government, you will find that about 40 per cent are not occupied; so why waste taxpayers' money?

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, ... we seem to have another speaker at the end of the horseshoe.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the point of order?

Mr. HUSBANDS: No, Sir. The hon. member seems to be under the illusion that he is talking to the last Government through me. I may inform the hon. member that I speak from my own experience, and as far as applications for housing in the country are concerned, I know that the method of fulfilling these applications has been extremely slow at times. Speaking for myself in my constituency, I refer to the kind of house that the agricultural worker wants to own

and not rent. I am not now speaking of the houses in St. James or at Thorpes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may very well be a point of elucidation; it is hardly a point of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member seems to be speaking to the last Government through me.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member objects to my referring to his affiliations with the last Government or the last Government Party. It is universally known that the hon. member was a staunch and influential member of the last Government Party until the microphone was taken away from him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, is that a part of the Budgetary Proposals? Does the hon. member want me to tell the House that he applied for membership and was not accepted?

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear neither a point of order nor a point of elucidation now.
3.55 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was making a point on rural housing. I said that the hon. junior member for St. Peter should be au fait on rural housing as he is a representative of a rural constituency, and he should know better than anyone else that the amount of land which is available for Government housing projects in the rural areas is not the only land which people who live in rural areas go for. The people who live in the rural areas are interested in a half acre of land where they can do their own gardening. They do not go for houses which are built in housing areas in rural districts.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister has mistaken me. I was speaking of the type of houses which the agricultural workers go for. He has completely mistaken me.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, this Government is continuing and still continuing its policy of granting loans to sugar workers and general workers and, as a matter of fact, this Government is interested in these people so as to improve their living conditions; but where the question applies to rural districts and the building of more houses and as regards the projects which were carried out by the last Government, we are not concerned with that because it is a waste of the people's money and we prefer to give them loans. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the average peasant or general worker in the country district does not like to be too far away from his land. He likes to be his own watchman and, therefore, we have to think of the needs of the people, and the needs of the people are not more houses in a housing scheme in a rural district as the hon. junior member for St. Peter would like us to believe.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise again, on a point of order. That is the very opposite to what I said. The Hon. Minister seems to be wilfully distorting my suggestion. I was not speaking of a housing scheme at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of elucidation, not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. junior member for St. Peter referred to the provision of houses by this Government at a snail's pace. I think he was referring to certain statements which were made that the Government was not building this number of houses. I want to tell him that the present Government has spent more money annually in providing houses for the people than the last Government has done. We have spent large sums of money in taking people from living under the worst conditions in some of the worst areas and placed them in better districts, and we have also repaired their houses for them.

The other point is this. If you have a limited amount of funds to spend on houses and you spend it in repairing the houses of people whose children get wet from rain -

and, as a matter of fact, some of whose children died from pneumonia - that is what we are doing. Some of the houses which the Government has spent money on were houses built by the last Government with little or no thought about them and, therefore, we thought it better to repair these houses for the people and move them out of the slum areas. We have also loaned these people funds to repair their houses so that their children may at least escape from catching pneumonia and other ailments to which they are liable when they live under such conditions.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter has criticised the Government on its housing policy. The difference between the Party which ran the last Government of which the hon. member was an associate member and this Government is that this Government does not see the point in building new houses or building houses with the funds available and not trying to improve the standard of living of those people who have houses but do not have the wherewithal to repair them. We have been concentrating on the granting of loans to these people, and in some cases, resiting their houses at great expense in order to improve their standard of living.

Now that we have done that, -----

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that the Hon. Minister will not attempt to go too fully into Government's policy on housing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but when the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who should know better, accuses this Government of not doing all it could, it is the responsibility of the Government to reply to him. The hon. member does not know that in June, last year, people have had to run out of their houses in Martindales Road and had to attend the Hospital owing to the condition of the houses which they were in. These people may have to run out and look for shelter again. The hon. member would like to tell us that we should sit casually aside and allow this condition to continue in a developing country in the heart of the City.

Sir, I really have to reply to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, but I want to keep the record straight as regards what my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Peter said.

Now, Sir, in reply to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, the hon. member in his introduction of the Resolution mentioned the amount of money which has been spent on the construction of the new Hospital and said that the money which was spent on it to accommodate only 630 people could well be spent in building two 300-bed Hospitals.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not say so. You cannot find that in any part of the records. I do not know if the Hon. Minister is wilfully misquoting me, but I said that I do think that a Hospital at the cost of \$9 million was too expensive when you take into account the economy of the country, when you imagine that this was a country with a population of 240,000 people; and instead of your building a 630-bed Hospital for \$9 million you should have built two Hospitals.
4.05 p.m.

I was only saying that I feel that in accordance with the economy of this island, I would have preferred to see two hospitals built for that money. We may have had two hospitals for that money because you are moving from a 650-bed hospital to go to another 650-bed hospital with better conditions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of elucidation has been duly made and there is no need of any repetition.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has now said what he intended to say, but I took a note of what the hon. member said. He actually said that the money could be spent on the erection of two 300-bed hospitals.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Again, Sir, I must object to that. I am no fool. Any simple arithmetic would tell me that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order, but a point which the hon. member may have made, in connection with which he is offering an explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood in accordance with Standing Order 26 (16).

Mr. MOTTLEY: As Your Honour pleases, I was just asking this question for the benefit of the Hon. Minister. Who outside a Mental Hospital could argue that you should take the same money and erect two 300-bed hospitals? I said that the \$9 million which was used to erect this 650-bed hospital could have been used in the erection of two hospitals. I made that point abundantly clear and the whole island must have heard that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this debate, but what I said is correct. Perhaps the hon. member intended speaking about two 600-bed hospitals.

Mr. SPEAKER: Time and Hansard will tell.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member spoke about a population of 240,000 people. I have always had a very high respect for the hon. senior member for the City and for his ideas as to health and so on; but where the provision of two hospitals is concerned, the hon. member should remember that to run two large hospitals in this country would not be in keeping with the economy of the country. The old Hospital had provision for 443 beds, but it did not have the facilities of an up-to-date hospital and it cost the Government approximately \$2 1/4 million recurrent expenditure last year to run it. If we had provided two hospitals, do you not see that two hospitals either of three hundred beds or of six hundred beds - and if the hon. senior member for the City is speaking of two hospitals of 600 beds, the recurrent annual expenditure for the present 600-bed hospital will be over \$3 million a year. If we were to run two hospitals of that size, let the hon. member tell us where we would find the money to do that. We can only provide a hospital, and the number of beds in that hospital which the country can maintain.

