

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th June, 1965.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C. (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J. P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P.; (Deputy Speaker); and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER; I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting which was held on Wednesday 24th March, 1965, have been printed and, ircularated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be deemed to be confirmed. (After a pause). There being no objection. I declare those Minutes to be now duly confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER:

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Other Place which reads as follows;-

THE SENATE

TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Senate has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Message from the Honourable the House of Assembly, in connection with the Seven hundredth Anniversary of the Parliament of Simon deMontfort, and to inform the Honourable House that it concurs in the Resolution attached thereto.

3rd June, 1965.

H. MASSIAH, President.

I need hardly remind hon. members in this connection that the Resolution referred to is the one in which the Senate has concurred, and in its being presented on behalf of the Other Chamber as well as on behalf of this Chamber

by myself. That, of course, can only be possible if this Chamber decides to grant me leave of absence from my duties in the Chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR Mr. SPEAKER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, when this House concurred in that Resolution and requested you to assume the duty of representing this Legislature in presenting the Resolution, it necessarily intended that you should represent this Legislature away from the Chair. I do not know whether a formal motion granting you leave of absence is necessary or not, but if it is necessary, I now formally beg to move that Your Honour be granted leave of absence from your duties as Speaker of this House for as long as you happen to be away on the business of the Legislature.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I did not quite catch that last paragraph.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I said that Your Honour should be granted leave of absence for as long as the business of the Legislature warrants it. As Your Honour has just hinted to me that it is better to specify the date, I now beg to move that leave of absence be granted to Your Honour until the 30th June, this year.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to second that motion provided that Your Honour indicates that the end of June would be sufficient time for this purpose. I was worried about the Hon. Minister's remarks

as to Your Honour being granted leave of absence as long as you happen to be on the business of the Legislature. If your Honour were to be taken ill in England, as has happened with the Hon. Premier, or if some unforeseen circumstance took place, it would certainly mean that Your Honour would not be on leave altogether on the business of the Legislature. I do not want to play with words, but if Your Honour intimates that leave until the end of June would be sufficient, that might be all right. Nobody would expect that Your Honour would be present on the day when the Anniversary celebrations begin and return here on the date those celebrations end. We are acquainted with parliamentary traditions which are to be upheld by members of this House. I agree with the motion that leave be granted Your Honour until the end of June; I certainly do not like the idea that Your Honour be given leave as long as the business of the House warranted it. I prefer to make the motion that leave be granted Your Honour until the first week in July. For how long will the celebrations last? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR All right, we will agree to leave being granted until the first week in July.) If we agree to a motion giving Your Honour ascertain amount of time, it is necessary that we will have to give you the allowance which is necessary. I note that the Hon. Acting Leader of the House is willing to amend his motion to grant Your Honour leave until first week in July. I beg to move that amendment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I accept that amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I should just like to say that leave is not being granted to me as a member of this House, but as Speaker, I am required to perform certain functions in the United Kingdom as Speaker of this House.

The question that leave be granted His Honour until the first week in July was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I beg to thank hon. members for the leave which they have granted to me.

Hon. 4. DaC. EDWARDS, MESSRS. HOLDER LYNCH and COWARD entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay The pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1965.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "\"The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1965.\""

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66 under Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 3, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill providing for the control and development of tenancies, I should like the House to know that one of its provisions becomes operative as soon as the Bill becomes law. I should like the attention of hon. members drawn to that matter.

On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I also would like to give notice of a Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th July, 1965. 12.25 p.m.

I also beg to give notice of the following: -

A Bill to amend the law relating to the liability of occupiers and others for injury of damage resulting to persons or goods lawfully on any land or other property from dangers due to the state of the property or to things done or omitted to be done there.

A Bill to provide protection to persons in respect of fires accidentally beginning on their premises.

A Bill to amend the Statute of Frauds, 1762.

A Bill to amend the law relating to the frustration of contracts.

A Bill to amend the law governing the making of contracts by or on behalf of bodies corporate and for connected purposes.

A Bill to amend the Guardians, Executors, Administrators and Trustees Act, 1891.

A Bill to repeal various obsolete Acts,

A Bill to amend the widows and Children Pensions Act, 1963.

A Bill to amend the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1961.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Electricity Regulations, 1965.

REPLY TO ORAL QUESTION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am to state that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James is ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th July, 1965, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the law relating to the liability of occupiers and others for injury or damage resulting to persons or goods lawfully on any land or other property from dangers due to the state of the property or to things done or omitted to be done there, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to provide protection to persons in respect of fires accidentally beginning on their premises, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FEBGUSSON a Bill to amend the Statute of Frauds, 1762, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the law relating to the frustration of contracts, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon.

G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the law governing the making of contracts by or on behalf of bodies corporate and for connected purposes, was read a first

time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Guardians, Executors, Administrators and Trustees Act, 1891, was read a time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to repeal various obsolete Acts, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C, Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Widows and Children Pensions Act, 1963, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C, Tudor, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the United

States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1961, was read a first time.

PUBLICATION OF WHITE PAPER ON FEDERATION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and learned Premier I desire to make a public statement-

Since the tabling on the 18th May, 1965 of the Statement on the State of the Federal negotiations, it has been discovered that due to commitments in respect of the Budget, the Economic Survey and other pressing legislative and Government requirements, it would not be possible to print and publish the White Paper during the course of this week as originally promised. The Hon. Premier therefore wishes it to be known that it is now hoped to have the Budget and Economic Survey presented during the fourth week of this month and the White paper immediately thereafter,

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of money for the service of the Island.

I understand that the Hon. Minister of Education is acting Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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. Lowe in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No. 2. POWDER MAGAZINE

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum of the Resolutions sets out, provision in the sum of \$25,355 is required for the construction of a new powder Magazine at Gun Hill. The Powder Magazine presently situated at Powder Road Station Hill, is inadequate and hazardously situated.

This matter has been drawn to the attention of Government by certain authorities and it was finally decided that Gun Hill was the most suitable site out of those which were put up. The Director of Public Works has submitted an estimate of the cost of erecting this new Powder Magazine at Gun Hill, and the plan of the Magazine has been based on the subject matter put forward by Imperial Chemical Industries, Limited. The building is planned to take up 1.262 square feet of land and the estimated cost is \$25,355

At present, the explosives are secured at the Regimental Headquarters at the Garrison on a temporary basis until the new Powder Magazine has been constructed at Gun Hill. Therefore, that precautionary measure is being taken to ensure the safety so far as the public is concerned, until the New Powder Magazine is constructed and built on the site which is regarded as convenient and less hazardous to the public at large,

I think that is about all that I can usefully say at this stage.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$25,355 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the Powder Magazine at Powder Road has been in existence for many years. I

have not the date, but I am sure the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works would be able to tell us. I remember when I was a boy there was rumour that we had gentlemen detained at the Glendairy prison and that they were digging underground to get at this Powder Magazine.

Quite frankly, I am making it perfectly clear that I am in favour of this Resolution, but I think in this particular case it would have been much safer to put it that the explosive which you had therein had been removed to a temporary place of safety - a place which is considered safe for the time being - instead of saying that they had to be removed and are now temporarily held at Regimental Headquarters at the Garrison. When you are dealing with explosives, you do not exactly say where they are stored; but when you had them stored in Powder Road, you had a Powder Magazine which was then built by the military people, and that would be a place specially built for storing such things.

However, Sir, we support this Resolution to build a new Powder Magazine at Gun Hill. What we want to know is what part of Gun Hill this Powder Magazine is going to be sited. There is no plan for such. Originally when you were about to construct a Government Building of this sort, you usually have a small plan to show hon.members of the House what you were constructing. As you know, Gun Hill starts by the \"Lion\", and Gun Hill is an area of land where there is a House sited. I would like to know if this House is where this Magazine is going to be, if this Magazine is going to be dug underground in the rock, or if it is to be a building. We have no plan to guide us.

As I have said, we are supporting this Resolution, but this Government usually brought to us a plan showing us the area and what was the position as regards the building. Will the Hon.Minister tell us something of that?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member who has just spoken, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, has pointed out that we made a disclosure of the present site of the Powder Magazine which we should not have done, and I thank him for that bit of advice; but I am somewhat taken back that precisely that same thing which he

warned us about, he want us to state her publicly. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to know the exact site of this new home for explosives, or in other words, the new location for the permanent Powder Magazine. It is conflicting when in one breath you do not want us to disclose where the explosives are presently held, but in another breath you want to know where this new powder Magazine is going to be sited.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order . The Hon. Minister said that what I have said is conflicting. The Hon. Minister is conflicting the Place where the explosives are now held with the Powder Magazine which was built by military people for storing explosives. I said that if you are removing them to a temporary place such as this, which is not built for placing explosives, it would have been much more prudent if you had said that they had been removed to a place of safety for the time being. 1.45 p.m.

There is no point in telling me that you are carrying powder at the Drill Hall or in a hut. Your are now going to build a place for holding powder. You are not building a cowpen or a house. I am submitting that in this Addendum enough has not been told us as to whether the powder is to be carried to a place of safety or not. One would have thought that you would remove it from the present position to a place designed for that purpose. One might say that \$25,000 seems to be a lot of money for building a place like this unless it is a place which is designed by people who know something about this matter. Another thing is, Sir, that we are accustomed to see plans of these things. The site does not matter so long as the place is constructed for the particular purpose. I hope that the Hon. Minister understands me. I am not opposing this Just for the sake of opposing it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Acting Chairman, I am very grateful to the hon. member for explaining himself a little more thoroughly. I would also draw to his attention the fact

that the Garrison is a Fort, and there would be some provision made for the storage of these explosives. We do not want to imply that the Garrison is the final resting place for this Powder Magazine, I would repeat for the benefit of the hon. member that the Director of Public Works has submitted an estimate of the cost of the construction of this new Powder Magazine. The plan has been based on specifications supplied by the I.C.I. and the estimated cost of the building is \$25,355. The area of land involved is 1,276 square feet. I am afraid that I have not got the plan of the building. It is not anything subterranean; it is a building which will be constructed along the lines which I have indicated and I can assure the hon. member that it will be properly constructed.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am not trying to give the hon. member any trouble; but when you see a building occupying 1,276 square feet of land and that is going to cost over \$25,000, hon. members must remember that when a plan of that building has been submitted by the Public Works Department, nothing can be done in this country unless the Legislature passes the money. If there is a plan - and the hon. member says that there is a plan - and it has been drawn by the Director of Public Works, I have not seen such a plan. It has been the custom in my years in this House of Assembly that such Plans are always submitted. If we are spending over \$25,000 for this purpose I am submitting that it is customary for us to see a plan.

At this stage the plan of the proposed building was produced.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I must thank the hon. member for passing the plan to us. I know that the Hon. Minister is always doing his duty. I have passed around the plan for the perusal of hon. members on this side of the House. We are not specialists in the building of Powder Magazines. The people who are accustomed to this sort of thing have given their okay to it, and therefore it must be all right.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Acting Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
12.55 p.m.

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

THE INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES (FACTORY CONSTRUCTION) ACT. 1965.

Mr. Speaker; The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to encourage the building of factories for certain recognised industries and enterprises by the grant of tax and customs duty concessions and for matters incidental thereto.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with this Order in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Premier who is not now in his place.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is seeking the indulgence of the House to proceed with Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Acting Leader of the House to proceed with Order No. 2.

Hon. J. a TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, some time ago - I believe it was last week when the House was considering

the Development Plan - several hon. members opposite drew to the attention of the Government the necessity for more varied, more rapid industrialisation of this island for the reasons which they had already mentioned, the pressure of operation, the necessity of this island to pay its own way, and things like that. What those hon. members, I think, had in mind was their desire that this island, as it enters into competition with other under-developed countries, should spare no pains in attracting the greatest

quantity and the highest level of capital investment. They were preaching to the converted in this respect, because this Government's policy even before it assumed the reigns of office was always to urge on the Government of the day, and to do it ourselves when we became the Government, that any reasonable concession consistent with the interest of the people of this island - any reasonable concession or any reasonable incentive - which would give greater variety and greater rapidity to the flow of investment capital into this island, should not only be looked upon favourably, but should be actively and very promptly acted upon. To this end we have amended the Pioneer Industries legislation. In 1963 we produced and introduced in this House, which have since become law, two Industrial Incentives Bills, and the Bill before us is a further stage in carrying out that policy.

The object of this Bill is to provide certain tax concessions to companies who have already been granted a licence to construct and equip factories for the manufacture of approved products. The Bill itself defines in one of its clauses what an approved product is. As a matter of fact, I think that definition is found in Clause 2 of the Bill. An "approved product" means any product which is declared to be a pioneer product under Section 7 of the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958, or an approved export product under Section 3 of the Industrial Development (Export Industries) Act, 1963, or an approved product under Section 3 of the Industrial Incentives Act, 1963, two of which I mentioned a moment ago.

The Bill also in its first part gives certain powers to the Minister responsible for development. It falls to him to grant to companies licences for the construction and equipment of factories for the manufacture of products approved under one of these bits of legislation. Part 11 of the Bill lays down the conditions under which a licensee is entitled to claim exemptions from customs duty and from package tax for raw materials for the construction and equipment of factories, and it is left to the Comptroller of Customs to exercise his discretion and to make recommendations. The Minister however may from time to time make exceptions where corresponding articles of local manufacture are available for purchase in the island. 1.05 p.m.

It is only fair that tax concessions for the importation of materials and for the construction and equipment of factories should be given if those materials and constructions are not already available in the island. It is only sensible that the first call should be given on the local industry. When a case has been made out, well then, the Minister can exercise his discretion in granting relief from customs duties and package tax.

There also have to be accepted conditions for the granting of relief. A company which obtains a licence from the Minister is also granted relief from the payment of income tax in respect of profits or gains derived from the lease or other letting of the factory for a period of fifteen years from the date of completion of its construction.

The fourth part of the Bill is the one which I think will engage the attention of hon. members more than the other parts. This is the part which provides that a factory which is recognized and made available for a licence cannot continue to enjoy that licence if it decides to produce something other than the product approved. The Minister granted his approval as to certain conditions, and those conditions must not be varied unless with his approval. As a matter of fact, the Bill expressly says 3 that a factory which has been constructed by virtue of a licence granted under the Bill may not be used for any purpose other than that of a recognised enterprise without the prior approval of the

Minister, who, in granting his approval, may impose such conditions as he considers necessary.

Therefore, Sir, in summing up I would like to say that this Bill defines the policy of incentives which this Government makes available to enterprises and to investors for the purpose of constructing and equipping factories and for producing goods and services for this island. This provision is made providing, of course, that these articles cannot be obtained locally.

Then of course, there are very important financial implications in the provisions of this Bill. These are provisions relating to income tax, depreciation of machinery and plant and all certain other provisions which arise out of that.

I do not know if I can go much farther, but if hon. members in the course of this discussion have questions to ask and the substantive Minister is not present, I shall do my best to answer them.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:
I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I would like to say now. Let it be known that my Party has always agreed to the encouraging of capital to this country for the purpose of industrial development. I think that has been abundantly clear and has been made so clear that I will always make it known that we were the persons in the forefront in this community for this legislation, although we did not have the power to make it.

This legislation to be enacted by this Government has gone a bit further and has given a better incentive which will, I believe, give more relief to persons coming in and cause more buildings to be erected in this country; therefore, light off the mark I will have to approve of this Bill* However, I do not think it will be wrong to issue a word of caution to the Government. You know there are business men and business men. There are business men of honour, and business men not of honour. You must caution the Government especially when you find some of these people coming in wanting to go into some of these businesses. Some business men are very shrewd and when you see some of them coming in, you must be very careful.

I do not want to hold this Bill up, but there are one or two things which can be done by the Minister alone. If you look at the Bill you will see that there are certain changes. If you look at the objects and Reasons which deal with Part IV of the Bill you will see that it is stated that a factory which has been constructed by virtue of a licence granted under the Bill may not be used for any purpose other than that of a recognised enterprise without the prior approval of the Minister, who, in granting his approval, may impose such conditions as he considers necessary.