Mr. Speaker, we have a solution to this problem and our solution is that we will provide small Cottage Hospitals. In last year's Estimates, provision was made for a re-organization of the Infirmary system. We have recently surveyed some of these Infirmaries, and work on this project will begin in a few weeks' time. That is our first step towards abolishing some of the old almshouses and keeping two of them in the North and two in the South, providing Children's Homes for the children in the North and those of the South, and also providing two District Hospitals for the North and an additional District Hospital in the South. These District Hospitals are not expensive to run; but when you provide a six hundred bed hospital or a three hundred bed hospital, that is very expensive to run. The hon. member can say what he likes to say, but if we were to provide another up-to-date 600-bed hospital with the cost of material as it is today and with the cost of labour, by the time you set about constructing another 600-bed hospital, the Barbados Workers' Union would have succeeded in securing higher wages for the workers. If we have to provide another 600-bed hospital it will cost us more than this \$9 million. It cannot cost less, not if it is to be an up-to-date hospital. I just wanted to let the hon. member know that we are aware of the problem, and we have made, and will continue to make, attempts in order to solve the health problem of the people of this country. We hope that by the end of the financial year some of the Almshouses or Infirmarys will be abolished and we will have additional District Hospitals and Children's Homes.

The hon. senior member for the City is always concerned about training for Nurses at the Hospital. In the 1963-64 Estimates when that matter was discussed, the hon. member asked certain questions and included in those questions was this one.
4.15 p.m.

The hon. member asked whether it was true that all the Student Nurses who failed had done so in anatomy and why. He asked several questions which I at the time promised to answer, and I will do so today. He also asked whether it was true that Specialists at the Hospital were attending to more private patients than public patients. This was in last year's debate when I promised to reply to the hon. member in due course. I thought the hon. member would have asked for it then, but he did not. However, to get the records straight, I would like to answer all those questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest that now is hardly an appropriate time to give the replies promised in due course, but today week when we are dealing with Government policy in all its aspects would be most appropriate. We are now dealing with the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, and I do not think that we are entitled to deal in detail with any such matters as mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Community Development and Health.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it may be appropriate today week, but I may not be here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that other of Her Majesty's Ministers would be here and would be adequately briefed by the Hon. Minister before he leaves.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I leave tomorrow, I will speak therefore on the concern of the hon. member where the nursing school is concerned. The hon. member in his address referred to the fact that Student Nurses are sent out of the Hospital because they cannot get through with the training, and they go to the United Kingdom and qualify. I should like to point out that in the course of last year there were 42 students admitted to the nursing school, of whom two resigned. One resigned a week after she went into the Hospital because she did not like nursing; she did not go there to do nursing as a calling but as a means of occupation. The other Student Nurse resigned, but not to go overseas.

Mr. Speaker, there were 27 students who resigned last year, and it has been traced that 19 of them have gone overseas. I should like to point out to the hon. member why these girls have gone overseas. It is not that they do not like the training which they get at the Hospital, but it is because the course here for a Student Nurse lasts four years. When she shall have completed her four years course here and she qualifies after passing her final examination, she is not yet a State Registered Nurse, because we do not here have reciprocity with the Nursing Council of England and Wales. She gets a R.N. Certificate but not a S.R.N. Certificate. She therefore does one year in the Hospital - which qualifies her for another three year course in an English hospital, and having been qualified after a year here, she goes to England and spends three years where she secures her State Registered Nurse Certificate. If after spending four years in Barbados she wants a S.R.N. Certificate, she has to go to England and spend another year; so she spends one year here at the Nursing School, and then goes to England for three more years where she gets her S.R.N. Certificate. That is what is responsible for girls migrating to the United Kingdom after they have passed their Preliminary Examination.

The hon. member is also worried about the fact that girls seeking entry into the Hospital as Student Nurses are turned down, and they go to England and qualify. Now I mentioned that the number of students admitted to the Hospital last year was forty-two. We do not have fewer than 500 applicants to enter the Nursing School, but we can only admit 40 or 50 annually. The hon. member may be surprised at this, but it is a question of Tutors. Right now we have on the establishment of the Hospital provision for three qualified Tutors, but we only have one qualified Sister Tutor, and we have got to use ordinary S.R.Ns and S.C.Ms to fill the two vacancies as acting appointments, because we cannot get Tutors. We had a Jamaican who was here until last year, but she has had to go to Canada to her husband. We cannot get Tutors and therefore we cannot give the training.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, is that if you have vacancies for 40 or 50 students, and you have girls leaving school with four, five and six subjects at ordinary level in the G.C.E., to whom are you going to give preference? If you are going to consider the better qualified people for your nurses, you can only consider 50 out of the five hundred. It is not infrequent that girls who apply to the Hospital for nursing do not have at least two subjects in the G.C.E., and the subjects which we demand are English or Mathematics. We ask for one of the two of these and the girls with these qualifications are allowed to write our entrance examination.

4.25 p.m.

It is not that we like turning back people. We would like to train 200, but we do not have the Tutors. We have been trying to get Tutors for the last two years and we cannot get them. We can only take in that number and we can only take the best.

On the question of girls who do not qualify here and then go abroad to England and qualify, most of the girls who go are drafted for the State Assistant Registered Nurses course, and after completing that course in two years, those who do well are admitted to the S.R.N. course. But the majority of them do not leave to go to the United Kingdom to do the S.R.N.; they go to do the S.A.R.N. This is practical nursing; but, as I have said, after two years, if they do well, the Matron at that Hospital recommends them to do the other course.

Another aspect of this is that girls from Barbados and the other Caribbean Islands when they go to the Nurses' schools in England, in which the hon. member says that they do well, the evidence from the World Health Organisation Consultants and people who are experts in this field, the literature from the Nursing Schools in England and Wales, the Canadian Nursing Association, show that these girls from the Caribbean Islands are not marked for English. Here in Barbados, we demand a high standard of English, but in England they say that proper English is a foreign language to those people and they are not marked for English; they are marked mainly for the knowledge which they have on the subject. But to tell them to sit beside a girl who has to write the examination and whose English is taken into consideration at the Hospital, they cannot measure up to the standard of the girl who is trained at the Barbados General Hospital.

I would like to point out that from 1946, immediately after the World War, there was admission for 30,000 nursing assistants in England; so that country had to drop her standard. At the same time, Canada increased her standard; and if you want to go into a nursing school in Canada, firstly, you are not paid; secondly, you must have about five or seven subjects in the G.C.E. and those subjects must include a Mathematics or Science subject and English. Those girls who go to Canada are not given any large sums for payment for the work which they do in the Hospital, but they are trained and that is why Canada pays a better salary to their qualified nurses than the United Kingdom because during the course of training, they are not paid.

Another thing is that many people who leave the Caribbean to go to Canada on the pretence of doing nursing, do not do nursing at all. They go to do assistant nursing. However, in 1962, the Nursing Council in England has been viewing with great concern the question of recruitment from the Caribbean of Student Nurses, and some of the best of schools in England are demanding the School Certificate and G.C.E. qualifications. Those schools which take people who do not have the G.C.E. qualifications are not regarded in England as up-to-date schools today.

I understand from the World Health Organisation Consultant as regards taking Student Nurses from the Caribbean that in within a short time from now, within the next two years, all of the schools in England, if you want to do nursing, are demanding that you must have G.C.E. qualifications; therefore, it would be wise for those who are aspiring and would like to do nursing to try to go to the

United Kingdom now because if they wait until next year or the year after, the doors would be closed against them inasmuch as high academic standards are being in demand. It is because the Nursing Society in England is having its demands met. As soon as they have recruited the number of Student Nurses which can run their Hospitals, there will be a ban against those people who are not qualified. Again, I repeat, that the hon. member can join me in advising our young girls who have just left school and who would like to be trained as nurses to try and do so now, because unless they can produce a school Certificate of at least four subjects, they will not be able to get into the United Kingdom Hospitals.

Sir, I think I have said enough to let the hon. member know that I am *au fait* with what is happening in the field of nursing. I have tried and I am still trying to have the problem solved here. The main problem is the shortage of Tutors. There are three Tutors on the Establishment of the Hospital, but we have one only. We have been trying to get the other two Tutors but we cannot get them.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to prolong this debate unnecessarily, but it is my duty as one of the directors in this Island's largest business called Government to report my position which I do hold as a Director in the Island of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 240,000 shareholders in the business of Government in the Island of Barbados and we on this side of the Chamber are the Directors of that Company, and the Premier is Accountant and President of this Company. The black box to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph so often refers to in this Chamber is the box that holds the shareholders accounts and decides what dividends the company is prepared to pay. 4.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the lowly person who sells ice and snowballs in the street is also in business. The lowly fishseller who enters the Market and purchases 100 fish and sets out on the highway for re-sale, is also in business and the people of this island should know and realise whence a Government receives its finance. The Ministers of the Government are the people who are entrusted with the management of the Government, and before each year starts, we should know how much in the way of dividends will be shared in that particular year. Every person who spends money to make money in any way, however little it is, is in business. If on a Sunday morning the weather appears to be cloudy and the sky is overcast, the lowly seller of the snowball with his cart will not be prepared to buy that amount of ice which he purchases on Sundays because there is the likelihood that he will not regain his money. Without money this Government could not carry out its housing programme or its water programme; it could not pay its Police Force; it could not keep running the schools; it could not subsidise and maintain the poor houses, and it could not give aid to the sick and incapacitated people of this Island. Therefore, Sir, everyone of the 240,000 people of this island is annually contributing his share to the company of which he is a shareholder.

Mr. Speaker, it is only within late years that the average citizen of this country is becoming sensible enough as to realise what a good Board the Government is operating. Prior to this Government coming into power, the lowly person in the street felt that a Government received its money as pennies dropping from Heaven, and therefore the average person had absolutely nothing to lose in making demands for idling and not producing the work which is required for a certain amount of finance. Today every man who is employed, whether it be in road works or in any other project, must realise that when he is not giving the best in his work he is not only robbing the same person from whom the pennies drop from Heaven, but he is also robbing the fellow men of his own standard and he is also robbing himself. When, at one time, certain inhabitants of this country would pass and see people idling away their time, they would simply look and laugh and consider what a smart bunch of people those people are; but today these people are realising that they are robbing themselves. Every citizen of this country will think of what the Black

Box of the Hon. Minister of Finance contains in any year. If it produces less then it should produce, I am sure that it is with a very heavy heart that the Premier would impose taxation on the people of this country. I would go as far as to say this; and it is the first time that I will mention it. I have never mentioned it to the Minister of Finance, but I felt that the Hon. Minister was in a very nice and charming mood when he made his Financial Statement and introduced the Budgetary Proposals. I knew by that that everything was good because it is with a heavy heart when the Premier has to impose taxation; but in the good mood in which the Hon. Premier was prepared to make his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals that wished well to the people of Barbados. There is nothing to complain of in this year's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals.

The hon. senior member for the City, in the course of his remarks, suggested that the Marketing Corporation should be opened throughout the night for receiving fish. I would like to say that I accept all responsibility for the Marketing Corporation not being opened after 10 o'clock p.m. as a standard rule in the island of Barbados. Prior to my assumption of office in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, I was called in at a meeting to assist in making a decision on the hours during which the Corporation should be opened for the purchasing of fish. The hours decided on were from 3.30 p.m. to 10 p.m. normally, but on several occasions it remained opened until 2 a.m. I am prepared to accept full responsibility for that as I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, to be an accomplice in poisoning people with rotten fish and thereby defeating the purpose for which the cold storage was constructed in this island.

In this island people are not sufficiently educated in the handling, storage and use of cold storage and refrigerated cargoes, and therefore they do not get the best results from these commodities. Fish landed today in the present fishing launches are of inferior lasting quality to what we received in the old sail boat, and possibly unobserved by the very fishermen. Fish caught in the sail boat received fresh air, as they were open boats, and were constantly washed by sea water, and the sails acted as wind ventilators. This was obviously more by accident than by design. Today fish are stored below deck and receive no fresh air. The heat penetrating from the engine compartment, in addition to bilge water, contaminated with mineral oils which at times come in contact with fish cause decay much sooner. Added to this, most of the fish caught today are caught in gill nets and they are pulled through tight meshes which break the tissues, and that helps to cause decay much earlier. 4.45 p.m.