I quite frankly want to make myself clear. In dealing with these industries, we all know that industries which come into the island can create certain suspicions, I am not casting any aspersions on anyone, but in dealing with persons, one must be like Caesar's wife, that is, above suspicion. It is my considered opinion that any changes should go to the Cabinet and not to the particular Minister alone. That is my view and the view which we on this side hold. The Bill says "approval of the Minister". That means obviously the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. The Minister is for the time being charged with the responsibility.

I have always heard in this House, Mr. Speaker, that when we pass legislation here, we do not pass it only for this generation and only for ourselves, because we rely on the integrity of the person, but we pass legislation for all time unless it is amended, "Minister" here means the person who is responsible at the time. I am not casting any aspersions, nor am I making any apologies either. I say again that any legislation which is passed here today is not passed merely for us today. We pass it on to Govern-

ments, and individuals must pass on. I am sure the Hon. Ministers would appreciate the fact that this is not casting aspersions on anybody; but we do feel in a matter of this nature where application is made for such changes that they can be such manoeuvring that it would be infinitely better for your Cabinet to deal with a matter of this sort than for the Minister alone. I can see in the initial stages the Minister dealing with this matter alone.

Sir, I have read this section and thought on it most carefully. I think that this should go to the Cabinet and not to the Minister alone. We have seen changes and upsets. Who knows who may be the Minister?
1.15 p.m.

Do not let the Minister grumble and say that that is not possible, because nothing is impossible; but all things are possible with God. (ASIDES.) I do not mind the \"Little Johnnies\".

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are no \"Little Johnnies\" inhere.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I know, Sir. Children and fools have no right with sharp-edged tools. I feel that this thing should be done by the Minister with the approval of this Cabinet. I might be wrong, but I am entitled to my opinion. Any hon. member is entitled to his opinion. I submit that with such radical changes you must have the approval of the Cabinet. I do not know if the Minister would be in a position to say \"yes\" or \"No\" to my suggestion as to this amendment; I take it that the Bill has been gone through by the Cabinet, but we are entitled to say how we feel about it. I do not feel that the Minister alone should be responsible for these changes. We, on this side of the House, support the Bill - with the exception of the Minister alone having this responsibility, and not the Minister with the approval of his Cabinet, We are supporting this Bill because it is a question of further encouraging industries, People will come here and find work for our people, and you are doing thereby a tremendous job for the benefit of the unemployed and for the development of this country.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I can quite understand that the hon. member would be agitated on this point, but I want to draw this matter to his attention. This is not the first piece of legislation in which it is set out in the Interpretation Clause what \"Minister\" means. Within the last year or perhaps longer than that, in innumerable bits of legislation, we have said that \"Minister\" means the person who is, for the time being, charged with the responsibility for a particular subject. You cannot have a representative form of Government, a Cabinet system and full internal self-government if Ministers are not charged with the responsibility for certain things. The fact that in some other country a Minister might take a bit between his teeth and do things which would embarrass the Government must be taken into consideration, but you must not allow anything like that to derogate from the particular aspect of the matter. So long as Ministers are constitutionally responsible for departments under their control, you have to make them responsible for the granting of licences and concessions. In this case, the appropriate Minister happens to be the Minister of Trade and Industry; in another case it may be the Minister of Finance, the Minister

of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Minister of Health or whatever it is; but you cannot have full internal self-government with a full Ministerial system and not have, at some time or other, individual Ministers being charged with responsibility for matters. There are members of the Cabinet, and even the Head of the Government has, at all times, to exercise his functions in accordance with Cabinet policy, except perhaps those functions with which he is constitutionally charged with responsibility outside the cabinet. The Head of the Government, or if it happens to Be a Minister in charge of the Department, has to exercise his functions. If a Minister is charged with the responsibility of doing certain things, we have to take it for granted that that is how the Cabinet wishes it and that is in accordance with the law of the land. That Minister is not in any way different from another Minister who is charged with responsibility under a particular Act.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker. I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses I to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:-

4. (1) The Minister may grant a licence to a company to construct or to construct and equip a factory under this Act if he is satisfied that the company is able to finance the construction and equipment of the factory.

(2) Every licence shall be subject to such conditions as the Minister in his discretion may specify therein so, however, that the licence shall as a condition require the company to retain ownership of the factory during the relevant statutory period.

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (2) the Minister may at any time during the relevant statutory period permit a company to which a licence is granted -

(a) to sell the factory to a recognised enterprise; or

(b) to sell the factory to a company, to which upon the sale being effected the provisions of subsection (1) of section 5 shall apply; or

(c)

(d) to sell the factory subject to such terms as he may specify to some person other than a recognised enterprise or a company referred to in paragraph (b) of this subsection, but there shall be no such sale of the factory until the Minister is satisfied that the sale thereof under paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of this subsection cannot be effected.

(e)

(4) Where it appears to the Minister that a company holding a licence has contravened any of the conditions specified in that licence or any of the provisions of this Act or of any regulations made thereunder, he shall serve upon the company a notice requiring it within such reasonable time not being less than fourteen days as may be specified in the notice to do all such things as will make good to the satisfaction of the Minister any default or deficiency arising by way of the contravention.

(5)

(6) If a company fails to comply with a notice served under subsection (4) then, after the expiration of the time specified in the notice, the Minister may revoke the licence of the company, in which event -

(7)

(a) the company shall pay -

(i) to the Commissioner, a sum equal to such concessions as respects customs duty and package tax,

as, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, it has received since the date of the receipt by the company of the notice aforesaid; and in addition thereto,

(b) if the contravention is the sale of the factory (whether the factory has been completed or not) otherwise than in accordance with the provisions of subsection (3), the company shall pay to the Comp-

troller a sum which bears the same proportion to the total amount of the customs duty and package tax from which the company was exempted or which were refunded or paid to the company in respect of the factory as the unexpired portion of the relevant statutory period at the date of the receipt of the notice by the company bears to the whole relevant statutory period.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Acting Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. a E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Acting Chairman, I will make my point which I intended to raise, although the Hon. Minister has replied, clearly putting his point of view. 1.25 p.m.

I would suggest that wherever the word \"Minister\" appears that the word \"Cabinet\" be substituted. Having raised the point, I just want to make it clear.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, there are two difficulties which I see in the proposal made by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. The first is that Clause 2 of the Bill has already been passed which defines what a Minister is, and the second one - which I am sure he may not be aware of - is that under the existing constitution of Barbados, any matters specifically assigned by law to the Cabinet can be delegated by the Cabinet to a Minister without any reference to Parliament at all; so according to the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions, certain powers can be delegated to an individual Minister, and this is what is invariably done. This is not done with reference to Parliament, but purely by a simple Cabinet decision, when the Minister in charge of Development and Industries for the time being will be assigned those duties which by this Act or Bill have been allocated to the Cabinet. This would therefore be a very empty exercise if the Government on this side agrees to the amendment, because of administrative reasons the Cabinet would almost certainly delegate the powers back to the Minister. As the Hon. Minister of Education has explained, it does not mean that you would be pinning down the responsibility to the Cabinet if they chose to delegate the power, because even if the Minister is assigned a particular jurisdiction over a matter, the Cabinet is collectively responsible for his decisions anyhow; so whichever way one looks at it, I do not think any useful purpose would be served in this exercise, because I am positive that if it were done in that way, the Cabinet would delegate it back to the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Hon. Premier to think that I do not understand what he means by the Letters Patent and the powers of the Cabinet and things like that, but this appears to me to be clumsy. He did not hear my first remarks when I dealt with the matter. I said that I supported the Bill, but I thought that in passing legislation we were not passing it for this Cabinet or for any particular Minister, but for all time. When we read the Bill and saw what power was given to the Minister, we thought that a matter of this sort could better be dealt with by the Cabinet. I appreciate the fact that the Cabinet can delegate its power to a particular Minister, and that that particular Minister would be responsible for the fall of the entire Cabinet if he did something which the people found particularly wrong. We were not trying to pin-point any particular Minister, but what we were thinking of is the question of such changes to be made. In the initial stages, we agreed to the Cabinet delegating powers to the Minister. Now you are going to make changes, and I was cautioning the Government that while we appreciate the extension it was making in the incentives to bring in people and so on, when it comes to the point where the Minister can make such changes, we were wondering whether it was scientifically possible from a parliamentary point of view for such changes to be made by the Cabinet instead of the Minister. The Cabinet has vested certain powers in the Minister to make such changes as are set out in this Bill, but we felt it would be infinitely better for the Cabinet to do that.

I repeat I do not want the hon. member to think that I do not understand what internal self-government means and what the powers of the Cabinet are, but now that you are going to make substantial changes which can change the entire structure, I only suggest that it be amended to read \"the Cabinet\". I am willing to bow to the Premier's parliamentary knowledge that it might not be scientifically possible to have it amended in this way, I have personal views on this, and my Party has personal view on it. The definition clause defines \"Minister\", and the Bill itself says what the Minister has power to do. That is

all well and good. But there are certain changes to be made, and -who knows? I might be a Minister, and anything can happen, and therefore I am saying that such changes should be brought about with the approval of or reference to the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the Minister of Education has said, but there are several statutes which allow for things to be done with the approval of the Cabinet and not the particular Minister even though the Governor-in- Executive Committee Act has been changed. The Cabinet may delegate authority to a Minister by this statute to allow a company to come in and build a factory and bring in things duty free for fifteen years. These changes may be made unknown to the Cabinet, and I agree that it is right to say that whether or not they are made unknown to the Cabinet, the Cabinet is still responsible and that can bring about its downfall. I was, however, looking at the safeguard in dealing with industries, because when you get people coming in, I would rely more on the combined experience of Cabinet than the experience of one man, because if you get some of these shrewd businessmen coming in who would only take advantage of the fifteen years and put up things, as soon as they are ready, they can pack up and go leaving us with the bag.

I am not doing this, Mr. Speaker, to cast aspersions upon any particular person, but I am doing it with the honest-to goodness feeling that I feel the combined experience of the Cabinet in making the changes would be infinitely better than the experience of an individual Minister only when it comes to making these changes. 1.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, quite honestly I do not appreciate this business of one saying that you must handle business men with silk gloves when they are dealing with the Ministry. So many people seem to understand that because certain people have money, they are entitled to greater consideration than any other person. I think it is better that we get on with the business of this country, especially in the light of the constitutional changes between now and the next two or three years. We have this atmosphere being built up by some hon. members that the people who know of running business are those people who are especially imbued with special gifts.

I think this Government has made a statement of policy from time to time. We respect the rights of businessmen in so far as they are citizens; that is to say, we respect their rights Just the same as the man who is working in the scavenging department or the man who is the artisan; no greater or no less consideration is given. You find politicians telling you that you should not make such statements because you discourage foreign investors from coming in; but I say that if a statement has to be made in the interest of the people of Barbados, even if a company or foreign investors do not like the statement made, in the interest of the people of Barbados that statement has got to be made.

In this Legislature, we do not agree on everything. I do not necessary subscribe to the view of the United Kingdom on racial discrimination. We do not necessary subscribe to the foreign policy of the U.S.A., but you have this idea that you should not say anything about it because you would offend the American Government. Some people believe that we should only speak looking over our shoulders. We should speak on notions of our own if we suffer for those notions.

The hon. senior member for the City has that philosophy. I think that we should get away from that stupid idea

that the Government does not understand how to deal with business men. He thinks that nobody else should acquire the same prominence as they acquire. This Government does not base its political philosophy on that. The hon. member speaks of Caesar\'s wife. What is undemocratic in these changes being reviewed by the Minister? The hon. member does not come out and talk plainly at all. I prefer that he talks plainly. If the hon. member is suggesting that permission to construct a factory may be withheld by the Minister, he can say so. Why should the Cabinet be more honest than an individual Minister?.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have not hinted at corruption or anything of any Minister. Sir, you have been in the Chair before the hon. member came in here. Did you hear any talk of any corruption? I have not hinted at corruption in any quarter at all. I do not think it is fair for the Hon. Premier to say why should not I come out and say it if I think there is corruption. I have never at any time hinted at that. What I did say was that we do not pass legislation for ourselves and that we pass legislation for all time because when Ministers go, Government still remains.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member rose the first question which he raised was that when dealing with Ministers, they have to be like Caesar\'s wife, that is the industrialist. What does he mean by that?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I rise on a point of order. I have not said anything like that. Get it read back. I said that when you are dealing with matters of this nature and changes of this magnitude, we have to be like Caesar\'s wife. What I feel is what I said here, not today, or yesteryear, but all the time.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member said that in dealing with matters like that you have to be like Caesar's wife. Who was Caesar's wife? Caesar's wife was supposed to be a person who was above suspicion. As far as history is concerned, we understand that she cried out three times in her sleep. The hon. member said that you have to be like Caesar's wife, above suspicion; so he is saying that the individual Minister could not be above suspicion to think that something would leak out.

This is a notion which this Government cannot accept at all. Constitutionally, it is improper; and from the point of view of good government it is inept. I would just like to say that and nothing more.

The position is that we cannot agree that industrialists have to be treated with a special sort of silk glove. Any Minister is competent to exercise his discretion to the community because he receives his advice from the people who have direct responsibility; that is to say, the Barbados Development Board of which I believe 99% of the people are business men. I do not want to hear any insinuations about Caesar's wife because I have no qualms about this at all. 1.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I have no nightmares about it; it is my honest and considered opinion to say it here and I have said it here. If the hon. member feels that it is not constitutional, it is not scientific, it is not possible to do it in that way, that is all right; but I am entitled to get up in here and say what I feel. I have been a small business man long enough to say what I mean. That is my opinion, and nobody will stop me from saying what I want to say in here. If the hon. member with his experience suggests that, with the Cabinet system, this goes to a Minister and so on and that it would be unscientific to make that amendment, I would be the first person to say "Well, I do not see any sense in actually pressing for an amendment as such"; but do not let the hon. member suggest that because I have said that you are dealing on this level where you are having industries coming in and you are doing all of this - I am not apologising for this. Businessmen who are coming into Barbados or businessmen in Barbados are out to make money, and it will be nothing strange to me for people, having all the incentives which you offer, to leave us hold-

ing some bag. We will have the actual buildings, labour and so on, but do not suggest that because I say something in here I am accusing some particular person of dishonesty.

I do not know of any dishonesty in anybody, nor am I accusing anybody of it. It may be I am a bit old fashioned to put things in that way - that is, instead of saying "Governor" we say "Governor-in-Executive Committee", and a Minister would be responsible to the House and not to the Government.

These things may flash across my brain, but I do not say I have anything against any particular person. If that were so, I would get up in the Lower Green and say it. However, Sir, this is a great incentive to have industries and I do hope that this Bill will work. We do not suggest that any businessman would get any greater treatment than anybody here, but I say that, in dealing with businessmen, you are dealing with people who are out to do business and at the same time they are out to make money. That is my argument. I do not think that the Minister in charge could tell the Hon. Premier that I hinted about dishonesty against anybody. All Caesar's wives are supposed to arouse suspicion and everybody knows that. I am not pressing for the amendment in view of the explanation which has been given that such an amendment is not scientific, but I do object strongly to the Idea that I am inferring that some person, and more especially it is the idea of the Minister of Finance, that I am inferring that somebody would be dishonest. When it comes to the question of being like Caesar's wife, all of us have to be like Caesar's wife in dealing with matters of this sort.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 19 inclusive were called and passed.\" 1.55 p.m.

Clause 20 was called and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

It now being 2 o'clock, this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

On-Resumption.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Shaker, I observe that there is no Quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thank the Hon. Minister for drawing to my attention that there is no quorum. Mr. Clerk, let the bell immediately be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained. QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am advised that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39/1964 asked by the Hon. and Learned member for St. James has been laid. Does the Hon. and Learned member for St. James propose now to put his question?

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister- Is the Minister aware that the Magistrates of this Is- land have recently formed themselves into a Magistrates Association?

2. Is the Minister aware that the said Magistrates have submitted a Memorandum for the consideration of the Government?

3. If the answer to 2 is in the affirmative, will the Minister state what reply, if any, has been sent to the Magistrates?

4.

5. If no reply has been sent, will the Minister state why not?

6.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

\ "1. Yes, Sir.

2. Yes, Sir.

3. The Magistrates' Association was informed through its Secretary that the memorandum has been sent to the Appropriate Ministry for consideration.

4. Does not arise.\ "

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are no other Replies to Oral Questions, and consequently the House may now proceed to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition whom I observe not to be in his place.