If the hour of arriving is 10 o'clock at night, Mr. Speaker, that would give the average fishing boat five hours of sailing before it arrives. For instance, Mr. Speaker, if a boat did five hours' fishing and five hours' sailing, that is sufficient time for fish, in a hot room without ventilation at a temperature of over 90 degrees, to be put in cold storage or to be cooked, and I would go so far as to say that fish being brought into this country to be put into cold storage should be even of a higher standard than fish bought for consumption at the same time, because during the period that the fish is undergoing the treatment of cold storage, bacteria is still taking effect on it, and fish must be thawed out for a time before they can be eaten. If the Marketing Corporation or any business in this country selling fish sold any that could ptomaine me and I could prove it, I would be the first man in this country to lodge a suit against the owner of the business, and I am perfectly sure that I have a 99 percent chance of winning as long as my doctors could prove that I was poisoned with a commodity I bought from the cold storage, because I would have been buying fish suitable for human consumption, and if I was poisoned by it, they would have been breaking the contract I entered in purchasing that material.

The fisherman of this island, Mr. Speaker, should go out of their way to maintain a high standard and better quality fish landed in this island for the Marketing Corporation. The Marketing Corporation is at present negotiating with Canada and the United States of America for export markets for flying fish. If hon. members in this Chamber ever enter the United States and knew the requirements

under the Food and Drugs Act, they would have to do a lot and get them in there in a lot better condition than I have seen fish landed in Barbados, if they hoped to find a market in the United States. I say that without any hesitation, I had been employed as a trader in the United States and plied in moving food, vegetables and cold storage under the United States Food and Drugs Act. Only today, Mr. Speaker, the Marketing Corporation has been asked to supply shrimps for Paris in ten lots. During this debate, Sir, I will be able to say a lot more on the Marketing Corporation and the possibilities of Barbados as a first class Port of not only sea-foods but fish in general.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown also made comment on the exportation of yams from the island, and stated that what has been exported from the island has caused a shortage here. I cannot agree with him. Every estate with ten acres or over of arable land, except in the Scotland District where there are specific arrangements, is required by law to plant a minimum of 12% of the arable acreage in vegetables yearly. It must be borne in mind that yams are seasonable and perishable, and if surpluses are grown, they would be of no use after the month of May and June. The total amount of yams produced was estimated at 9,674 tons. The amount exported was 561 tons leaving approximately 8,631 tons available for local consumption after planting material of approximately 482 tons is deducted.

The United States of America, Mr. Speaker, is a very large producer of Irish potatoes; so is the Dominion of Canada, but they cannot keep a crop from one year to another of perishable commodities. Onions are one of the commodities that are seasonal, and you must dispose of them within a limited time and purchase even at a higher price from other countries whose seasons do not come inside the reaping seasons in other countries, and Barbados must learn to do the same. The yams that would have been left in this country would be no good between May and June. They would sprout, and beside that the weight would deteriorate to such an extent that it would not be worthwhile even with controlled prices to keep them, since ten tons would hardly weigh more than five tons after deterioration, and they would be of little or no value to the community.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for Christ Church made mention of larger ships to devote more time to the fishing industry. I am in agreement with the hon. member, but you cannot overnight train people to take over boats. The world's most famous fishing grounds are located off the mouths of the world's largest rivers or where two currents of varying temperatures meet. The fishing grounds in the Gulf of Mexico, off the mouth of the River Mississippi, the grounds off the mouth of the River Amazon are typical examples of fishing banks located off rivers. The Grand Banks of Newfoundland off the island of Newfoundland is an example of fishing grounds caused by a cold and a warm current meeting. Mr. Speaker, the cold current proceeding south along the coast of Labrador coming into contact with the warm Gulf Stream south of the island of Newfoundland, causes the icebergs to melt which contain minerals and fish food, and the cod and halibut feed on these banks from the deposits that come from these glaciers and icebergs yearly.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, as far as 300 miles off shore from the mouth of the Amazon River fresh water has been discovered. After heavy rains the ebb tide brings to these parts fish from fresh water which are incompetent to stem against the strong currents which become stagnated when they come into contact with the sea water, and these fish are not capable of protecting themselves from the larger fish that feed on them as bait - and fish, just like man, will feed and live where he finds his best food.

Besides that, the flow of these currents coming from thousands of miles bringing certain minerals and deposits which mix with the sea bed and form food for the fish from all parts of the ocean along these river banks. Those are the reasons why the world's best fishing grounds are situated in this vicinity.

Mr. Speaker, as an Island of only 166 square miles with an ever increasing population of over 240,000 at present, this Government is considering, as a matter of urgency, making greater use of the resources of the sea to supplement its limited land resources to provide a reasonably cheap source for the fishermen in this Island. Even large countries with great land wealth take advantage of the valuable resources of the sea which is a no-man's land not within their territorial jurisdiction.

Fortunately this Island is now moving forward at a pace that must break professional and class barriers that have stagnated many of the youth of this country, and it is these youths who must fight to maintain their rightful positions, as the children of yesterday are the men of tomorrow. No profession is degrading. No profession is so overcrowded that there is not always room at the top. It takes all types of classes to make a world, and it is just one little world where those of us who are adequately educated and trained to do the job in which we are engaged are on the high road to success. My own career is a typical example of this.

Mr. Speaker, my Ministry is actively organising Co-operative Societies through the Island for fishermen. There are six primary fishing Societies, and one secondary Society - of which these six are the members - which have been formed to deal with the insurance of boats and of fishermen as required by the Workmen's Compensation Act. These Societies have a total membership of over 400 members with capital of approximately \$5,000.

With the co-operation of these Societies, training classes for fishermen in elementary navigation will commence next week. Captain Clarke, Senior Berthing Master of the Port Department, has assured me that it will be a pleasure for him to give all assistance possible outside of his official duties; so has my son; and I am perfectly sure, should we require more help, Captain Lewis and Captain Van Stuytman of the Port Department will also be willing to give any assistance required as well as the two Tug Masters. Those are the two persons whom I have approached, and the three of us are prepared to give of our best.

It is more than 10 years ago that I have offered my assistance and suggested that a training scheme be set up for fishermen. I have written article after article on the fishing industry of this Island in the daily papers without any attention being paid to either me or the articles. Today, we are left with the same range of operation as we had in the time of our great great-grandfathers. This is the development which has taken place in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I built the first powered launch in this colony, and took it to St. Vincent with two fishermen and returned with five fishermen. I say that only to show that the fishermen were doing, and to show that it was not necessary to have any special training in navigation. I am in position to say that with a little training our fishermen can sail to any of our islands, and show that they have as much experience to handle ships just as the captains of a lot of small schooners. I have sailed between all of them, and I know how much they can do; but our unfortunate fishermen have never had the chance.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask why after two and a half years nothing is done to save these people. I am in a position to say, From the time we entered this Government, we realised what was the position, but there were offers from the United Nations to send out experts to train West Indians in fishing and navigation and all the other techniques. We have been waiting long enough on them; so we have to take the bull by the horns and start. I understand now that the ships of training will be here next year, and next month the operators will be in Barbados to set up headquarters; but if we start now, so much the better.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that it is more than 10 years ago that I have offered my assistance and suggested that a training scheme be set up for fishermen. I have written article after article on the fishing industry of this Island in the daily papers without any attention being paid to

either me or the articles. We are prepared through the Co-operative Society to give training to these men.

After the first 10 weeks of these courses we will pick out the most interested and intelligent persons from these groups for higher training. The capital investment required for one ship capable of doing the job, the hon. junior member for Christ Church has mentioned, would be equivalent to the value of approximately what it would cost to build and equip forty of our present fleet.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Barbados is only 800 miles from one of the world's largest fishing grounds, and that is off the banks of the River Amazon. These are fertile grounds and today the Japanese and the Russians are already moving from No Man's Land. The Russians, the Japanese and the Americans, nothing to do with the Dutch, the French and the Brazilians, are right alongside the border-line of one of the world's largest fishing banks. With trained men we would have a chance to develop our industry to a higher standard. The cost of one of the ships mentioned by the hon. junior member for Christ Church would be approximately what it would take to build and equip forty of our present day fleet, and no man employed in our industry would be in a financial position to attempt that venture. Therefore all of these new experiments would have to be handled through co-operative societies, and I am perfectly sure that with some training, with the geographical position of Barbados, with the facilities offered by the modern Deep Water Harbour, the fuel store and with all types of marine produce, Barbados, in a short space of time, should be one of the largest export countries for sea foods. When I say "sea foods" I do not only mean shrimps, but large quantities and all types of fish which frequent the waters in the proximity of the River Amazon. Just as the large launches draw on the wealth of No Man's Land, I do not see any reason why Barbados cannot make a move in order to share in the wealth equally as well.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR and Hon. C. E. TALMA rose to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: My eye caught the Hon. Minister of Education first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am giving way to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, now that the comments and criticisms of the Opposition Parties and certain backbenchers have been concluded - and I may say, of course, that we have been subjected to a great quantity of verbiage and, at times, a general harangue where hon. members were seeking, but could not find any good reason or good ground to offer any constructive criticism of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals laid by the Hon. Premier. That being so, we have listened and have been subjected to that sort of harangue for the last two weeks. It is, at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that each Minister is expected to reply to the criticisms or questions which have been raised affecting his particular Ministry. The procedure which has been followed on this occasion is that each and every member of the Opposition Parties present has had to hold forth and express his views and sentiments on all and sundry matters whether they are contained in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals or not. We have had a long number of addresses and in certain cases they have been as devoid of constructive criticism as could be humanly possible. This might be regarded by hon. members as a golden opportunity for them to be heard in their respective constituencies and, in some cases, probably for the last time. *(Laughter)*. It is the duty of the Opposition to make, I would expect, some sort of constructive criticism. Criticism of a constructive nature did come from the Opposition, but when criticism came from the other groups, I am afraid that it was not at all elevating.

On certain occasions in England, speeches are made by the Shadow Minister of Finance or by the appropriate member who is regarded as a Financial Expert, however unsound he may be. He will be expected to make the necessary speech on behalf of his group or Party, but in this Chamber

the exact opposite is the case. Each and every member rises and every member is an expert on financial matters. That sort of behaviour, Mr. Speaker, we are very familiar with, and it would seem to me that if this procedure is adopted in future, it will cause the setting of a time-limit on speeches. I am not suggesting that the Government, with its numbers, should impose anything on the Opposition, but by mutual agreement it might be a good thing to have such an introduction. I am thinking of the public who have to listen to this sort of harangue.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the time or the ordinary speeches?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is a combination of both. I think it would be a good thing, if by mutual agreement in future, the Hon. Premier who is the head of the Government, discusses this matter with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and with all the other splinter Opposition groups and all the Independents in Opposition so that perhaps a time-limit could be imposed whereby, instead of our listening to all this sort of verbiage for hours on end, an hon. member would be able to make his contribution, say, in forty-five minutes. The Hon. Premier spoke for only 35 minutes and in his speech, which was full of substance, he said all that he had to say and gave the country the very good news with which the people were all very pleased. Mr. Speaker, I throw out that suggestion for what it is worth.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the questions posed by the members of the Opposition in so far as my Ministry is concerned were restricted mainly to the Transport Board and the Deep Water Harbour. There were certain suggestions made concerning Seawell Airport, but that subject of Civil Aviation no longer falls under my Ministry, and therefore the Premier and Minister of Finance will probably deal with that when the time comes. I shall therefore restrict my replies to the two Departments which were the subject of some measure of criticism.

No less than three hon. members dealt with this subject of the Transport Board and the Transport Service of the island as well as enquired about the Report of the Committee which was set up recently to go into the Transport Services of the island. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown enquired whether the \$2 million guaranteed the Transport Board had been included in the public debt. He also enquired about the Report of the Committee which was set up. The hon. junior member for Christ Church asked similar questions and said that it was a matter of concern that the Transport Board carried an overdraft of \$2 million. He also said that new buses are needed badly. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph was concerned about the Report on the Transport Services which was the subject matter of a question which he asked in this House and which was replied to only today, and his second question was about buses operating on a gentleman's agreement since 1954; and the third point was that extra special transport services must be obtained by long term planning over a period of five to ten years. I will give a brief resume of the setting up of the Transport Board, and answer, as far as I can, the questions that have been raised.

As hon. members will recall, on August 24th, 1955, an Act was passed for the establishment of the Transport Board, and as a result of the passing of that Act and the setting up of this Statutory Body, during August and September 1955 the Government took over 116 buses which were then owned by eight concessionaires. Many of these buses were in a very dilapidated condition at the time. There were no set plans and no regular organisation to deal with them. At the present, there is an outstanding loan to the Royal Bank of Canada to the extent of \$855,544.10. The loan capital is \$822,607.76 and interest is \$32,936.34 making a total of \$855,544.10. The amount owing to sundry creditors is \$182,682.75. The number of buses we have at present is 98, of which 77 are diesel buses and 21 are gasoline buses, many of which are in a very bad condition, because they are over 16 years old, and in some cases, over twelve years old. Of these 98 buses, 91 passed inspection by the Highways and Transport Department and the other 17 buses are being prepared for inspection at present.