The second Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. Junior member for St. Peter, whom likewise I do not see in his place.

RESOLUTION re SHARP DETERIORATION IN ISLAND'S ACADEMIC EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS.

The third Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. Junior member for Bridgetown whom I do not espy but in view of the fact that this is a matter to resume debate on a Resolution relating to the sharp deterioration in the island's academic educational standards, and when the debate on this Resolution was adjourned, as I recall, it was on the motion of the hon. senior member for Christ Church which was seconded by the hon. Junior member for St Michael that further consideration be postponed, it will be entirely in order now for the hon. senior member for Christ Church to resume his address, and immediately next to that the hon. junior member for St. Michael, and then any other hon. member who is disposed to contribute to this debate.

It has been drawn to my attention that on a subsequent occasion the hon. senior member for Christ Church moved the adjournment and it was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is the Minister of Education. Does the hon. senior member for Christ Church desire now to proceed with his address?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Then the Hon. Minister of Education may now proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last week, I intimated to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, who, I regret to see, is not in his place, that I would be making my contribution to the debate on the motion which he moved on the 13th April. 2.40 p.m.

I assured the hon. member that I was ready and willing to proceed and he rose in his place and thanked me for the assurance which I had given. When he moved the motion which stands in his name I, unfortunately, was not in my place on that occasion and despite the appeal which

was made to him at the time by the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown said then that he had no guarantee that I would be present. I pass over that because I do not think it needs any reply from me except to say that I genuinely regret that the hon. member is not in his place, I ascribe no ulterior motive to his not being present, but rather believe that the hon. member is making every conscientious attempt to be present. I hope that the hon. member will come in sometime before I conclude my address, if I manage to conclude before the end of Private Members' Time.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's motion reads as follows:-

"Be it Resolved that the House views with grave concern the sharp deterioration in the Island's academic educational standards as mirrored in the recent public examination results and the stultification of the technical education programme."

The motion narrows itself down to criticism, both expressed and implied, of certain aspects of secondary education and another aspect of technical education; so it really was not in the context of the motion, the matter which the hon. member asked for - that is, a commission of enquiry.

I notice however, that in the report of the speeches appearing in the Barbados Advocate dated 14.4.65.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have to apologise to the Hon. Minister of Education. I understand that that debate has not yet appeared in Hansard; so I appreciate that the hon. member is at great disadvantage.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the very fact that I had to resort to the speech of the hon. Junior member for the City of Bridgetown as appeared in the daily newspaper indicated that I had no more certain source of authority to quote from.

In the report of the speech, one of the headlines was "Time for enquiry", and one gathers from the tenor of the report that the hon. member was suggesting that he thought there should be a commission of enquiry into the island's educational system.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister is bearing fully in mind where it is stated in Standing Orders that a member may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes, Sir, I am aware of that. I am only drawing attention to the headline. Now, Sir, let me say if the hon. member wishes to press his point about a commission of enquiry, I shall have to advise the House to resist that pressure; but I presume if that is what he wishes, he would ask leave to amend his substantive Resolution because nowhere in the text of that Resolution does he call for enquiry. That point arises only in part of his speech.

I wish to begin by saying that nobody is more worried than I am of the shortcomings of this island's educational system, and I go farther to say that the energy and emphasis which this Government, and my Ministry in particular, has given to the island's educational system have been indicated in the tremendous upsurge and improvement which has taken place in the educational structure over the last three and one-half years.

I have already given the House the full details of our progress from year to year as regards education, and later on in the course of this debate, I shall furnish this House with the same details. I would like to say this however. If I had known in 1961 what I know now about the island's educational system, in other words, if the magnitude of the task which I suspected then, but did not know for certain, was known to me, I do not think I would have had the courage to undertake this Ministry.

It has been a colossal and uphill task, but I undertook it because I have a genuine interest in education going far back to my own time. I was familiar for many years, as far

as any person in my own age group could be familiar, with the educational developments of the western world for the last 20 years, and because I think the people of this Island deserved to be raised from their complacency in this respect and start to recover the ground which had been lost in the last two or three decades.

The hon. members who sat in the previous House would remember the atmosphere which prevailed in this House in this country before 1961. You could not get a point of discussion to take place because the Government of the day was not interested in it at all. A Minister of Education was only appointed as a member of the Cabinet in September, 1958 and it was only in the last two years of the last session that the House enjoyed the privilege of hearing a discussion on education. 2.50 p.m.

I say this of my predecessor; he was a man who understood the primary school system in this island. It was no fault of his own that he had no experience of secondary education or of University Education, but he had a clear grasp of essential issues and principles, and did for me what few Ministers of Education would ever think of doing to the persons whom they suspected were going to succeed them in office. Before the end of the 1961 Legislative Session, the then Minister of Education called me and told me that it looked to him as if - at any rate it was possible - there would be a change of Government, and in order that the work of the Ministry of Education should not be held up by the change of Ministers, he wanted me to know in some detail what the Ministry was then engaged in. That was uncommonly decent of him and I have since paid him the tribute which I think, was due to him.

I have mentioned all of this to show that why I was able to enter upon this Ministry with so little dislocation was due to the fact that my predecessor in office had made me aware of the position at first hand, even before I had the constitutional responsibility of the problems and difficulties. It is not only that, but in the last two years of the last legislative session, he and I had an arrangement whereby I would give him previous notice of any question which I wanted to raise so that he would be fully seized with the issues and facts of a matter before he replied to me; so that between us we could make our fullest contribution to the debate at issue. I want to say here and now that that is the practice which I myself have carried on with the hon. member on the other side of the House. He is the person in this House who is the chief Opposition spokesman in matters relating to education, I regret to say that that understanding which I myself was prepared to honour to the hilt was not fully gone into by the hon. member when we debated the Estimates last March, because I repeatedly asked the hon. member before the House went into Committee of Supply on the Appropriation Bill, if there were any points which he wanted to raise with me and which would arise out of the consideration of the Estimates. I asked the hon. member this question: "Will you let me know beforehand anything which you would like to

raise?" The hon. member assured me that there were no points which he wanted to raise, that he wished to make only one point in the Estimates and that was on the question of examinations in the Secondary Grammar schools; and so when we considered the Estimates I was completely unprepared for the attack which was launched from that side on the Ministry. Happily for me, the hon. member did not take me completely offguard because, as Minister of Education, I have to be familiar at all times with what the Ministry is doing since I may be called upon at short notice to answer anything about the work of the Ministry. Although the hon. member had not given me previous notice of what would have taken place, I was able to answer him to his satisfaction. I say this because I would like the hon. member to know that if the two-party system is to work, there must be complete trust and honesty on both sides of the House. While it is true that I would not do anything to inhibit any hon. member on that side of the House from taking any line or point of view or any aspect of educational policy, I expect him to say to me what he wants to know and that he would take my offer in good faith and not try to spring any surprise on me. I would hate to accuse the hon. member of a wilful breach of good faith, but I would otherwise have to relinquish my parliamentary tactics.

The second point which I wish to make is this: In my position as Minister of Education, I get every day a voluminous amount of advice as to what to do and what not to do in my Ministry. Quite a lot of it is gratuitous because it either turns out that matters are already under consideration or they are already dealt with; if they are not dealt with, they are already under consideration. This advice is so contradictory that if I were to follow it in all of its aspects, the work of the Ministry would be reduced to shambles and our over-all administration would come to a stand-still. One bit of advice says that I should do this, and another bit of advice says that I should not do it, and so it goes on. I do not regard the advice which has been given by the hon. member as being either gratuitous or contradictory. Nobody could argue in what precise terms the hon. member should frame his motion or when he should debate the motion when it was framed. In deference to him, I would say that I believe he postponed the motion as long as he could. I believe that on the day when the hon. member did make the motion, he, like most people in the community, was suffering from the backwash or the front wash of the public controversy which had then started to rage about the Harrison College appointment. You will remember, Sir, that that controversy started, or when the hon. member started out on that strain in protesting against the alleged appointment of a non-Barbadian to that post. Your Honour intimated to him that it would have been better not to pursue that particular line; but it was clear that the hon. member was so taken up in the public controversy which was then raging, that he lost a lot of his usual dispassionate attitude towards things of great moment. I do not have to make any comment on the Harrison College appointment. I think - in fact. I know that it is being handled by the persons who are constitutionally responsible for handling it, and I have reasons to believe that when it is finally disposed, it will be to the satisfaction of those who are howling and growling.

One comment I wish to make is that there is a lot of that criticism which was unfair to the Government, and if I were a free agent I would have entered the controversy and would have set the position in its true light. Those who howl and growl for what they consider to be the appointment of a local person - a concept which the Government itself shares - those who howl and growl ought to know that sometimes when God wants to punish us, he answers our prayers. I would not go any further on that

point. 3.00 p.m.

I have disposed of that, because the appropriate authorities will finalise that matter, I believe, to everybody's satisfaction.

Now the hon. member among other things, accused the Ministry of being slavish in its imitation of the British educational system. This is certainly not true, and it is not true for a variety of reasons. I am to warn the hon. junior member for Bridgetown for this: I am certain he can say that I have taken the trouble ever since I have been Minister to make him aware of all major developments which are taking place in my Ministry from the time his appointment as Shadow Minister of Education was made known to this House. I cannot undertake to let him see Government files. Matters which quite properly belong to the Cabinet and only the Cabinet, I cannot bring to his attention, but outside and beyond this there is a wide scope which I have always invited him to share by making him aware of whatever is going on, and there is scarcely any major development that I know of which has taken place since I have been Minister of which I have not made him aware by personally informing him myself; and if at any time I happen to be carrying on conversations with important people whose contribution to our educational system has some significance, if these people are here in the island for any length of time, I always make it a positive duty to bring the hon. member into contact with them.

I am not saying, Sir, that he has ever had the opportunity of sitting down in conference with my advisers, both local and overseas, except on rare occasions when we are discussing private schools, because that is not his constitutional responsibility; but certainly I try, I think with suc-

cess, to make him aware of whatever I am doing save and excepting such matters which quite properly belong to the knowledge of the Cabinet or of the Government. Outside of these matters, if anything is going on, I let the hon. member know; therefore I am very surprised that he should select this particular point for attack that we are slavishly following the English educational system. He knows, for instance, that it is part of my policy now that Commonwealth bursary awards should be shared or enjoyed by students at Canadian Universities as well as Universities of the United Kingdom. He is perfectly aware of what the Ministry is doing in respect of a team teaching project at Harvard University which, after all, is an American idea, and he knows that I am importing it into the primary school system, and he knows also that I have very good hopes of spreading it throughout the whole system. He knows, for instance, that I am negotiating to get Peace Corps personnel here for teaching purposes, and he is also aware, because I have made this point to him, that if the numbers that I expect come, some of the Peace Corps teachers will be made available to Independent Approved Private Schools. I do not keep anything from him, and as I said, if I have really distinguished people here talking with me on wide aspects of educational policy and development, I make quite certain that he has a chance of meeting them, and I tell them that this gentleman is not only a highly successful Private Secondary Grammar

school educator himself, that he has run his own school for 24 years, but I say - more important and more significant than that - that he happens to be a member of our Legislature, and he is the person constitutionally charged with expounding the educational matters and policy for the Opposition, and this serves notice on people I talk with that we work the two-Party system in this island, and the Government, in so far as this Ministry is concerned, has no vital secrets from the Opposition.

I have no authority, nor does he desire me to show him Government files; but outside and beyond that, wherever I can make him aware even sometimes before my own colleagues are aware, I make him aware so that there should be not only continuity in educational policy, but that there should be genuine two-Party agreement on all important matters. To say, therefore, that we are slavishly following the British system is not only wrong, but I think, if he thought the matter over, he would perhaps want to amend that stricture, and I think he was speaking quite frankly when he made his speech. If he were speaking as a person who has vast, and in some cases, quite superior knowledge to myself in the secondary education system, because he has been in it longer than I have been, he could not have made the strictures which he made. I therefore could not accept for a variety and abundance of reasons any proposal for a Commission of Enquiry. For one thing the suggestion is big. What sort of operational terms would he want to enunciate as terms of reference for such a Commission of Enquiry? What sort of criterion would decide that all was well? I am sure he does know that education has so many phases and the educational system has so many ramifications, Mr. Speaker, that to set up a Commission of Enquiry and not to give it clearly defined terms of reference would be to make its work hopelessly vague in many cases, or make its report so long and so laborious that quite apart from conditions of cost, it would be quite likely that by the time the report was published, the conditions would have been changed long before, and therefore I must tell him that I have to reject his demand for a Commission of Enquiry into the educational system, not because all is well, but because I cannot advise the Cabinet to waste money and time in this kind of project. 3.10 p.m.

I prefer to concentrate my attention on what appear to be the crucial points of the system: and by concentrating my attention to what I consider the crucial points, this will allow me to exercise and prevent the waste of time in dealing with the facts that are really all too well known. One example of this it is useful, Mr. Speaker, to draw to my attention that one of the central facts in our educational system is the needs for trained teachers of all sorts. I really know that, and I have already taken steps of which this House has already been aware to meet the situation. Of course the demand for trained teachers outstrip the supply.

but this situation was inherited from the Barbados Labour party and I am now trying to make good the flow. In 1962, 90 teachers were trained; in 1964, 144 came out trained; therefore, in less than two years I have stepped up the output by 50 more and it would be probably nearly 200 by the end of 1966.

Another example of this. Since this Government has been in power, we have increased the number of Bursary scholarships, teacher training grants, and so on. All of these we have increased almost threefold; so much so now, that apart from the fact that we are pressing to get the greatest number of people trained in the shortest possible time, we have now found out that we have so many teachers at present on study leave that we have to employ more substitutes.

I have 82 teachers at the College of Arts and Science. Some of these will graduate in 1966, and the rest of them in 1967, 1968 onwards, according to the length and duration of the course. When you take that 82 teachers in your Establishment teachers who are already trained - some of whom you have given full time leave, others half time leave, when you do all of that and you know your Establishment needs, in order to encourage them with the facilities you (give them access to all of that, how can you say that the Government is falling down on its Teachers training policies? You give special Teachers special scholarships; that is to say, teachers who have a special knowledge in Science, you give them further training.

The reason why I am getting 25 teachers to come from overseas in September from the Peace Corps and eight others who can teach scientific subjects from the Canadian Exchange Service is because I want to release even more teachers, but I could not release them. The Canadian Exchange Service will fill in the breach and substitute for the teachers whom I would like to release.

The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown makes criticism about the fact that the primary school product of today is worse in ability and aptitude than the primary school of 20 years ago. That is quite true and I have said this myself. I think I know the reason for it, and I am trying with every effort I possess to set primary education again on its right path. But let us be fair. Do not blame me for the situation which I have inherited. Long before I was a Minister, all of us were complaining about the primary school system which was prevailing. It was not I who progressively neglected it. The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown said that all I am doing with educational development is to put up more buildings, to extend new wings, and make good speeches. However, there was a time when no primary school building was erected or no extension was made to secondary schools, and the eyes of the community can attest to the fact that more replacements have been done in the three and a half years that this Government was in power than had been done in the 15 years of the Barbados Labour Party/This is a matter of fact. Week before the last, there was a replacement of a school in St. Andrew and I have gone through the file and have seen that since 1956 the education authorities through Mrs. Bourne had been calling attention to the plight of St. Andrew's Girls' school; but the Government of which she was a strong supporter did not take her on. It was left to the hon. senior member of St. Andrew and his colleague to draw the matter to my attention, and I think I can safely say that they have asked me to put a new school there and their appeals have not gone unheeded. We have also erected new wings to the St. Martin's Junior School in St. Philip to which I went last week for the purpose of opening it, and I am going to one of two schools in St. George next Thursday afternoon to open a wing.

All over the island there have been extensions in school building. All of that has been done: and I want to tell hon. members that on this question of school buildings and extensions that is alright if you wish to put them up; but I think it is unfair when you are asking for more schools than you know we can afford to put up.

My answer to that is you can have more schools if you can join with me and other members of the Government in persuading the people of this island to provide educational facilities for their children. It means this; if money were available in quantities necessary, there would be no question at all that be able to build ten new secondary schools; as a matter of fact, I could change up the whole idea of secondary education in this island if I were granted the money to do it. But if the Hon. Premier were to come in here and lay on taxes to do so, there would be a big howl. That is the unfairness of the whole situation. Everybody wants something done. You get proposals from hon. members on the other side, and even from your own back- benchers: but they are proposals not to raise revenue, but proposals for spending. I am not saying that the proposals which they make are bad. Nobody gets up in this House and makes proposals to increase the revenue; all proposals made are for expenditure.

I say it from the point of view of my own Ministry. When my own Ministry is asked to cut back in order that other Ministries and Departments can project any development, I have to notice very carefully what is done. 3.20 p.m.

There are a lot of little pigs and there are a lot of nipples on the sow; so some of the little pigs will not get all the milk they want. That is the situation. Suppose people clamoured for this, that and every method of development in education! Suppose they said that we so badly need these schools that we are prepared to make any sacrifice, and they said to the Government: \"You can tax us, provided that you are willing to look after the children and we will provide the Government with a plan to build the secondary schools which we need.\" Our surplus children need ten secondary schools but who will provide the \$10 million which is needed for the capital construction and the recurrent cost? Everybody is complaining that the level of taxation is too high. You put the Ministry in an awkward position; you make proposals for development, but no proposals are made to get the community to take the plunge and provide all that is necessary for this improvement of the educational system.

Let me show you something, Mr. Speaker. If you take the figures of the Ministry for December, 1954. the number of pupils in the Government Secondary Grammar Schools was something like 4,714. The number of pupils in the approved Secondary Schools was 6,475. The number in the Government Comprehensive School was 5,992, and the number in the Private non-Approved schools was 6,449. That gives a total Secondary School population of something like 23,560. If you were to add to that the

"tops", that is to say, the eleven plus in the senior forms of the Primary Schools, you will get another 5,707, so that the number of 23,560 plus 5,707 will make a total of 29,267. We are roughly getting some kind of secondary education in this island. Some are in the Government-aided schools, some in the Secondary Grammar and Secondary Comprehensive schools some Approved and non-Approved schools and some are in senior form in the Primary schools. The point about that is this: if you were to take the pupils in the Comprehensive schools, the number in the Private schools, those in approved schools, and the senior "tops" of the Primary schools and add them together, you will get a total of 18,078. That is to say, that 18,078 pupils attend either the approved the non-approved Secondary Independent schools, the Government Comprehensive schools and the senior forms of the Primary schools. Those are the people in this island for whom I would like to build or to provide Secondary schools.

On this basis, we should need about 20 schools. I said that I could do with ten, but what I should need would be twenty schools; but who is going to say or what element in the community is prepared to make a sacrifice of 5, 6, 8 or \$10 million to provide 20 secondary schools, starting from next week? That is the problem with which we are faced. Therefore, it is no good making a claim that there is something wrong and that our standards have deteriorated. Our standards must necessarily deteriorate if we cannot provide the schools and the trained teachers at

the crucial and focal point at which they are needed. I therefore, do not boast that our situation on in this island is what it should be. The charge that somebody is complacent is not a charge which the hon. member could lay against me, because I said that some teachers are not working hard enough. I got into hot water when I told the grammar schools that they must break the back of the work in the First and Second forms; and some teachers whom the cap fitted and who drew the string, made strictures against me in the columns of the newspapers. That is the point at issue.

Another point is this; even although I know what schools are needed, one of the reasons why I hesitate to recommend an Immediate construction apart from the question of money - if we had the money we would certainly have one-half of what we need. I would not recommend all at this time for this reason: I cannot do the work of the Ministry of Education in a vacuum. I try to lay down the policy in my Ministry - a policy which dovetails with policies laid down in other Ministries. In other words, the Ministry of Education has to be patterned with the over-all development in the island. I cannot recommend anything which is out of proportion to other aspects of policy in the island. Suppose it happens that plans are being worked out and acted upon for the distribution of population in this island; Suppose we managed to spread industrial development over the whole face of the island wherever possible and we could build community centres, social centres, business centres, market centres and provide every single facility in St. George that we would wish to see in the City of Bridgetown! It would be clear that under these conditions the "imperatives" for private school places would not be the same as they are today. I said in our Manifesto that I would like to have a change in the school hours so that children would go to school at 8 o'clock in the morning. I cannot recommend that now in the light of the reorganization. If I were to do that, it would disorganize the transport system which flows into

Bridgetown in the morning and which flows out in the afternoon. I have to consider whether I should not time some part of this education policy to go hand in hand with other developments. If the policy is held at the present level in the next fifteen years, if industrial, commercial and cultural centres are spread out from Bridgetown over the whole face of the island, that would be bringing out a levelling up of living standards. 3.30 p.m.

It is possible and likely that the schools which are now called for due to the pressures on Bridgetown will no longer be needed in Bridgetown, but elsewhere; so I may find myself giving way to operational pressure because it now exists in a certain context, and neglecting future development. While it is true that I certainly need twenty new secondary schools, I cannot rush to recommend to the Cabinet that we put them down higgledy-piggledy where there seemed to be overcrowding. I have to wait and see how our plans fit in with one another for the overall development of the island.

There is an expert point of view that wherever you have 1,000 of population, that 1,000 of population can support a one-stream primary school of 240. Suppose it happened that in the next 10 or 15 years we did manage - and by "we" I mean the community - to carry on the type of development which some people envisage; suppose all our plans worked out and fructified to that extent, we may see as many people living in an area around Speightstown as now lived in Bridgetown; we could see as many people living in an area around Oistins as now live around Trafalgar Square. You would therefore have three big centres of population growth and population development, and each of these three centres would need identical forms of development; so that I have to relate educational policy to other policies elsewhere.

To attack the Ministry and to state that it is complacent and is doing this, that and the other is simply not true. We have presented a record in this island, Mr. Speaker, which cannot be challenged. Ever since I have been in the Ministry, the officers of my Ministry have been instructed to provide me with a progress report; but to tell the truth sometimes I am so busy that sometimes two or three

months pass and I do not look at it until occasionally I see something which reminds me to ask about something, and then I discover that the matter has been taken care of, and it astonishes me that we have been able to do so much.

Now here are some of the achievements of the Ministry of Education for the period January, 1962 to March 1965. I am giving them in terms of school places because if you follow the Development Plan, Mr. Speaker, you will see that it is more sensible to tell you how many places have been provided than to say how many schools have been built, although one's own eyes will tell him how many schools have

been built. Primary extensions, 3,500; primary replacements, 1,400; a new secondary comprehensive school giving 800 places; a new primary school giving 640 places; and other secondary replacements and extensions giving 875 places. Add that and see if it does not come to 6,000 new places, provided in a three-year period on an average of 2,000 per year. The Labour Party's record for any comparable year was something like 200 to 300 as compared with 2,000 a year by this present Ministry.

With respect to the grammar schools, this is what we have done for them. We have given to Queen's College two Science laboratories; we have given to Harrison College three Science laboratories; we have given Combermere School two Science laboratories; we have given the Boys' Foundation School a canteen and have renovated the buildings at the Girls' Foundation School and have given them an additional classroom. We have established Industrial Arts wings at ten secondary schools, including the Alleyne school as my colleague reminds me. On the Public Library side, we have extended the rural services by a Bookmobile, and the Public Librarian tells me that since the Bookmobile, - that is to say, the Library on wheels - has been going around the country, the number of juvenile borrowers has increased some three times. There have been extensions at Gall Hill Branch Library and at Six Cross Roads. While all this has been going on, we have still been doing other things which have been brought to the Cabinet's attention under the aegis of the Ministry of Education.

We have established, Mr. Speaker, a Hotel Training school and attached that to the Technical Institute, and we have put there two classrooms, one lecture room and one administrative office and we have appointed a staff for it. At the Technical Institute itself we have put on these increased facilities: one laboratory, one extra workshop for plumbing and metal work, two new classrooms; we have extended the welding shop, erected a forge shop there are courses in radio servicing, technicians' course from motor vehicles, and another course just beginning on electronics.

It is true that the hon. member says that there has been a stultification of the Technical Institute's work, but I think that he is aware of the fact that plans are on foot for moving the Technical Institute from there on to a new site, expanding its work and for turning the building there now presently occupied by the Technical Institute into a Trade School to take in a wider number and variety of 14+, 15+, 16 year old people. This is going to cost about \$1 million, and what the Government has done is this: we have asked the Department of Technical Co-operation and the Foreign Aid Agencies of the Canadian Government whether they would co-operate in allowing us to make this expansion in technical training. Both the Department of Technical Co-operation and the Canadian external aid agencies have said that they are interested, and we must wait on them until they can tell us what they are prepared to give us for this project. If I do not from time to time get overseas aid of some kind for these projects, and if on the other hand I ask for them without saying how they were going to be financed, the Ministry of Finance in order to give them to me would have to raise them from revenue.

I have Just been given \$1/2 million to have a team teaching project here. That is vital because to those who want to re-organize and refurbish and re-develop the Primary school system, I tell them they are going to get it when the effect of team teaching is spread. To get that spread and to be able to institute it, you have to have money.

I had to appeal to the Ford Foundation for aid. If we had come here and asked for \$1/2 million, it would mean increased taxes and there would be a howl. On the other hand, they accuse us of going cap in hand and begging overseas agencies for help, but we have to do that, because the people of this island are not prepared to meet the responsibilities which the community should make for its own development. 3.40 p.m.

In order to help them get development, Ministers have to lug about often to their own inconvenience, and go and ask for over seas help and to ask for aid in these projects. When the Canadian External Aid people and the British Technical Co-operation can give us huge sums for building well then, of course all the things which the hon. member is asking for will be done. Under the present circumstances which I deplore more than he does, we must carry on as best as we can,

I do not like the remarks which have been made of officials when I know that under terrible conditions they have been keeping the proverbial Ministry going. It is really stupid to say that the amount of work which is now being done in various aspects could have been much more. I can make even more damaging criticisms than the hon. member made of the Technical Institute. It was entirely at my insistence that the new wings have been put on in the last two years because I saw the need for them. The Ministry was approached by young people who had left school and who said that they wanted training. There are hundreds of young people whom we know who want training. I did not advise the Government out of current revenue to lay large sums for education; so I asked the overseas agency for the extension.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to deal with this matter at such length, but I am not prepared to let the case of my Ministry go by default. I sincerely hope that the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown is not initiating agitation against the Government by the bringing up of this matter or merely because this happens to be election year. Whether or not this is election year, I know the Ministry of Education as headed by me can face any electorate. Be it election year or not, or whether the election is now, tomorrow or the next day, it is not the slightest concern to me because the Ministry of Education has done sufficient to commend it to the people of this island.

Now, Sir, may I just touch on the question of the report. One thing which agitates me considerably is this question of examination. But before doing so, let me just refer to teacher training to let the hon. member know what we have done at Erdiston. In 1962-63, we erected two new buildings and two demonstration blocks. This was because my predecessor for reasons which were acceptable to him but which I entirely rejected had changed the policy of teacher training, and had this idea that in future at Erdiston teachers should be trained in a one-year course and not in a two-year course. I understood his anxiety. He wanted to turn out as many a number of trained teachers as possible and he thought that if he shortened the course he would turn out twice as many.

After I became the Minister of Education I changed it. I knew from my knowledge that in shortening the course, sooner or later you would have to take these people back into the College for Refresher Courses. The point is that a one-year course was not sufficient; therefore, I agreed to introduce the two-year course again, but to retain the one-year course. I felt that it was better for the young teacher to get the full training, and the teacher who already had been in the teaching service could come back in for a one-year course. I do not like to say old teachers; so I said that the matured teachers could come back in for a one-year course while the young teachers take the two-year course. Therefore, I started the two-year course and the one-year course, and then found it necessary to make these additions to the building.

I was not also only interested in the buildings. I have already pointed out the number of trained teachers which we are getting from Erdiston. I wanted to recruit as many

as possible into the teaching service; so I, for the first time in 1962 called in about 300 young people who had never taught before and gave them training in an induction course. In 1963, we trained 600 of them and in 1964, 800 of them. It does mean that even though they are not all employed in teaching, you can call on them to help you because they were given some of the rudiments of teaching. As I have said, not all of them are employed by the Ministry of Education.

There is also an increase in the numbers catered for, and the number of teachers from Primary schools who have been trained in Certificate B has increased. They have been increased provision for those taking scholarships in Science and Geography. There has been an increase in the number of people we have on courses at the University of the West Indies; there has been an increase in the number of persons taking course in England, and there has been an increase in all the external assistance programme from Canada and the United States and all this sort of thing.

I do not wish to speak of the specific things which my Ministry has done. But if you would take an instance, we have completely overhauled the Relief Teacher system. Only two months ago, the Cabinet approved of the new system of payment for Relief School Teachers of which the House is well aware. Since we have undertaken the induction course, we have made it more substantial. We have extended the length of the course. All that we have done. 3.50 p.m.

We have given free secondary education by abolishing fee-paying in our schools, and a re-organization of the curriculum in these secondary schools is currently going on. The care of children of school leaving age is still under consideration, and it will be dealt with when the general educational picture emerges. I am putting before the Government proposals for a new Education Act consolidating all the laws dealing with education in a Statute Book, and making new provisions as and when they become necessary. We must have a new Education Act because the system which I have inherited brings more embarrassment to the Minister merely because it is obsolete. It needs law in order to clear up what the powers of the Minister of Education are. If he knows what his powers are, he can direct things; but if there are not defined you will also have somebody else \"passing the buck\" and a lot of things will happen which will not become a credit to the educational system. We have given greater encouragement to teaching and we have thoroughly re-examined the teacher-training syllabus.

With respect to the independent Private Secondary schools, there are a lot of fringe which we have instituted, and the refund of the examination fees is one of them. All these bits of concessions which have been given have to do with the importation of educational material, and we are engaged in re-appraisal of the private secondary system in these schools. When the Hon. Premier makes his Budget Speech week after next, he will include in that Speech the matter of dealing with the independent secondary schools. I say this because it calls for a massive financial contribution from the Treasury, It is only fitting therefore that because of the tremendous financial outlay involved, education should be given proper treatment in the Budget and not released to the public in the ordinary way. I am quite sure that when the approved Primary Schools are made aware of what it is proposed to do for them in these proposals, 99.99% of their grievances would have gone by the board. Of course, there has been a lot of clamour over the last two or three years that something should be done for the Private Secondary Schools, but you cannot do anything unless you make a thorough appraisal of the entire situation. Until I know the total number of school children needing accommodation. I could not fit into the picture the part played by the Private Secondary Schools. It is only now that I am making some proper comprehension of what is to be done for the approved Secondary Schools.

I have received valuable assistance not only from my colleague the Minister of Health, but also from the hon. mover of the motion which I am now debating. I have called upon the hon. mover of the motion, the hon. Junior member

for Bridgetown, to advise me on certain aspects of the proposals for the purpose of helping the Private Secondary Schools. The hon.member therefore knows what is operating in my mind, and he knows what I am putting before the Cabinet; it will have both the approval of the Cabinet and the Principals and Heads of these schools. In every step we have made there has been approval.

To go through the Manifesto, we promised to grant scholarships and to abolish the payment of fees in the Government-aided Secondary Schools; we have done this. We have promised the provision of more University Scholarships and Exhibitions for people studying in the fields of Preventive Medicine, Economics, Commerce, Agricultural Sciences, Climatology, Civil Engineering, Community Planning, Fisheries production and all of that. This is something which we did not promise - we never promised that we would establish a College of Arts and Sciences in Barbados. We said that we would invite recognised Canadian and American Universities to establish University Colleges and Specialists faculties in Barbados. We have done that to some extent because the Mc.Gill University has a specialised faculty here, and it does a considerable amount of work in research problems which will help our development. We did not promise to establish this Arts and Science College; but when we saw that it was possible for the people of Barbados to sustain and support a University College, which is an integral portion of the University of the West Indies, in this Island, we lent our support to such proposals. Therefore the University of the West Indies has been established in three islands, namely, Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados. We did not promise the people a University College, but we have given them one. We did not promise them that if they went in for any sort of Higher Education facilities we would pay the fees for those who attended these institutions. We did not promise that, but we have done that. Every single Barbadian student who attends the College of Arts has his examinations fees paid by this Government. That is not a promise in the Manifesto, but it is something which we have done. We have established a Wireless Broadcasting system in the time which we have indicated. We have established within the framework of the present facilities, more classes and more workshops at the Technical Institute which we said we would do. We said that we would embark on Nursery School Education. We thought that we would have been able to do that in 1962, but when we examined the issue, we found that it would have been better to start experimentally, and eventually we opened an experimental Nursery School. The experience gained in this school would be very valuable to the Government in planning the establishment of kindergarten and nursery education in this island. We have also established a School Meals Service and an extension of that service to St. George will soon take place. 4.00 p.m.