Now a Committee was appointed by the Government to investigate and report on the transport services of the island. They have gone into the matter very carefully and have made recommendations. The Report was submitted by the Committee earlier this year, and the comments of the various Ministries concerned, the Minister of Finance and the Department of Highways and Transport and the Transport Board itself have recently been received at the Ministry, which is actively engaged in preparing its recommendations for the Cabinet in another few days, I hope. The position, Sir, is that I cannot disclose the contents of the Report; I have not got the authority or permission to do so until the Report is laid on the Table of the House, and of course that has to be approved by the Cabinet. I would therefore ask hon. members to bear with me, but very soon the Report will be laid on the Table of the House and the recommendations of the Ministry will be implemented.

On the question of the deepening of the Deep Water Harbour which was raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I would like to report that active steps are being taken in this matter. The advice of the Consulting Engineers, Messrs. Coode and Partners of London, England, is being sought on this aspect of the deepening of the Deep Water Harbour, especially in the Northern sector where we hope to deepen it to a depth of 40 feet. The possibility of accommodating larger ships for bunkering purposes is also being very actively considered, because there is a great volume of trade which we can do, provided we have more facilities and a deeper Harbour; so we are at present actively working on that, because we fully appreciate the potential revenue which can be collected by the Port if the harbour were deepened at that sector to 40 feet. We have started negotiations in that respect and I shall report on that at a later stage.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he thought the Government would have done something to reduce the landed cost of goods at the Harbour which could be passed on to the consumer, and in answer to him I should like him to realise that formerly the landing charges at the Carlisle Port was \$7.20 per ton, and the present landing charges are \$6 per ton; so there has been a reduction though very little has been reflected and felt by the consumer as it should be. I am not making any definite pronouncement on that, but the fact remains that the landing charges have been reduced from \$7.20 to \$6.00 per ton; so that is more or less all I need say.
5.25 p.m.

In my case, I have been in this game for a long time and I do not think I need make a political speech. I do not regard this as the proper occasion for making a political speech when I have an election to run.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this debate has been in many respect a most instructive one, and it certainly cannot be said that all hon. members of this Honourable House have not had their full and free opportunity to debate this matter, and I hope that as from now we shall hear the very last of these charges which are sometimes brought against this Government that we are attempting to stifle free debate in Parliament.

It is true that the motion which we are called upon to debate is not one which can be conveniently debated because it is worded in a way which says it expresses concern at the Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance. One must assume, therefore, that wishing to express concern, the Mover of the motion would have expressed what anxiety, if any, had been felt, but by the tenor of the speech of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, we have no reason to suppose that he was other than personally pleased with the Budgetary Proposals because he could not find it possible to offer any criticism of the proposals. But his duty constitutionally was to participate, and, as Leader of the Opposition, to make a formal motion of dissent against the Government's proposals.

However, it was left not to the hon. member who moved the motion which we are now debating but to the two hon. members of the Barbados Labour Party to supply what little

criticism there was. They spoke with differing voices all to the same point, scratching about with great difficulty to find some accusations to lay against the Government's financial policy; and because neither of them — the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph — and neither of them is in his place at the moment — has found anything fiscally to criticise. Their speeches ranged far and wide against the whole field of Government's policy, so much so that Your Honour had to remind both of them at various times that the contribution which they were making would have been more appropriately made on the debate in reply to the gracious speech from the Throne.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the spokesmen for the Barbados Labour Party came to this House mostly to contribute to their own Government's failure. I was reminded when they spoke of the story of a wrestling match; and when the two contestants were not together and the referee saw that one of them was exerting more energy than he should, he said to him: "Be careful, you fool; it is your own head which you are twisting". That is actually the position of the Barbados Labour Party. But we are not inclined to laugh at them, although they ought to be thankful to the people of this Island that they did them no worse. To be in this Legislature is something; and we like them, are thankful of the opportunity which they have given us to show the people the level of the representation which the Barbados Labour Party contributed. I would like to know what it is that the people of this Island have committed, what crime they committed either in the immediate past or what crime have been handed down to them by their ancestors in the far past from which they could not extricate themselves and from which they could only, as it were, undergo the consequences of having imposed on them leadership by the members of the Barbados Labour Party; in other words, what had the people done to have found themselves imposed by the Government of that political Party.

Members of the Barbados Labour Party have shown that neither in their fiscal or in any other aspect of Government policy they can lead the people, and at long last the people have come to the conclusion that they must shove them out in order to rescue themselves — and they have done so. It is the Democratic Labour Party that struck the first unkind blow at those people.

Even before this Government had taken the oath of allegiance, the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party trumpeted far and wide all over the world that a set of ruffians had somehow or the other managed to get into Government and the Ministers were wild men.

We are discussing the Financial Proposals of the Hon. Premier and there was the time when the income which this Government had inherited from the last Government was a deficit of over \$3 million, and there was nothing in the Treasury to meet the demands which were imposed on us. This deficit which we met was foretold even by the leaders of the same Government Party to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph belongs, because it was Dr. Cummins who in his speech on the Estimates in March, 1961, foretold that the general revenue balances would be in deficit by October, 1964. That was before the elections. That is what they told us, and we found it exactly as they prophesied.

Now, Sir, you would have thought that the Government coming into this doleful heritage should have been at least left alone to make its arrangements unhindered and unhampered. It would certainly have to borrow, and more so because we had Civil Servants to pay increases to which the other Government had left for us to pay. It was not only a question of Civil Servants' increases, but the wherewithal to pay them; and at that time when we had to think of it, there was not a lot of time to do it. Therefore, you would have thought that the very least the Barbados Labour Party would have done then would have been to refrain from making any public comment. But when we were in the middle of rectifying their mistakes, Sir Grantley Adams let it be known that a group of wild men had succeeded to the Government of Barbados.
5.35 p.m.

If his statement, as made at the London Airport within two or three days of the Election, had any consequence at all, and it had been relayed to the people for whom he obviously intended it, we, as a new Government, should have been in a very sorry plight indeed, because the confidence which we should have established in these circumstances would have been dissipated even before we sought to make use of it. That is the first of the recent damages which the Barbados Labour Party have inflicted upon the people of this colony in fiscal matters in the recent past. Mr. Speaker, there is worse than that. They knew well how they had left us. They knew that if it had not been for the fact that you had a Government in power which was prepared, in the light of its own judgment, to bear in mind all adverse criticism, to discharge the responsibilities that it had taken on — they knew that because there was a courageous Government in power they were prepared to walk all over this island and make statements, because we are in a free society, damaging to the confidence which the people of this island should have in themselves and in us. They knew that they were damaging us; yet when we called upon the people in 1962 and again in 1963 to summon up the reserves of strength and courage and to make appropriate sacrifices to set the finances of this country on some sort of even keel, the same Barbados Labour Party took time off — they really did not have to take time off — and went all over the country imputing the worst possible motives to us and trying, without success, to make the people of this island believe that somehow or other they were being overtaxed when they themselves, more than anybody else, were in a position to tell the people of this island how they had left the island.