Now therefore it occurs to me that in so far as the Ministry of Education is concerned apart from the re- organisation of the school hours, apart from bringing in the new Education Act as promised, there is nothing promised in the Manifesto which this Ministry has not done or at least attempted; so all who want to make political issues out of the Ministry of Education can make them at any time. I am ready to face any challenge which anybody wants to bring with respect to the work done by the Ministry of Education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I turn to the strictures levelled against the Ministry by the hon. member with respect to examination results, I find his attitude very extraordinary. First of all, he must have been aware of the fact that he had not made any criticism which I myself had not made. I went to the Lodge School Speech Day two months ago and excoriated what I still think was the lazy minority of teachers in grammar schools, and I make no apologies for it. The grammar school teachers who opposed and criticised me do not do it on educational grounds; they do it on political grounds, because they are supporters of a political Party which has been displaced from the seat of Government. I well remember the first week that I was Minister, I received deputation from the Association of Secondary Teachers. They brought a proposal to me, and I said to

them: \"Your proposal might be all right and quite acceptable in theory, but it has financial implications and I will have to study them, because I do not know where the money would come from\". Whereupon, Mr. Speaker, a member of that delegation who is on the staff of one of our leading girls' schools said to me, \"Well, Mr. Minister, if you can find money for hot meals, you can find money for what we require.\" The opposition to me from among teachers is never the opposition made on educational grounds; but from what I am told, their opposition to me is on political grounds and I accept it as such. But I will not answer them in the newspapers, because it would be beneath my dignity to do so. I am Minister, and if I send a directive to them, they have to obey it. A certain request was made of the Educa- Department by the Head of one of these Secondary Schools. He sent to say that he has in his First and Second forms a large number of pupils who show no promise, and he wants to know if to put them out of school. Now a person in a second form of a grammar school can only be at most 13 years. Do you think I am such a mug as to give anybody, even apart from my own private opinion, authority to put any child out of school at the age of 13 on the grounds that he has not made any progress? Do you know why this question has been asked? I said at the Lodge School that the results show that if the back of the work had been broken in the first and second forms, by the time the children reached the fifth forms they would face examinations without any fear, and I still say from the floor of this House that not enough work is done in the first and second forms of the grammar schools of this island.

One of the people who applied for an important vacant post was a person who never corrected or set a single written test in the course of a whole year in a form doing work in his subject for the General Certificate of Education. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, preparing pupils for a public examination and not setting them a written test for the whole of the year and then being surprised at their failing, if any failed? That is the sort of thing that is going on; and when I drew attention to the laziness and callousness which some teachers - only the minority who support the Barbados Labour Party - indicate and demonstrate, they get angry with me, but that is a matter entirely for them. I will say this: so long as I discover that the pupils of the Government grammar schools of this island are being short changed and not getting the full level of tuition which they deserve and which they have a right to have, for so long I am going to castigate the heads and the individual members of staff responsible.

I was attacked last Saturday night at a Founder's Dinner held by the Old Boys of Combermere School. The Headmaster of Combermere School chose that occasion to attack me without even the courtesy of warning me that he proposed to make some reference to my policy. That is the sort of thing I am up against; but I am not up against it in the sense that I cannot do anything about it, for as quiet and as tranquil a person as I am, I am determined that my own policy with respect to secondary education will be carried out in this island. I do not care who the Heads are, where they come from, who are their friends and on whom politically they have to rely; so long as I give a directive, and that directive is backed by the Cabinet of this island, that directive must be obeyed; so if they wish to write letters to the newspapers attacking the Minister, motivated by political spite and opposition, they are quite welcome to do it; this is a free Society; but after they have written the letters and grumbled, they have to carry out my policy, and my answer already communicated to them, already handed to them in personal conversation, is being given from the floor of this House. I would like the children in the first and second forms of the grammar schools to be thoroughly taught, and that I ascribe to the fact that they are not being properly motivated, that not enough attention is being paid to them in the First and Second forms, and that the poor results experienced in the Fifth forms in public examinations are traceable in large measure to the neglect by some teachers in the work done in the First and Second forms of the grammar schools.

Now I would say that if tomorrow they wish to send a letter to the Press again excoriating me, they are quite

welcome to do so. I shall not answer them before; I should only like to see that my policy is carried out and Governing Bodies are informed by me what to expect, I say that because I want to deal with this question of examinations. When the hon. member talked about a decline in the standards, he and I are not at daggers' end on this point, because he knows what a properly taught Fifth form is capable of, as I do. He spends all of his life in looking into these problems and I have had considerable experience of them. 4.10 p.m..

Therefore, apart from being Minister and having certain responsibilities to discharge, in my personal right I am aware of what it is to produce successes in the Fifth form to pupils reading for the G.C.E. examination. The hon. Junior member for the City of Bridgetown must know that part of the trouble is that there has been a deterioration in the comprehension, expression, and what not, or the language you speak by pupils of a certain age.

I have my own view of the background of English. I know that when English Grammar used to be taught in Elementary schools, nobody ever complained that a boy who has a good elementary training in English ever found it difficult to express himself. I am sure the hon. member has found this out too, and he would say that this is true. When the old Senior Cambridge certificate used to be taken by pupils of secondary schools, all pupils discovered that the English Language paper of the Schools curriculum was already covered by them if they had passed out of the seventh standard at Primary schools. You had pupils leaving the primary schools then and going and taking the L.C.C. Examination papers in Arithmetic and English and passing. That has happened before, and it would take us some time now before primary school education comes up to that standard. This is supported by the wealth of experience. From the time we stopped teaching formal English, our standards began to drop.

It is with regret that I have to say that the people who are responsible for the Primary schools' curriculum are the same people who received a sound training in English Grammar, and I had to tell teachers of a Secondary school that at its last speech day. I did tell them that they would have got better results if they would only teach English Grammar as it should be taught, and I pointed out that the people who say that it is not necessary to teach English Grammar are the people who have been taught it, and it is very hard to think that they having acquired a thorough knowledge of English now want to deny it, to their pupils. It is not fair at all. I am no expert of teaching methods; I only had an experience of it when I was teaching; but I do know that you cannot teach a subject unless you teach the structure.

All these things which the people are complaining about is attributable to this weakness. If you cannot comprehend your own language, you cannot express yourself; so your failure in other subjects may be due to lack of ability to be able to express the knowledge which you have in other subjects. If you can write a good essay and can comprehend, you probably can write six good answers to a History or Geography paper or you can get proper marks in Mathematics. If your own language is good, your other knowledge in the other variety of subjects may not in all instances be up to mark; but you will be able to give good answers if you are properly taught. But if you are not properly taught in the English language then, may be, the discouraging results in the people who teach and the failure in Mathematics may well be directly attributable to the fact that the persons who failed had no proper teaching in their own language, and could not express their thoughts precisely. Not all the people who fail in Mathematics fail in English; but if they did it would tend to establish the point which I am making. My chances of passing an examination are 50 - 50; but if you do not know your own language, your chances of failure are 75 - 25.

Naturally however, there are lots of things which we can do. We can tighten up the whole question of examination

procedures, and see to it that people should undertake the same examination under the same

circumstances. In the last resort, however, no matter how much you do, you do not write the examination for the child, and you cannot guarantee if he would pass or fail.

Sir, I want to make it known that this whole question of overseas examination is under constant review. The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown is also aware of this because at my invitation he very kindly accepted to participate in the working of a very important committee which met here in August last year to go into the question of substituting a Carribean Council for the present General Certificate of Education. The hon. member sat on that Committee, and he knows my mind; and he knows that one of the reasons for the change in the original examination is to eliminate the things which we now complain about. The hon. member knows that the change will give us the opportunity to set our own papers, to work our own syllabuses to take into account the environment, and so on, of the child; in other words, to give, in addition to the highest possible chances of achievement, a Carribean set up. I mention that to show that it is one more instance in which to keep the hon. member fully informed of every conceivable measure. I tell him what we are doing, and if you can name any project which this Government is embarking on which I have not brought to his attention, I would be too glad to be made aware of it. But I do not think he can say that he has not been made aware of everything which we are doing which is of overriding importance.

While it is true that I do not anticipate any change of Government, there well might be, and education has to be made a matter for there to be no hiatus or no marking of time. Therefore, if his Party assumes power and he becomes Minister of Education, he would have been made previously aware of what the position is. Therefore, Sir, I say today that the hon. member knows all the important developments in my Ministry because it is more important that the youngsters of this country should have the best education that they can get than who is returned to power or which Government is in power. That is how I think about it: so I cannot see the force of the hon. member's strictures.

All the lower standards which the hon. member has complained about I have complained about too. I called a meeting two or three month sago of the heads of the Secondary Grammar schools, and told them how displeased I was of the examination results. I observe some of the good canons of justice to tell them before I made my speech at the Lodge School of what I was going to say. I put my point of view and displeasure to them to give them an idea of how I was thinking. 4.20 p.m.

I paid the Heads of Schools that courtesy, but I did not feel that I should extend the same courtesy to the staffs. The one Head who did not attend that meeting is the one Head who is giving all the trouble today on this aspect. I say nothing more about that. I was displeased with some of the examination results in some of the schools. I have given my ideas and views on it, and I gave the necessary support. There has been agreement with me in theory and principle, and I am preparing a directive to go to the Secondary Schools to put right two or three things which the hon. member has called attention to in his

speech - and not only to those things but to the other things which have been going on of which the hon. member is not aware, but of which I am aware and I wish to put right long before he is made aware of them.

The hon. member knows that it is my policy to make recommendations to Government that representatives of the Approved Independent schools be given seats on the Education Board. I feel that the time has come when they should form part of the Minister's Advisory Council. I would like to be able to call upon them as freely as they say I can on matters as to the running of all our Secondary Schools. Since these representatives of Approved Independent Schools are going to be brought more fully into the school system, it is only right that I should make my self available

for advice and counsel from their side. I also propose to have from the staff of the Ministry, somebody to give advice to the Approved Secondary Schools, to advise as to the curriculum and also to get advice from these schools. In order to do that I have to have a special member of the Inspectorate whose work will be to look into these schools.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Ministry of Education has anything to be ashamed about, but I am not complacent. We feel that wherever there is a good system there can be a better system. We have outlined in some detail our disability, and find that there is a lack of money and a lack of expertise in certain quarters, and all of that indicates that the Ministry of Education since 1962 has performed marvellous work in this island. I do not think that any other Ministry of Education in any other part of this area could boast of the achievement which this Ministry in Barbados has performed. This is not to say anything about other Ministries whose work calls for praise, but I do say that this Ministry of Education stands out not only for its performance but for its aptitude, for its policies and for its expertise; and it stands head and shoulders above any other Ministry in any territory of comparative aspirations.

The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown has asked for an official enquiry into the educational system in this island. I resent that request because I do not think it is called for. If he wishes to divide the House, we will do that on his motion. I do not think a Commission of Enquiry is called for because the Ministry as at present constituted, is a better Commission of Enquiry than any Commission of Enquiry that we could appoint. We are not a Mutual Admiration Society in Bay Street; we have no time to praise one another or to chide anybody. Even as we have rapidly fulfilled the pledges we have made to the community and we work overtime to carry out our aspects of policy, we still find that we are most dissatisfied with the situation because we know that wherever there is a good system, there is a better one. It is because we know that this system is a good one, that we want to have a better one.

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER:

It now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business has expired, and the time for Government Business is resumed.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. John- To move the second reading of a Bill to impose a tax on travel tickets issued in respect of journeys commencing at Seawell Airport.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned Premier, but I understand that he does not propose to proceed with it today. Even if the Hon. Premier were here, we expect that he would have said that.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned senior member for St. John- To move the passing of the following Resolution -

Resolution to approve the draft Order entitled \"The Boundaries Commission Order, 1964\", which was laid before the General Assembly on 24 November. 1964.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable and Learned Premier wishes to initiate the debate on this Resolution at today's sitting. He is not now in his place and I do not know if it would be in order for me to move the suspension of this sitting for half an hour.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That would not be out of order. Does the hon. member propose to make a motion?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Yes, Sir. I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly until 5. 05 p.m. of the clock.

4.30 p.m.

On Resumption.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the Bell be rung, Mr. Deputy Clerk. The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained. THE BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ORDER. 1964

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, which is Order No. 4, and that is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Draft Order entitled \"The Boundaries Commission Order, 1964\", which was laid before the General Assembly on 24th November, 1964.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in October, 1962, the Legislature passed an Act of that year, Chapter 41, entitled \"The Boundaries Commission Act\", which made provision for the setting up of a special Commission under Your Honour's chairmanship in order to make recommendations for the division of the island into as many constituencies as there are members for the General Assembly. The Representation of the People Act, 1957, Section 3, provided that the island should be divided into twenty-four constituencies, and as a result of a legal ruling given to the Commission, it was decided to proceed to divide the island into twenty-four electoral districts, following the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, Section 3, that there should be as many members as there are constituencies in the island.

The Report, Mr. Speaker, was submitted in the Legislature on the 14th April, 1964. That is well over a year; so I do not think that any member here is in a position to complain that he has not had sufficient time to study the provisions of the Report as he would have had by now well over twelve months in which to do so. A Resolution was first presented to the Legislature over five months ago, and the Government having presented the Resolution which was in my name, on several occasions was ready to proceed with the debate on the Resolution. From about the second week after the giving of notice of that Resolution, on each occasion on which this House met, I personally invited the Leader of the House to proceed with the debate on the Resolution. The fact that the debate was not proceeded with is not due to any hesitancy on the part of this Government to institute the reform which is at least 115 years due - to divide the island into single-member constituencies, no matter what fulminations one may get in the columns of the Press. We appreciate that columnists have to do something on week-ends to justify the pay they receive at the end of the month, and in a community like this one where all sections of the community are being satisfied with the programmes which are being carried out, one has to look around for straws, if one is a journalist, for the lack of something substantial in order to justify the pay which is given to you. I should like it to go on record, however, since I was absent at the time when the Leader of the Opposition drew to Your Honour's attention that the Resolution had been on the Order Paper over the prescribed period and had not been dealt with, that on each occasion that the House met, as I said, after an interval of two or three weeks of the tabling of the Resolution, I invited the Leader of the House who is in charge of Government Business to debate this, but

It was not debated due to the recalcitrance of the members of the Opposition Parties who were seldom in their places in sufficiently representative groups, and it is for that reason alone that the Leader of the House elected not to proceed. The Leader of the House, of course, is exercising his democratic right as

far as I am concerned. Once members have been given notice of a Bill, they have a right to be in their places to have it debated, but I presume that the Leader of the House felt that in a matter which some people considered of a revolutionary character such as this, as far as the electorate is concerned, he did not want to proceed unless the Opposition Parties were fully represented.

Now whether the Opposition Parties are fully represented here today or not is immaterial to me, because I intend to proceed with it so that no one would have any illusion whatsoever as to the intention of this Government to introduce the principle of single-member constituencies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government in its programme which it put before the people during the election of 1961 said this under the heading "Constitutional" in the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party:

"In accordance with the Party's memorandum submitted earlier in 1961 to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Democratic Labour Party is unswervingly dedicated to the principle of singlemember constituencies with the setting up of the necessary Boundaries Commission to provide for a re-distribution of the seats in the General Assembly on a population basis."

It went on to refer to such other constitutional matters as representation of the Official Opposition - whatever it may be - on the Legislative Council, now the Senate; the reduction of the voting age from 21, and the setting up of an all-Party Public Accounts Committee to guard against the misuse of public funds. Every single one of these promises made to the electorate under the constitutional reforms envisaged by this Party has been implemented - without exception - with the approval of the Legislature. The voting age has been reduced to 18 years, and I note now that the United Kingdom is thinking of following in the footsteps of Barbados in that respect. The Official Opposition is represented in the Senate, and not only is the Official Opposition represented in the Senate, but the Governor in exercise of his powers under the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions has even given representation to the Unofficial opposition. It is true that it is a rather noisy belligerent, unprogressive and uniformed type, but nevertheless the outward and visible signs of democracy have been ensured in the representation even of the Unofficial Opposition in the Upper Chamber; so that is an act of supererogation on the part of this Government. 5.20 p.m.

In many other respects we have gone far beyond what was promised. I need only mention the educational field where we promised that there would be free secondary education by January, 1962 and we had it: and by September 1963, we had gone beyond that and gave free University education. When people say that this Government has not been keeping their promises to the electorate, it is very difficult.

A single matter which we said that we would do and have not done is to put up a cement factory. We have not got the cement factory because when going into the economics of it, we discovered that the capital would be almost prohibitive, something to the extent of six to seven million dollars, and then its employment content would be infinitesimally low* therefore, we felt that as far as Government is concerned, some of that money would be more profitably spent in a category which would employ 300 or 400 people directly.

I now deal with the substance of the Resolution. In accordance with the provisions of the Report, the island is now being divided into 24 constituencies: but the one salient feature of the Commissioners' work is the fact that the voting and polling districts have not been disturbed; in other words, the number of polling stations remains exactly as it was in 1961 under the Representation of the People Act. I cannot remember the precise number, and I do not want to

spend time turning over the pages of this document to find the appropriate number, but my recollection of the number of polling stations in this island is approximately 110. Those stations remain intact* But what has been done- a measure of reform which has been effected - was that instead of grouping the polling stations into groups so that there would be 12 voting areas or constituencies, they have reallocated some parishes for less, and some parishes for more, and they have regrouped the country into 24 constituencies. Therefore, right at the outset the only difficulty, which is not really a difficulty, is that people in some parishes may find themselves voting for somebody in another parish.

However, the parish in Barbados for a long time has ceased to be a rational administrative or electoral area. This administrative antiquity was overcome by the Local Government Act in 1958 when the island was subdivided into three Local Government Authorities - the Northern District Council, the Southern District Council and the Bridgetown City Council. The whole rationale of the Government structure has been advocated by the Jackson Report, and in due course the Government will be bringing done the necessary regulations to give effect to that rationalization.

If the parish is obsolete as an administrative area, I do not think there is any doubt, and I have no doubt, that as a line of electoral demarcation it never had any validity at all.

There has been for the past 50 years a large migration of persons from the rural districts into what is now known as the urban area, which is now under the jurisdiction of the Bridgetown City Council. Over two-fifths of the island's total population, and certainly over 50% of the people who pay Local Government rates and taxes, live in the urban or metropolitan districts, and I do not think it is incumbent upon me to express that with any great force; but the rationale is if the people who pay 50% of the

island's taxes and who number two-fifths of the island's population are represented by four people in the General Assembly, whereas the other three-fifths of the island's population and the people who pay 49% or 50% of the Local Government Rates are entitled to representation by 20 persons in this Assembly, the principle of parliamentary democracy could not function on that basis.

Some people in different political parties consider the present position congenial to their interest* We are not concerned with that because defeat must come at some time. We have gone all over the island and preached that the question of double-member constituencies was found in no part of the world except a very few countries and it had no basis whatsoever. Therefore, once we have expressed ourselves so strongly that we are dedicated to this principle - which principle was promulgated before when we presented the Secretary of State with the memorandum in 1951 - the question of whether it is individually convenient or not or whether some of the sad faces which we see around from time to time would be seen in the future is irrelevant to this exercise. The fact is that Barbados is one of few territories in the British Commonwealth-and the Legislature of Bermuda is the other which comes to my mind - which still retain double-member constituencies. We cannot always be in line with the people who are lagging behind; we have to be with the people in the vanguard or at least try to catch up with those in the front.

The Commission recommended that the island be divided into 24 constituencies. They are allocated among the five groups: Group I, 9 constituencies; Group II, 4 constituencies Group III, 4 constituencies Group IV, 2 constituencies and Group V, 5 constituencies.

Group 1, with the City of Bridgetown comprises of nine constituencies.

While I am on this subject, I am glad that the representatives of St. Michael and the City of Bridgetown are here because the other day I picked up an official document and read that the population of Castries is 27,000 and I read that the population of Bridgetown is four or five thousand persons, 5.30 p.m.

I think it is time that this Assembly went on record as inviting the Colonial Office and all the printers and publishers, Whittaker's Almanac, the Caribbean Year Book and other publications to realise that the population of Bridgetown is in the region of 100,000 persons. When people look in this Statistical Digest or other publications and see that St. Lucia has a population in the Capital City of four or five times the population of the Capital in Barbados, they come to the conclusion that Barbados is a backward place with a little fishing village, whereas these other places are progressive countries bursting at the seams. You would be surprised that the Bridgetown City Council or the Chamber of Commerce

has not taken up this matter before. I certainly feel that there are lots of things in the Municipality of Bridgetown which should be done and I do not see them done. I should like to see something being done for the money which we are paying. It looks undignified for the Capital City of Bridgetown to be attributed a population of four or five thousand persons, and I think that we are doing ourselves a great injustice when we let that sort of thing get around. Since the Local Government Reforms of 1958, the City of Bridgetown has a population of probably 92,000 persons within its boundaries. These 92,000 persons are represented by two persons in the General Assembly.

It is proposed that the parish of St. Michael shall be divided into nine constituencies which will be five constituencies more than there are at present. This means that Boundaries Commission tried to follow its instructions by making a constituency as close as possible to the 5,000 mark. There is not a single constituency recommended which is under 4,000 in the nine constituencies, nor is there a constituency which is over 4,000 dealing in round figures. The constituencies would be as follows:-

St. MichaelNorth-West4,437

St. MichaelWest4,885

St. MichaelSouth West4,577

St. MichaelNorth-East4,776

St. MichaelSouth-East4,953

St. MichaelNorth-Central4,795

St. MichaelSouth-Central4,695

St. MichaelSouth4,302

These are the figures for 1963-64. I do not intend to read out all the constituencies, because they are in the Report of the Boundaries Commission. I think that the Commission has done a good job in managing, without disrupting the number of polling stations or cutting through the polling districts, to rationalise the number of the electorate in such a way as they have done, and to keep quite close to their job.

We come now to the rural districts. The parish of Christ Church has a total of 15,000 electors and there were two representatives before. The Commission has recommended that this parish should be divided into four constituencies namely, Christ Church West, Christ Church North- Central, Christ Church South-Central and Christ Church East. The registered electors for the respective constutencies are 4,146; 3,849; 3,760, and I notice that the Ministerial District of Christ Church East has 3,329 registered electors. (Laughter).

As far as the parish of St. Philip is concerned, there will be two constituencies- St. Philip North, 3629 registered electors, and St. Philip South, 3,768. Similarly, the parish of St. George has been divided into two constituencies - St. George North, 3,668 registered electors, and St. George South, 4,006 registered electors. That is as far as the 1963 Electoral Register is concerned.

We come now to the constituency of St James. The parish of St. James has at present two representatives, and the proposed change will allow one seat for that parish with a voting population of 5,050 by the 1963-64 Registers of Electors. As far as the parish of St. Andrew is concerned [believe that that is the smallest constituency. The people who live in St. James and have the same sort of geographical configuration, will gravitate towards St. Andrew. A

part of St. James has been cut off and put on to the parish of St. Andrew. The Commission in its Report says this:-

\\"This Commission considered that the uniformity of the terrain of the hilly district of the parishes of St. James and St. Andrew should afford a more balanced distribution of the electorate between those adjacent constituencies than at present exists. In order to achieve this the Commission recommends, as stated in paragraph 65 above, that the two polling districts SA and SD which form part of the present constituency of St. James should form part of the proposed constituency of St. Andrew.\"

Therefore the total number of electors, even with this new appropriation to St. Andrew, will still be almost one thousand less than the number of voters in the new constituency of St. James; but neither one of the two parishes is sufficiently large in order to afford a voting population of 4,000 in two constituencies. Neither of the two parishes is capable of supporting a voting population of 3,000 or 4,000 electors in two constituencies; so what the commission has recommended is perfectly rational, and I do not see that there should be any cause for disappointment or alarm with this allocation. 5.40 p.m.

As a matter of fact. Sir, this is the only territorial realignment in so far as the parishes are concerned. The constituency of St. Thomas will have one seat with a voting population of 4,362. Similarly the parish which I have the honour to represent, the parish of St. John will have one seat with 4,816; the constituency of St. Peter whose boundaries will be co-terminal with the voting district will have one seat with a population of 4,529; similarly a. Joseph will have one seat with 3,967.

Your Honour, of course, submitted a Minority Report, and I am sure that at the appropriate time, if Your Honour chooses to leave the Chair - I do not know what machinery we have for that - Your Honour will be able to give your views.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. and Learned member may be assured that I will not descend into the arena.

Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. Speaker, those are the recommendations of the Boundaries Commissions; they are simple, they are straightforward, they are not complicated and they are capable of being understood by the average elector of this island, and even by some members of the House, and I do not see that they should be in any way controversial, because I consider that the Commission which was comprised of Your Honour, Sir Frank Holder as Deputy Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the House and the hon. senior member for St. George, was fully representative of political opinion in this island, and I consider that all other members of the House will agree that the Commission has done a first-class job of a very difficult task and in very difficult circumstances in recommending the re-allocation of boundaries in this Report.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier made it clear that I happened to have been one of the members of the Commission, and I can only say that long before the Democratic Labour Party brought in their manifesto the question of single-member constituencies, we of this Party always advocated single-member constituencies. I well remember that during the tenure of office of the last Government, Sir Grantley Adams in an interview at Seawell said "If you find something will make you lose power or lose an election, then you should not do it." I think every member of this House remembers that. There are, however, one or two things on which I must take up the premier, because I fully subscribe to the recommendations of the Commission as one of the members of the House who can appreciate

and understand what it is all about. The Hon. Premier said that when the Leader of the House was ready to proceed with the Order, we were not always in our places or fully represented. I want to make it abundantly clear that when I was selected to serve as a member of this Commission, naturally I discussed it with the members of my Party, and we felt that single-member constituencies suited Barbados and were in keeping with modern trends of democracy; so there could be no arguing that we were not ready.

When I drew to Your Honour's notice that the Item had been on the Order paper for some time. I was at the time doing what I thought was the right thing, because I felt that after listening to a number of political opinions going about the Municipality and with the various suggestions which I has heard about the Order. I should draw it to Your Honour's attention so that something could be done. I am very happy that the premier has brought it up today, and although we are all not represented so to speak- my party is fully represented here - I can assure the Government that we are 100 per cent behind single member constituencies.

There are, however, one or two points which I must draw to the Horn Premier's notice. When the 1958 Act came into being, it brought about an amendment for the purpose of the Municipality by taking in parts of Christ Church, cutting off parts of St. Michael and carrying parts into the South. That, I believe, increased the numbers. But judging from the Almanac to which the hon. member referred and said that neither the Municipality nor the Chamber of Commerce corrected this, I may draw to his attention that the political boundary line actually remained static for the purpose of voting for the Legislature in the City of Bridgetown which really had nothing like 92,000 people. The boundary line runs along Passage Road and around the border to Queens Park, and that area could have nothing like the 92,000 people to which he referred.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not think the hon. member understood. The City of London. I believe, has a smaller population than the City of Bridgetown electoral district, but the British Government was not allowing it to go abroad that the population of the capital City is less than 5,000 persons, because 1,000 of those who live in the City of London are mostly watchmen and members of the City of London Police force which is a special Police Force. This is the point I was making. You cannot allow it to go abroad that your capital City only has a population of so-and-so because the electoral district has so many people.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member is speaking of Greater London and the City of London which are two different things; but if we had seen the 1961 Whittaker's Almanac, I suppose we would have drawn it to the notice of the persons Concerned that we did not have a smaller City than the City of Castries. 5.50 p.m.

Anyhow, be that as it may, we pass that on. As regards the recommendations which we have made, as the Hon. Premier puts it, there was a Minority Report which was signed by Your Honour, but you have intimated that you will not descend into the arena to discuss that Minority Report at this stage. The number of representatives, as has rightly been said by the Hon. Premier is 24.

There was a feeling that there should be more members elected to the Assembly, but the legal opinion which was given to us was to the effect that as the Boundaries Commission Act was drafted, we could only have 24. The Hon. premier was quite correct when he said that the Commission had done a wonderful job, but I do not give the credit to the Commissioners; I give the credit to the Local Government Commissioner who worked it out in such a way that the present voting stations and districts would not be disrupted.

The Commission decided that in the City where you had two seats in the General Assembly, you would have one seat.

As hon. members know, the boundaries of the City politically run along Passage Road through the New Orleans right to the old Police Station and below the St. Michael's Infirmary right back to Queen's park. What we found out was that you had 38,000 people registered for the parish of St. Michael as such as against other parishes which had the same two people, to represent the people in those parishes, but

that those parishes had an electorate roll of only 3,800 people, and a parish like St. Joseph which the last Premier represented having a matter of only 3,600.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think the hon. member is mistaken. The last Premier represented the parish of St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

We did not recognise him as Premier. We called him a gentleman. Anyhow, Sir, the Commission found that parishes with only 3,800 people were represented by two people.

Taking the 1958 amendment, the municipality of Bridgetown embodies St. Michael, the City of Bridgetown and part of Christ Church. Part of St. Michael is taken off and added to the Southern District Council. According to the Commission's Report, St. Michael remains the same as it was, that is to say, that part which is taken off and given to the South is put back on, and for this purpose eight seats have been allocated to St. Michael and one seat to the City of Bridgetown. Working it out, we put the norm at 3,000 because judging from the parish of St. Joseph where we had 3,600 voters, we said that we would take that parish as a guide.

As you are aware, these were the recommendations which the Boundaries Commission made. I am very happy to support this Resolution for single-member constituencies and I hope that the machinery will soon be put into operation to have the people registered so that we can vote under single-member constituencies.

Now that people of 18 years old would be able to register to vote, I think you will have a little difficulty. When you start to register people from the age of 18 you may get a substantial increase in some of the constituencies. For instance, I think that in St. Michael when you start to register the 18-year olds and over, you are going to get a total of 5,000 more electors, although I do not think that would interfere with it very much. But in St. Andrew and St. Joseph you may not have so many 18-year olds; therefore, you may only get a few more than the norm.

Sir, we of my Parry have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I would just say this to the Hon. Premier, as far as we are concerned, we had no desire, no wish, no intention at any time to hold up the passing of this Resolution, but we were all willing to have it passed. I am very happy that at long last it is about to be passed and we can get busy with it in the not distant future.

Mr. GODDARD:

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it. If you are to be properly represented, this is the correct thing to do, I am going to quote some figures which were furnished us in the Development Plan of 1965-68. These were taken from the census of 1956 and 1960. There was an increase in population between 1946 and 1960 in the parish of St. Michael alone by 19,000 persons. The increase in population in St. Joseph between the same period was by 870 persons. By no stretch of the imagination could you think that the citizens of St. Michael and of Christ Church could have equitable representation when a small parish like St. Joseph could have two representatives and St. Michael and Christ Church have the same two representatives.

Far too often politicians, after they have been elected, are too satisfied, or may be too selfish and wish to protect their seats at all costs; but it is the people to whom they go for votes that they too often forget too readily. I can do, or anyone can do, a better Job in representing a more defined smaller area than by representing vast areas over which you have to travel. When a parish is so wide, it means that you may find that one part of it is different from the other.

As regards the parish of Christ Church, one part can be termed as the urban area and other parts as rural areas.

Although it is our duty to somewhat forget that we are representatives of a defined area and that we should do the best we can for the entire island, representation of the people is a little more than that. All of us have people coming to us from time to time for help in matters of migration or to find out how to go about some domestic matter, as well as to get a recommendation. In the future by means of a more defined area we will be able to do a better Job for those persons. This Resolution is long overdue, and as the low of population comes more and more into the City, it is very disparaging. We now represent people and not cane- fields. It is the people that matter and we should keep that before us all the time. I think that the people who sent us here could be more satisfied with this division than what obtained in the past. 6.00 p.m.