As a matter of fact, I reminded them of their own attitude and of their own actions before the Government was torn from their hands by the people of this country. Towards the end of 1961 when they had to give up all hope of doing anything for the people of this island, they threw their cards on the table to show what they had bestowed on the people of Barbados. They came into this House with the proposal not to provide more employment facilities or any more social services, because they had served on the Old Age Pensioners that if they had asked for more money they would have betrayed a trust in the Island. They came into the House with the proposal to build more Prisons. In other words, they had served notice on the people of this island that the limit of their responsibility towards them had been reached, and the most that they were prepared to do would be to lock them up in greater numbers and in a critical time. That is what the Barbados Labour Party Government had done for this country. I therefore would not like the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to get away with murder in trying to make out that they alone and nobody else in this House have the interest of the people at heart, because they have betrayed them time and time again, and even now.

The hon. junior member for St. George, in the course of his speech, asked why we did not buy Roebuck Street and Crumpton Street so that the number of pupils at Harrison College could be increased, and why we did not buy the Girls' Industrial Union so that the numbers at Queen's College could be increased. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard the Hon. Premier and yourself say that you do not like to argue law with laymen. That, Sir, is a privilege which the lawyers have; but, unfortunately, with education you cannot take that point of view because everybody has seen the inside of a school, no matter for how short a duration and we are entitled to argue education with people who know a little more about it. When I heard the Barbados Labour Party attack the educational policy of this Government, I said to myself that they have no sense of shame or modesty, because if there is one area in the affairs of this island that the Barbados Labour Party should avoid, it is that of education in this country. They now want more children to be at Harrison College, at Queen's College and at the Lodge School, and yet when they were in power they connived at a system which kept children out of school. Not only did they do that, but all of their positive policies were actuated by the desire to deprive poor children, however clever, from having their full educational opportunity. I

stood up here in the last House of Assembly in 1957 and publicly accused Sir Grantley Adams who was, at that time according to him, devoting as much as four-fifths of his time to education; I accused him of something which he never denied either inside or outside of this House. I said that he had given instructions to the Governing Body of Combermere School to the effect that whenever any vacancies occur for graduates at schools, these vacancies should not be filled by people of comparable qualifications, but by people with lower qualifications. It meant this: suppose that you had a first-class tutor at Combermere School and the time came for him to retire; his place was not to be filled by somebody of equal stature, who could carry on the work at the level at which that tutor had it, but it was to be carried on by somebody who had a School Certificate! The argument that Sir Grantley used was that it would save money, if and when vacancies occur, you could secure staffs of lesser quality. Mr. Speaker, look at the contrast since we have been in power! Since we have been in power we have made available over 200 scholarships, bursaries, enabling grants and loans at all schools within two and a half years.
5.45 p.m.

We have been all over the world and begged our friends abroad who are interested in our development to give us scholarships, and about 50 Barbadians are now abroad through the efforts of this Government between January 1962 and May 1964 purely on scholarships which this Government asked for for them, of all kinds, and in all fields. Compare that with the five years preceding 1961. Compare 50 scholarships as against 12. Since we have been into power, we have provided or shall have provided 5,000 school places by the end of this year; that is, in two and a half or three years, as against 1,900 school places in the five years preceding 1961. By the end of this financial year, we will have built four entirely new schools and would have replaced two as against the preceding five years for them with one replacement and one new one. That is the record.

Mr. Speaker, how dare any representative of the Barbados Labour Party inside or outside this House attack the Government's financial policy on the grounds that we are not providing educational facilities? I do not want to speak of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the exceptional teacher training facilities. When we come to debate the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I shall have a lot to say, and shall bring the House and the public generally up to date fully on what we have done so far on education; but the last thing they should do should be to attack the educational policy of this Government. The hon. member also said that if and when — a matter of very flimsy conjecture — the Barbados Labour Party comes back to power, they will dismantle the School Meals Service. In his ignorant and very silly way he said that they will throw the pots and pans outside the kitchen, and close down the kitchen and the dining rooms.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that this Government has no apology to make to anybody whatever about the School Meals Service. I do not see why we should. Apart from the fact that our decision to establish the School Meals Service was put in our Manifesto formally as an election platform, endorsed by the electorate and embarked upon by us when we came into power, the very condition of the people of this Island speaks loud and clear for the establishment and expansion of the School Meals Service. When I hear the Barbados Labour Party attacking the School Meals Service, I wonder what their motives must be, whether they are determined both explicitly and implicitly that the younger generation of people in this island shall not have any opportunities to grow up into healthy human beings. I am not surprised at that, because their record on this whole question of nutrition is the most shameful and dishonourable that you can ever find. Part of the trouble which my Ministry has been having in this whole question of overseas aid has been due to the confidence which has been deliberately destroyed by the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party in this whole matter, a confidence which only now we have succeeded in re-establish-

ing, for it had gone abroad long before 1961 - therefore we were in no way responsible for it - that the Government of Barbados was not interested in getting any help whatsoever for the nutrition of young people and school children in this island, because when UNICEF and similar organisations offered in 1955 and 1956 nearly 25 tons of milk for distribution, they said they did not want it and refused it. From that day until very recently, a suspicion, hard to eradicate and difficult to remove, had gone around that the Government of Barbados was itself the chief obstacle of the people of Barbados getting help - not this Government, but the one before us. They said they could not afford to pay the cost of bringing it here, and this was in a year when they had a general revenue balance of nearly \$7 million and a surplus for the year of some \$2 3/4 million. But it was even worse than that. They ridiculed the Democratic Labour Party and said that we wanted to take up public money and spend on worthless schemes just to satisfy our own political ambitions.