I have great pleasure in accepting the recommendation of the Commission. I think that they have done an excellent job without disturbing the voting areas to which the people are so accustomed. I look forward - in fact, I am quite sure that the people will be very satisfied with these allocations.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down says that this Resolution is long overdue. I am not in a position to tell you whether it is long overdue or not; but, Sir, if it is so long overdue, I wonder why it remained so lone on the Order Paper that it had to be withdrawn?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows quite well that this Resolution was not withdrawn. It came under the pro visions of the Standing Orders, and it was removed from the Order Paper at Your Honour's direction, but it was re-introduced on the following Tuesday. It was not a question of the Resolution being with drawn.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The relevant Standing Order is No. 24 (3) which reads as follows-

"If an interval of three calendar months has elapsed after notice of a motion has been given without further action having been taken on the motion, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn unless the House otherwise orders."

After three calendar months the Resolution was automatically removed from the Order Paper in accordance with that Standing Order.

Mr. SMITH:

That settles it. The hon. member was just waiting for that point of order. I would still go to say this. Before I go further, I should like to say that it makes no difference to me whether you have single member constituencies or double member constituencies. If they should put a representative to each elector in the parish of St. Joseph, your humble servant will still be back in here. If they put 3,600 constituencies so that there will be 3,600 contestants, Lloyd Smith will still be back in here. Therefore, I do not have to fear. The Hon. Premier has said that it may be some members may not be in favour of this Resolution, or words to that effect, due to their retention of their individual seats. I do not have to try to retain a seat by not being in favour of this Resolution. If you look around on the opposite side of this House, you will see the paucity of members of the Government Party at this time. That speaks for itself. I hope that the Hon. Premier will look around and see the absence of those members. I am sure that very nearly all of them were here during the morning session of this House. As I have said, that alone speaks for itself and it will tell the public how they feel about this Resolution.

The Hon. Premier says that regardless of whoever is present this afternoon, it is his intention to carry on with this Resolution. If the members from this side of the Table were to walk out now, I do not think that this Resolution

would be passed; but the Government Party has many members so that they can pass anything which they want to pass. This is one of the cases where what has been said not very far from here a few nights ago is happening this afternoon; that is, every man is breaking for himself. I can see who is in favour of single member constituencies and who is not in favour of them. Regardless of what the Premier may say about the individual members, I can say that all is not well with this Resolution as far as the absentees are concerned.

This Resolution was on the Order Paper for a very long time. Speaking under correction, what is contained in the Resolution was one of the planks in the platform of the present Government. It was in their Manifesto; it is still there; and really, Sir, if this were of so much importance to them, the same speed with which other Bills and Resolutions were passed in 1961, this Resolution would have been passed. A miracle very nearly happened - people going up to the moon before this Resolution was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In any event, no boundaries extend so far as the moon.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, if I may speak anything which is out of order, please tell me; but if I just say what I have just said, I do not see what can be attached to it. Here it is this Resolution has not yet been passed. Sir, the Commission have made their Report and we also had a Minority Report. I feel that due to the Government's delay in this matter, this is a very late hour; and if the present Government had carried out one or some of their promises just as they were set out in the Manifesto, we would have gone back to the country on the basis of double member constituencies. 6.10 p.m.

If the present Government had carried out this promise as they have done with others in the Manifesto, we would have gone back to the country under double member constituencies, because I think it was promised in the manifesto that they would go back to the people in three years. I cannot see, therefore, why they could not have allowed this to remain and put it to the people a gain, because they did not have the green light on it; they had a Minority Report which shows that all was not well and there was not 100 per cent agreement.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, we have a Standing Order which says that hon. members must not impute improper motives to other hon. members. If therefore the hon. member says that the fact that Your Honour put in a Minority Report indicates that all was not well, that is an imputation to Your Honour and to other hon. members who participated in the work of that Boundaries Commission. The hon. member should be asked to withdraw that because it is a bad imputation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has said that all was not well in reference to the Minority Report. Will the hon. member say what he really meant by \"all was not well?\" That remark is vague and ambiguous. Will the hon. member clarify it?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is this afternoon trying to do what a lawyer told me he used to do to another lawyer in the Law Courts. I said, Sir, that a Minority Report showed that everything did not go well. In other words, the decision was not 100 per cent unanimous. If the Commission was comprised of ten and you got a Minority Report, I would say that one was not in favour, and if I am wrong, you can tell me that I am. I am not imputing improper or any other kinds of motives. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Premier said that some members may not be in favour of this because of the fear of their individual seats, I would ask what would happen with the person who made the Minority Report, Could I not say that he meant that the person who made the Minority Report was trying to save his seat also? Why did the Hon. Minister of Education not get up on a point of order and draw to your attention what the Hon. Premier said?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let me assure the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph that, so far as the author of the Minority Re-

port is concerned, he has no fear or worries about retaining a seat in this Assembly, and he had no such thing in mind when he differed from the method proposed by the majority.

Mr. SMITH:

I do not know what to say, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Education should leave it to somebody else to get up and make him self look like what he is making himself this afternoon. He should not get up

like that, because I have that much respect for him as Minister of Education, and he should try to set all kinds of examples. Anyhow, he will not prevent me from talking. He hates to hear this voice. When this voice is sounded, certain members are going to catch leprosy. Since the Government delayed so long on this, they should have instituted as soon as possible a new registration, and instead of cutting off a part of St. James and attaching it to St. Andrew, they might have been saved that trouble. They might have been able to muster the amount needed for St. James and St. Andrew; but as this is so late, they would be able to say to people, if they were accused of dodging or being afraid to do this, that they would have had to start a new registration before they bring in this and make it law, and then it is possible that we would not have had to inconvenience the people of St. James in carrying them to St. Andrew. Who could dispute that? That would be one out of the bag, and if I were in their Party, I would have told them that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is quite clear to the members on this side that the hon. member has been sleeping during the presentation of this Resolution, because it was made clear that the existing polling districts have been retained. This does not mean the transportation of voters down to St. Andrew's Parish Church. The people in St. James who are now in the electoral district of St. Andrew will vote exactly where they voted before, but they will be voting for a different candidate.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not regard that as otherwise than a point of order. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

I know you are a busy man, Sir, but you should write up something for the Ministers on that side and let them know what is the meaning of a point of order, because they jump up on everything and call it a point of order, and it is not fair to the member who is speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sure the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has not lost his trend of thought and that he will proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

They do not want me to come as I would like, especially the Premier. Why is that? Now, Sir, I am coming to the point which the Hon. Premier raised on a point of order. If they had done what I have just suggested, it would look feasible and they would have fixed it right. 6.20 p.m.

Now, Sir, you are going to ask people from St. James to go all the way down the hill to vote. It is not fair to the people of St. James, regardless of whatever the Boundaries Commission did, regardless of their Report and regardless of what we do in this Hon. Chamber. I am saying that it is not fair to those people who were voting in St. James from their birth to be taking them up in a motor car or a motor lorry and carrying them all the way down from the bottom of St. Peter to St. Andrew to vote. It may sound foolish, but it is a possibility that the first trip you take, the motor car brakes may pull out and the drive shaft get away and cause the vehicle to run down the hill and this Government would be responsible for it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is not my wish to interrupt the hon. member at all, but the Order is quite clear. I attempted to explain to the hon. member that we were not carrying the people anywhere different from where they used to vote because if they voted in Sion Hill, they will vote the same place. It is not

carrying anybody in a motor car all the way down to St. Andrew.

Mr. SMITH:

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Premier is very worried this afternoon. You will notice that I am keeping my right hand in my pocket. Now, Sir, What is the difference if you have 200 or 300 people more in a constituency? What is the difference? Would it do harm to allow a constituency to remain as it is? Would it do harm to allow St. James to remain as it is and St. Andrew to remain as it is? Why do this putting on and cutting off?

The Hon. Premier has helped me now. He said that the polling booths would be the same. Well then, what is the difference? If the polling booths are going to be the same place, in other words the people voting in Baywoods would be voting the same place, what is the difference? Why talk of cutting off and putting on?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Those people in St. James would be voting in the same polling booth, but their votes would be for a candidate in St. Andrew.

Mr. SMITH:

They would be voting the same place, you say. I was talking about transportation I was not talking of the particular candidate. I am not talking about the candidate. . As a matter of fact, I would not be so narrow in thinking that I can save a candidate, or that, may be, his losing a few votes will help to save him, therefore, I would only be simple to talk of saving a candidate.

I was thinking that the people in St. James would have had to go in St. Andrew to vote, but the Hon. Premier cleared the matter up and by doing so he has made it very much better for my argument. What then is the good of your saying that you are putting them on to St. Andrew? It would only mean that St. Andrew would have so many more voters. The number of voters in St. Andrew can remain the same. Just as St. Joseph have 3,600, they can have the same. You are taking some from St. James and putting them on to St. Andrew and making some from St. James and putting them on to St. Andrew and making St. Andrew 42,000. Why? It would be only a difference of 600.

As regards the particular candidate, since the hon. member has reminded me of the candidate, I wonder if the Hon. premier is serious or if he had given this Resolution serious thought. I wonder if he realises now that the only Party which would be in trouble as a result of this Resolution is the Government's Party. As I see it, they are in natural trouble.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That is entirely immaterial to this Resolution. We are not concerned with the fortunes of Parliament.

Mr. SMITH:

The Hon. Premier mentioned about candidates. It is he who started the ball rolling.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I was trying to elucidate for the benefit of the hon. member that it was not a question which would rise to the physical transportation of people from one place to another, but that it was a question of

whom you would vote for. I never started talking of any individual candidate. There can be no trouble for this Party; it may mean three from three for his Party.

Mr. SMITH:

Well Sir, if it is three from fifteen in the next election, I am going to leave. I am throwing down a challenge to you. But, after all, I heard an old lady say one day; \"Big words are no load; otherwise I would not be able to send my grandchild to the shop.\"

Talking about candidates, at present the Barbados Labour Party has one member in St. James. If St. James is supposed to be a single member constituency we will run one candidate. There again, I am not talking of the candidates.

Now, Sir, I want to know how the \"boys\" are going to fare - those who are out in the country. As I see it, they

will have to pack up and leave and come to town. With the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown well established down here, he would be commandeering the majority of the seats in St. Michael. (A VOICE: Do you think so?) Yes; you don't have the political brain to knock him out.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is this a forecast?

Mr. SMITH:

Oh yes. It is not a matter of candidates this time. I am talking it as I see it. I may be wrong or I may be foolish, but that is how I see it. I heard someone on my left said \"Both\".

Now Sir, you are going to have one man representing a parish. That is the case in seven of the constituencies. There is a possibility that the representative for any of these constituencies may not be able to get out to a meeting of the House. I do not mind how the newspapers may put it, but that member may be ill, and by his illness that parish would not be represented until that member fully recovers and comes back out. 6.30 p.m.

In other words, a representative of St. Joseph is ill and he cannot attend to his duties or to the duties of the people and something is wrong in the parish. What I am saying, in other words, is that the people need representation. They will either have to live in St. Joseph and go to St. Andrew or St. John because they do not have a representative. Sir, a motor car has four wheels, but you still have the fifth in the back by way of a stepney in case that one wheel goes bad. You can change to the stepney and you can go ahead. I am sure that the Premier would not leave his home, if he knew that his stepney is bad, and go into St. Andrew or in any cart road. He will make sure that the stepney is all right. You are the Speaker of this House and I am sure that you will be returned to St. Lucy in any case. They will be wasting time if they go up that hill - I cannot remember the name of it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member referring to the hill known as Grave Yard?

Mr. SMITH:

If they go up there, they are wasting precious time. You are the Speaker and you cannot do justice to your people as a single member; but if you have a colleague, there are certain things which you can tell him to say in here, or you can tell him what you want him to answer in here or to put forward in here. When one does anything in St. Andrew, the people will know that the two representatives are responsible for it. Up to now, the Premier has not convinced me that the number of people is all right. During my time in this House it was never drawn to my attention that the people of St. Michael were suffering from the lack of representation or that they did not have adequacy in the number of members. That could be so, but I have never heard it. I know that at Election time it was very hard on a candidate to have to canvass the entire area, but that is the business of the candidate because nobody called upon him to do it; he took that upon himself. (Laughter). He knew the parish and he knew that it was a question of hard work. If he finds out that it is too hard for him to deal with, there are others who are quite willing to try it out. He can step back and let another come in.

When you go to the parish of St. Joseph, the fellow up there can "blow a comb", because that is the smallest parish. It is also his business to go into that parish. If you can add two more representatives in the parish of St. Michael, that is all right too. What is the reason for increasing the number of representatives? If you had to put one or two more members in this House, that would be all right too. The Electorate could not say anything about that, because you did it in the case of the Other Place. I do not feel that the people will be properly represented by one member at all times. I may be wrong, but I will give my reasons for that.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church says that this Resolution is long overdue. He might have

seen that.

I do not know if he has to work too hard at Election time in having to go all over the place because he may be getting old. I do not think there will be much delay if you have your wards. If you do not have to go all over the place ...(ASIDES) I can see the point; the hon. junior member for Christ Church is getting old and instead of having to go all over Christ Church, he will stick to the place where he is more powerful, and he will be quite right in so doing. Otherwise I do not see why you are giving St. Thomas one member and St. Lucy the same. I know that we are going forward and we were doing this thing for a long time. There was a time when we used to come to Bridgetown by horse carts and by pony carts; now we are using motor cars. We also have aeroplanes and therefore we are going forward. However, Sir, I am sure that if a Referendum were to be taken in respect of having single member constituencies as against double member constituencies, the provision for double member constituencies would win through. If you were to put the matter into the hands of the people to decide the issue for themselves, I am quite sure that they would decide in favour of having double member constituencies. I am sure they would say that double member constituencies is what they want. 6.40 p.m.

We have power in here to do most things, and the people do not know about them until they are thrust upon them and they have to take them because they are the law of the land. I am not against it, Sir; but I am saying that if we pass this tonight, we still have to have a new registration and we will be right back on to the five year term of office you have to work out the pros and cons, and you cannot change horses whilst crossing the stream; you could not call an election in the middle of this thing, and by the law every man has to break for himself in 1966; so it is a sure case that we will be going back to the old religion. You should go back to the people with this, because although this was in the manifesto of the present Government, the manifesto was distributed so near the election that nobody had time enough to peruse it and raise objections to certain things in it, because I am sure that if people had time enough or if I had time enough to read it and go back to my soapbox and explain certain things in it, things would not be this way either. You cannot therefore raise the argument that you fought the election on it and won. I believe that members have lost sight of the fact that when you pass this tonight, and it becomes law, you cannot have an election next week. There is a lot to be done, and a lot of water has to flow under the bridge before we can go back to the people on the basis of single member constituencies, and as I have said already, however it comes, I am sure of a seat. I think the members on the other side know that they could not do sufficient to throw me overboard. They can only get up on points of order.

In closing. Sir, I would say that I do not think people are really for single member constituencies. The Government should give them a chance, put it before them again and fight the next election on it, because if you have a few meetings, especially in the country areas where they will be deprived of a particular member, they will say they want two members.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am to assume that when the Boundaries Commission Bill, as distinct from the Resolution we are now discussing was before the House in 1962, the hon. member had an opportunity to speak on it. Whether he did speak or did not speak I am not in a position to say, but I know that it is very improper of him to reflect on a matter already disposed of by this House by bringing into question the whole principle of single member constituencies because there was an opportunity during the passage of the Bill through the House so to discuss it. According to Standing Orders which are still in force, unless the hon. member has him self unilaterally changed them, you cannot reflect upon a matter which has passed the House in the session in which it was passed. I can understand the hon. member's difficulties. The hon. member belongs to a Party which has stuck its head out so far on this issue that not all the inconsistencies that he has trumped up in the course of a single debate can drag them back across the

water. In November, 1960, the Barbados Labour Party held the second of its Annual Conferences, because until 1959 it had never

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, does that belong to this? I will be doing like them now. That is not in the Resolution. Whilst I am on my feet, I will say that when the Boundaries Commission Bill was before the House, we had not received the Report of the Commission yet; so I want the hon. member to remember that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There was prorogation of this House on 31st March, 1964. Before that, the Boundaries Commission Act, 1962, was passed. As to the other point made by the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph, as I understand it, the Hon. Minister of Education is giving his reasons for disagreeing with the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph, and is citing from the manifesto of the Party to which the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph belongs. He is merely replying to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and referring, in the course of his speech, to certain things which made reference to something in the manifesto of the Government Party.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that in November, 1960, the Barbados Labour Party held the second of its Annual Conferences in its whole and entire history, because until 1959 they had not even thought of organising their Party on those lines. At this second Conference, Sir Grantley Adams, then in the process of wrecking the Federation of the West Indies, took time off from his very, very important duties to come up here to address that Conference, and the main issue at that conference was to reply.....

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is not in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party or the Democratic Labour Party. Sir Grantley Adams coming up here to wreck the Federation is not in it. I did not say in my speech that anybody came here to wreck anything. I did not refer to the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party except on single member constituencies, and I am not going to sit here and allow him to do anything else; either, or, or, on.....

Hon.J. C. TUDOR:

I was saying, he left off his main business which was wrecking the Federation to come here to reply to a Resolution which had been moved by Your Honour in this Chamber, which Resolution was debated and rejected by the then majority among whole number was the hon. member. I mention that to say that Your Honour could never be accused of being against the principle of single member constituencies.
6.50 p.m.

I wish to remind the House that on the two occasions before 1961 on which we debated single-member constituencies, the Democratic Labour Party had requested Your Honour to move the two Resolutions which our Party had put forward and their Party rejected them both. On the occasion in 1960, the arguments put forward for singlemember constituencies were so strong and so convincing and captivated so much public opinion that the Barbados Labour Party was forced to take notice of them in their own Party Conference. It was at this point that the ExPrime Minister of the Federation of the West Indies got up and said this.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Federation is not in this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister of Education is discussing previous debates in this House on the subject of single-member constituencies, as I understand him, he is making passing reference to some other incident or individual.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Sir Grantley Adams addressing that so-called Conference and commenting on the proposals laid before the House of Assembly by our Party of which Your Honour was then leader, told the assembled delegates - and Your Honour, I am quoting him - \"To hell with singlemember constituencies; do not have them if they do not suit

you: and if you think this Party would lose the election through them throw it through the window. \"Those were the words in reference to the newspaper report.

I can very well understand the hon. member's difficulties. He is embarrassed by the public stand already taken by the Barbados Labour Party on this issue, and he would like to draw a veil of secrecy over their attitude so as to enable the public to forget that they were opposed to this issue. But they should be the last people to talk of good representation of the people: so I cannot undertake to assist the hon. member in this matter. I cannot undertake to make him believe that our decision to implement single member constituencies only came up as an after-thought in the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party. Everything in this manifesto was given previous thought, and all that we did was to put our thoughts together in a formal way in our manifesto.

Your Honour for years, in season and out of season, talked about Christmas Loans: and each time you divided the House on it, all the members of the hon. member's Party rejected it. But you have lived to see the day that it has become a reality. The Barbados Labour Party would like people to forget that they were the stumbling blocks to progress in this country. Matters under consideration were rejected by them so I cannot take it seriously when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph pretends that this is a matter of which we never thought.

Not only do we reject any idea that our Party was divided on this matter, but every single member of our party was aware of our policy and we reject the insinuation that our minds and our attitudes have been hasty and ill-judged. Therefore, you cannot expect me to do any white-washing, because the Barbados Labour Party stands condemned on this issue.

The constitutional development of this country is not worthwhile if it is only to hold a party in power. All the constitutional developments taking place in this country we have advocated long before they were even taken, and all the issues implemented were the things which we promulgated.

Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made three or four points, if I may so call them, the first point being that somehow or the other in your producing the Minority Report, Your Honour by that very fact was saying that all was not well with the Boundaries Commission.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

It now being 7.00 o'clock p.m., this House stands suspended until 7.45 o'clock p.m.

The sitting was accordingly suspended.

7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling;

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained. NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of a Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister is now asking leave to give notice of a Resolution and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (Pause). There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

RESOLVED that the Order entitled the \"Qualifying Date and Date of Publication of the Registers of Electors and Registers of Local Government Electors Order, 1965\" made by the Governor on the eighth day of June, 1965, under and in exercise of the powers conferred on him by subsection (6) of section 9 of the Representation of the People

Act, 1957 and subsection (6) of section 38 of the Local Government Act, 1958, be approved.

I have given this notice on behalf of the Honourable and Learned Premier and I am also giving notice that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with this Order tonight in view of its importance. We are asking leave to proceed with this Order at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister has been granted leave to give notice of this Resolution to approve this Order at this time in view of the explanation which he has given to the House. I note that the Hon. Minister is also asking the leave of the House to proceed with this Order at this meeting.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Minister of Education was speaking on a Resolution to approve the draft Order entitled \"The Boundaries Commission Order, 1964\" which was laid before the General Assembly on the 24th November, 1964.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I need not detain the House much longer on the matter on which I was addressing the House. I want to make it clear that nowhere in the Minority Report submitted by Your Honour, is there the slightest indication that there is any disagreement in principle with single member constituencies. The signer of the Minority Report says this quite clearly-

"Whilst maintaining an unwavering belief in, and support for, single-member constituencies, I differ from the Majority in that I do not recommend adoption of the proposed method whereby eight of the existing constituencies will each be bereft of a sitting member. In my view - when they voted - the electorate never contemplated the possibility of a redistribution of seats in the General Assembly whereby the City or any parish would have its members reduced by one, nor am I convinced that even all Members of the Legislature anticipated that such reduction might be a recommendation of this Commission"

It is therefore clear from the Minority Report that there is an absolute identity of interest with respect to the principle of single-member constituencies, but a difference of opinion with respect to the method. We do not think that it is in any way unusual or in any way awkward that there should be a Minority Report, although we find ourselves unable to accept it. We do not accept any suggestion that there is a difference in principle between Your Honour and other members of the Commission which deliberated over this matter, and it is fully regarded that the acceptance by Your Honour of single-member constituencies still stands.

There is one last point which I would like to make and it is this. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph purports to be at variance with the idea on the ground that if a single member represented a constituency, during his illness or other inability the constituency will not be represented. That is not true. This is a General Assembly of the Island of Barbados and it will so continue. We are not a Congress of Ambassadors in this Chamber nor are we a Conference of Delegates. Every hon. member is a member of the General Assembly of the whole island and he bears responsibility not only to every voter and to every constituency, but to every single citizen in the territory. It is a good thing to draw to Your Honour's attention that the contention of the illness of one member of the General Assembly would render him inoperative to represent the island is quite an immature contention. I have already emphasised that in so far as this Government is concerned, we are interested in the furtherance of the democratic principle. We are interested in the fact that the people should be represented; and certainly, with the development of the Party system as it goes on, it will not matter so much what individual members get seats in the General Assembly. What will really matter is that in all cases the Electorate of this Island will have an opportunity to choose between the respective parties and their policies and in electing and carrying on a majority to run the business of the island.

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Speaker, I take it that the provision of single member constituencies in this island is long overdue. Let us take it that this island of Barbados has gone forward by leaps and bounds for many years, and the only thing which is lacking as far as Parliamentary procedure is concerned is that we are still carrying on the principle of double member constituencies. We are dealing with the parish of St. Michael. I am fortunate to have a colleague who is always willing to assist and, as a matter of fact, he is a Minister in this House. I can reach him by telephone and get anything I want done on behalf of the Electorate. However, Sir, from the figures which are available, you will see that the two of us have to represent

95,000 people. You will see that up to today 19,167 people have been added to the list in 14 years. That is compared with St. Andrew with 242. As far as the parish of St. Michael is concerned, I did not know it was so big to travel through; you cannot get through the parish of St. Michael in one day, furthermore, if you have to go through the parish from district to district and canvass. I welcome the principle of single member constituencies. I feel that the people will be better represented. I have got to the pitch now where I meet people in St. Michael and I cannot help stopping when I see them. It is my headache, morning, noon and night to meet people I have to thank the Government for the attention which they have paid to this matter of single member constituencies and I am prepared to support it.

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to have the opportunity of complimenting the Government in power in bringing forward this Measure which is really very long overdue. It is true that many people say we are usually one hundred years behind England, but in this particular Measure we find ourselves only a matter of 80 years behind England as, by the Representation of the People Act of 1885, England tried to set its house in order and we in this year, 1965, are now attempting the same exercise. The Boundaries Commission is to be highly congratulated on the job they have done, especially when it is considered that in England where the effort was made to have one member for every 54,000, when they got through in 1885 there were several anomalies such as Durham 15,000 and in the Romford division of Essex there was one member for every 217,000. I have not seen any glaring anomalies presented to us in this Report and I feel that the Boundaries Commission is highly deserving of our thanks and congratulations.

It is true that it will be perhaps amazing to the Electorate to see certain members fleeing from the rural areas to grasp the horns of the metropolitan altar; but why should the Electorate not be given a certain amount of entertainment? The principle of 'one man, one vote' eventually spread all over England until 1948 when the remainder of the double member constituencies was abolished. At the same time that the University and business votes were eliminated, these double member constituencies were abolished.
7.55 p.m.

We have now arrived at this happy stage, and it is for us a matter for congratulation. It cannot be said otherwise than that this new principle is reasonable, it is righteous, and it will make for more responsible representation.

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

THE QUALIFYING DATE AND DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THE REGISTERS OF ELECTORS AND REGISTERS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORS ORDER, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the Hon. Minister of Education proceed with the Resolution of which he gave notice today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I gave notice of it on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to apologise for the lateness in giving notice of this Resolution. Apparently it was to be sent to the House and I was awaiting it, but it got lost among other documents and was not at all sent to the House. There is some urgency in this

matter, and I do not intend to take up the time of hon. members, as we have less than thirty minutes in which to get this Resolution through, as we have not moved the suspension of the Standing Orders.

The position is, Sir, that according to the Representation of the People Act, the Register of Electors in each constituency should be revised before 30th June in each and every year, and once every five years a new Register of Electors is compiled, and the qualifying date in all cases is the 31st December of the preceding year. The position is that on the 30th June, 1965, under all normal circumstances there should be a new Register of Electors, but there should be a revised Register compiled before 30th June and that Register is then published, stuck up on the doors of churches, police stations and so on and the general public or electorate are given twenty-one days in which to object to the inclusion of someone's name or the exclusion of their own names, and after the expiration of twenty-one days from the date of publication which normally is 30th June, that Register then becomes for the ensuing year until the next 30th June the Register of Electors on which the general elections or Local Government elections may be held. As I said, the qualifying date is 31st December in the preceding year both as regards age and as regards residential and other qualifications.

This year the necessary notices were not published because it was expected that the new system of registration of voters whereby voters would be issued with identity cards with their photographs on them would have been completed for the printing of the register by 30th June under the new system. The compilation of the registers will be done by business machines and not by printing or typewriters. So the

Registering Officers who are the sub-treasurers of the districts did not send out the usual notices pending the passage of the necessary legislation through parliament in order to implement the new system of Registrations. It will be some months before the new system of registration, when approved by the House, can be completed, and we feel that it is undesirable that the existing register of 1964 should remain the register until such time as the new system is introduced.

What we are seeking to do, Sir, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (6) of Section 9 of the Representation of the People Act, 1957 and subsection (6) of Section 38 of the Local Government Act, 1958, which gives the Officer administering the Government of this territory power to vary the interval of time between the date of the qualifying date and the date of publication of the register by Order, is to enlarge the time or extend the qualifying date from 31st December to 31st August, and to enlarge the time between the publishing of the register and the qualifying date to 31st August so that the register would come into force on the 1st September. The reason we have asked for this to be done in all its stages today is because if this were not done before the date fixed by law for the publication of the revised Register of Voters, we would have a register which would not be at all up to date.

We have proposals to submit to the Legislature at a later stage on the system of Local Government. Despite the passage of the Resolution which we have just debated - or should I say because of the Boundaries Commission Resolution which has just been passed - and because of the new system of registration - or in spite of the new system of registration - whether the identity cards are ready, the Government always has to be free to decide the most auspicious occasion on which to advise the dissolution of the Legislature, and it is for that reason that we always like to have the decks clear for action. This does not mean we are going to have an election necessarily within the next five weeks. We could not have it in four weeks because dissolution does not mean that you should have one in five weeks or right after 31st August; but we still like to keep the enemy guessing, and therefore we would not like to have an antiquated register in which so many young people would be deprived of their democratic right of registering and voting during elections, and it is for this reason that I am asking members to approve the Order entitled "The Quali-

fying Date and Date of Publication of the Registers of Electors and Registers of Local Government Electors Order 1965", which was made by His Excellency the Governor on 8th June, 1965.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the simplicity of this is such that I might not have done anything else but sit and vote \"Aye\". 8.05 p.m.

It was very simply and very lucidly put to us by the Hon. Premier. There is one point on this particular Order which I would like to know something about, and that is when the Hon. Premier referred to the fact that it is the Government's policy to issue cards to persons who register to vote, judging from that, I gather that this will come into being for the next election. I would like the Hon. premier to tell us why this has been found necessary, if it has been found in Barbados that there is an amount of impersonating of persons, that is to say, if it is like Indians and Chinese where you cannot tell one from the other. Have you any statistics which would show - I know that if you have any information from a presiding Officer that it will be confidential - that you have such things as I have mentioned or if this has become necessary for other reasons which I have heard about, such as for the purpose of Social Security identification,

I know in countries where you have Social Security, you must have photographs and such things to identify a person; but in this country we have never found it necessary to vote by symbols or to resort to any of these things. I deprecate the use of photographs merely for this purpose; but if it is also for the purpose of what I have been hearing, that is for Social Security, then I am sure the Hon. Premier would make it abundantly clear.

Otherwise Sir, we support this Order. It is very clear and absolutely necessary. The Hon. Premier did not explain that part which I put to him and I would like some information on that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Sir, under the system of voting registration which we intend to implement on which every person registered is issued with an identity card, that simplifies the procedure and the question of identification. Presiding officers and election officers are not personally acquainted with the people who come to vote, and it would be foolish to say that there has been no impersonating in this country because it certainly has happened. I know one person who admitted to me - and that person is a member of this House, so I do not want to call his name - that he knows of some impersonation. Anyhow, I prefer not to mention it because the hon.member is not now in his place,

Not only was it ordained, Mr. Speaker, to prevent impersonation, but it also is introduced as a system of identification for people who may want to get a passport and who go to banks to have a postal order cashed, and it would also assist with the new system of social Security which we want to introduce this year.

With proper registration and identification, therefore, we are sort of stopping two devices with one stone. This is really for the purpose of identification, in other territories the people have to be fingerprinted as well. That happens in Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana. We do not think this will be necessary; therefore we did not ask for people to be fingerprinted because we know that Barbadian people of honesty do not want to be fingerprinted and even those who are dishonest do not want it. We think a photograph is sufficient identification for our purpose.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for the day.

Hon. W. A. CRAW FORD GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Before I fix the Order Paper, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, I am asking for leave of absence for him for a month as from today.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

FIXING THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, in fixing the Order Paper, I shall like to draw to your attention that we have given notice of twelve Bills today most of which we hope to do next week. Therefore the Order Paper will be fixed as follows-

1. Committee of Supply; then the two other Resolutions which were not dealt with on today's Order Paper; and then, the Bills of which notice was given today in their respective order.

I propose to move that we meet at 12 o'clock (noon) next week. 8.15 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

EXPRESSIONS OF GOOD WISHES FOR Mr. SPEAKER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 15th June,

1965, at 12 o'clock Non. Before I take my seat, I would like, on behalf of this side of the House, to wish Your Honour bon voyage because Your Honour will have left the island before the next meeting of this Assembly, and I express the hope that Your Honour will have a very pleasant stay in the United Kingdom and come back to us at the end of your stay refreshed and in excellent health.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Acting Leader of the House. I hope that Your Honour will enjoy yourself in Britain, that you will enjoy your rest and you will be refreshed to carry on your duties as Speaker of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sure that hon. members will clearly realise that I am not going to Britain on vacation or to rest

and because I have to perform duties on behalf of this House and on behalf of the Other Place, and they will keep me as busy as I would be when I am on the spot in Barbados. Anyhow, I thank hon. members for their kind wishes.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 15th June, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.20 p.m.