I well remember, Mr. Speaker, how the then Premier, Sir Grantley Adams, said at a public meeting that this question of being undernourished was all nonsense, and he pulled up his pants and bared his sleeve to his audience and said "I sometimes cannot find my own pulse; even Dr. Cummins cannot find it!" I only mention that, Mr. Speaker, to show that the Barbados Labour Party cannot with any decency pronounce on these matters. I want to say that the Government of Barbados is fully and wholly committed to the expansion of this School Meals Service. We are going to do it in the coming months, and we have solid reason to believe that we shall be able to feed all the primary and a good lot of the secondary schools as well; so there is no question of dismantling the School Meals Service, and there is no question of being apologetic or half-ashamed about it. It is cardinal policy and we are not going to rest until it is fully established and expanded over the total schools population. I therefore challenge the Barbados Labour Party that if it is this School Meals Service they wish to dismantle, they must tell the people that, as they have already told them; and if they should ever be tempted to back-peddle on the undertaking which they have given to dismantle it through the mouth of the hon. junior member for St. George, I will undertake to remind the people chapter and verse that that is what the Barbados Labour Party is committed to - the dismantling and destruction of the School Meals Service - so that they will have a clear issue at least on this matter when the time comes for the people to make their judgment on it.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph made a well-balanced and quite good speech, critical it is true in one or two parts, but on the whole well thought out, in contrast of course to the speech made by his colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, which added to the gaiety of nations.
5.55 p.m.

In the course of the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, he did, once again, draw the attention of this honourable House most particularly to the problem of the St. Elizabeth's School. Now, I want him to know that if it were really a question of providing a new school in St. Joseph and nothing but a new school, the Government would have been committed to it. It so happens that with respect to St. Joseph, we have to do things for St. Joseph which the last Government never did. As a matter of fact the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has gone on record that for the twenty-four years that Sir Grantley Adams represented St. Joseph nothing whatsoever was done for that parish. He has publicly stated that. He said that the most abominable neglect in the parish of St. Joseph was because of Sir Grantley Adams and the last Labour Government. We have to make good that angle. It is not a question of widening the school, but we have to look for a lot of social amenities which are required by the people of St. Joseph.

We have plans which include not only the building of a school, but other things as well. We have today not only to find suitable lands on which to build the school, but we

have to take two other things into account. This school would be developed in time. To meet the needs of the young people of St. Joseph, we have to provide vocational classes for the boys and commercial and secretarial classes for the girls, and we have to build the school in such a way and on such a site as to allow for future expansion. In addition to that, so far as it lies in our power as regards the construction of schools for which we are responsible, our policy is that each school should have at least five acres of land surrounding it so that the children will have the benefit of physical space for their own physical efforts through playing fields; and not only that but the people of that area which the school serves should be able to enjoy the facilities of recreation as well.

The last Government's policy for the building of schools would not suit us and it has been rejected by us in toto. We plan that whenever we put down a school, it would be some time before the pressure of land comes up before a future Government. It is a matter of planning, and I will not have it that this Government, merely because it has no representative in the parish of St. Joseph, is somewhat neglectful of the people of St. Joseph.

The hon. member can rest assured that there would be a St. Elizabeth's School before the end of the financial year, and it would be built on land which would not only serve the children of the district, but will also serve the people in the area for their recreation, both physically and otherwise; and when he sees that, I am sure that he will fully congratulate this Government on what it has managed to achieve. Rather than to be pressurised now into the building of the school on land which is scant and unsuitable we would like to have this debate so that our plans and policy would be fully matured for the purposes which we have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I was only concerned to define certain aspects of our educational policy in so far as what has been criticised in the course of this debate. However, I would just like to say that on this matter of education this Government stands on firm ground. Members of the Barbados Labour Party ought to choose their points of attack on this Government most carefully, and they should not choose education to attack this Government on. If nothing more, we have managed to do in two years more than they have managed to do in 20 years. They have not even begun to think what the educational requirements of this territory are or will be, and the difference between the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party in this respect is that it is not only in the light of the fact that we have achieved ten or twenty times more in the three years that we have been in office than what they have done in twenty years, because it is there for everybody to see; but the difference lies just here. For the first time in Barbados, since 1961 everybody is now interested in education. Everybody is interested in education and there is the spirit of interest, enthusiasm and adventure percolating through the minds of everybody.

The idleness which was the hall mark of our educational system before, the tragedy which was enacted in our primary schools, all of that has been changed; and if they do not understand the finer points, at any rate, it captures the imagination and they know instinctively by that that the country is going forward.

If, therefore, the Barbados Labour Party through its representatives in this House want to challenge this Government on matters educational, we are prepared to accept that challenge anytime and anyplace. We would undertake to prove that they were wrong in many respects. We will undertake to prove that they were wrong in their outlook, wrong in their arithmetic, wrong in their lack of interest for the people and wrong in their psychology; but right only in this respect, their senseless and silly criticisms of this Government's educational policy; and in their attempts to sabotage the economy of this Island by their repeated and uninformed criticisms of the public cause as regards education, they were right in the doing of those things that have shown the people of this Island that they have not had any knowledge of what they were doing and

that the best interest of the people would be served by assuaging anything they say and by following policies which are and very clearly set down and executed for the benefit of further education of the people of this Island.
6.05 p.m.

Anybody who has followed what has been going on in this island since this Government has come into power could not do other than despise the criticisms which have been levelled at the Ministry of Education in carrying out its policy. Not only, as I say, we have built more schools in less time than the last Government, not only have we provided more school places in less time than they, not only have we made it possible for hundreds of children who would otherwise have their fair chance and opportunity of a good secondary education denied them, but have done more than that. We have drawn the whole community into this exercise and business of education. Already I am awaiting the Report of a Committee which I have set up with the approval of the Cabinet to deal with the matter of industrial training and training for the people of this island. I do not wish to anticipate their findings, but I would not be surprised if some of the recommendations contained new proposals for encouraging the people of this island who are over forty years of age and who think they have no schools of learning to encourage them, to be trained so as to build up the strength of the economy of this island. Mr. Speaker, whoever wants to challenge us educationally can do so, but he will certainly do it to his discredit.

However long or short this Government will be in power — I have no reason to think that the period will be a short one — but long after we have gone the people of this island, and in this connection the people of other islands as well, will long enjoy the benefits of the educational system which we have set up, the educational system which we have encouraged the people of this island to show interest in and to establish and expand themselves. If this Government has nothing else to be proud of, if it has anything to be proud of, it can certainly rejoice that if it had done nothing else, it did at least make the people of this country interested enough in themselves as to learn more than they did before and to learn it better with the additions to the schools. (Cheers!)

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, we propose at this stage to bring this debate to an end. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 28th July, 1964, at 12 o'clock (Noon).

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week Tuesday, 28th July, 1964, at 12 o'clock (Noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.12 p.m.

