

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, 19th October, 1965

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker);

Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, C.B.E.; (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Govern.

ment and Community Development); **Hon. J. C. TUDOR. M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CQRB1N:**

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries);

Mr. W. R. LOWE:

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P.,

(Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. A. LYNCH. J.P.; Mr. G. V.

BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Hon N. W. BOXILL.

(Minister of Communications and Works); and Mr. J. B.

YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

APOLOGY

Mr. SPEAKER:

I apologise to the House. I am awaiting my file in quest of which, in the absence of the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk has gone.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, if I may have your permission, I would like to find out from hon. members on the Other Side whether they wish to do Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House wants to find out from hon. members of the Opposition side whether they are desirous of doing Private Business. I think it was last Tuesday that the hon. member intimated that hon. members on the Opposition side would be given the opportunity to do their business.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, I am very glad that the Hon. Leader of the House raised this matter. Now, I do not have anything on the Order Paper under Private Member's Business. What little I had, according to the Standing Orders has been already cut off only because we are always accommodating Government Business and forgetting ours; forgetting that the time is going to come when ours are going to be struck off the Order Paper if it is not dealt with in time.

It was my intention to raise this matter for hon. members who have anything on the Order Paper. It is not fair that the Government should come inside here, meeting after meeting, and move the suspension of the Rules, pushing Private Members' Business back until the time comes for you to strike them off. I hope it will not happen again during

this Session and I hope the hon. Minister will always ask if Private Members want to do their private business.

Hon. J. G. TUDOR:

I am sorry that the hon. member has upset himself, but on all occasions that I have led the House, and certainly now, I treat the House with the utmost courtesy, and hon. members have nothing to regret, as far as I am concerned. Therefore, there is no reason for the hon. member to fret himself. On the last occasion, I was grateful to hon. members on the Other Side for giving up their time, and I told them that if they wish to use their time to-day, we certainly would accommodate them. It is because of that that I am now acting in accordance with the undertaking which I gave.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it that hon. members of the Opposition have no opposition to the suspension of Standing Orders today in order that Government Business may occupy the entire sitting. I see that there is no objection to giving up Private Members time and, in fact, there is no matter standing under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the 12th October, 1965, have been circulated amongst hon. members and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed. (A pause.)

There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of the meeting of the 12th October, to be duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On behalf of the Hon. and Learned Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30th September, 1965.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The University of the West Indies (Exemption from Betterment Charge) Order, 1965.\"

Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Urban Development Corporation (Exemption from Betterment Charge) Order, 1965.\"

Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Special Development Area (Cave Hill) Order, 1965.\"

Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Development Duty (Capital Gain) (Cave Hill) Order, 1965\".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Betterment Charge (Cave Hill) Order, 1965\".

Resolution to place the sum of \$34,715.509 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, No. 22 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$7,150 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 23 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

In respect of the last Resolution of which notice has just been given, I am going to ask hon. members to indulge us by allowing us to proceed with this Resolution in all its stages today, 2.55 p.m.

Hon. members will be circulated with copies of it some time from now. It is only after hon. member have studied the Resolution that we will be proceeding with it, I therefore beg formally to give notice of

my intentions to proceed with this Resolution for \$7,150.00 in all of its stages today. With respect to the other Resolution for \$34,715.50, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next sitting in order to deal with that Money Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the sum of \$600,000 to be borrowed by the Transport Board for the purpose of meeting their obligations and discharging their functions under section 15 of the Transport Board Act 1955.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph; his question relative to grazing facilities.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that when, under the law relating to soil Conservation, certain areas in the parish of St. Andrew are proclaimed prohibited areas, many poor people who raise livestock as a principal means of livelihood, are forced to sell their animals before they wish to because of the new loss of grazing facilities in the same areas?

Will the Minister consider advising Government to provide some sort of financial compensation for these people handicapped by prohibited areas?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The honourable and learned senior member for St. James; his Question relative to Typists.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that provision is made for only four typists to the eleven Magistrates' Courts of this Island?

2. That at present no typist is assigned to anyone of the three Magistrates' Courts of District "D", "F" (Bissex Hill) and Belleplaine?

3.

4. That the absence of typists in these Courts impose a hardship on the general public and unnecessary inconvenience to legal practitioners.

5.

6. That the inadequate number of typists for the Courts causes much difficulty in the processing of work?

7.

5. Will the Minister see to it that a sufficient number of typists be provided without further delay for these Courts?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas his Question re Nurses' Uniforms.

Mr. BATSON:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the uniforms now worn by Nurses at the various Government Institutions are not the type best suited to the dignity of the professions?

2. Is the Minister also aware that the Blue uniforms with aprons, laced shoes and black stockings keep the Nurses very warm while on duty?

3. Is the Minister also aware that the present uniform prevents the Nurses while on duty from working in comfort and deprive them of giving of their best?

4. Will the Minister also review the conditions of working with a view to inducing many qualified Barbadian Nurses who are in the United Kingdom to return home to give of their experience?

5.

6. If the answer to the above are in the affirmative:

7.

Will the Minister explore the possibility of going into the matter, with a view of adding colour and fashion to the Nursing profession by changing the said uniform for a modern type of uniform probably all white?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the

remainder of this day\'s sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Order of the Day under Gov-ernment Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Minister of Educations. To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Island,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee to deal with the Resolution for \$7,150 of which notice was given at today\'s sitting.

Hon. C. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

3.05 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 18 Head I - Governor _ was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$2,306 be voted under Head 19 Item 19- Furniture and Fittings.

The explanatory note indicates that in 1966 there are going to be visits from members of the Royal Family and other distinguished persons, and it is therefore necessary that since these visits are going to be of more than one day's duration, we should carry out certain structural repairs and improvements to Government House, particularly with respect to furniture and fittings. To carry out this, Supplementary provision to the order of \$2,306 is required, and I now beg to move that Head 1 - Governor, stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 5 - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, Under Item 18 -Fees to Counsel Assigned in Capital Cases, representations have been made to the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Home Affairs on this matter, and in consequence of these representations the Cabinet has upgraded the Fees which are paid to barristers assigned to defend persons accused of capital offences. The number of cases in which it has been found necessary to assign barristers to this particular form of work has of course increased in the last year or so to a figure above that which was contemplated when the Estimates for the current year were drawn up. In order therefore that funds may be made available to the end of the present financial year to employ such barristers as may be required to defend people who cannot afford to pay for their own defence, it is necessary to seek supplementary provision of the estimated expenditure for the rest of this financial year.

I beg to move that Head 5 - Judiciary - stand part. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I hope I am not feeling out the hon. Leader of the House, but since we are voting this extra amount, I should like to know what is the basis on which these fees have been made. I believe the hon. member can tell us that because he would know that to arrive at the amount he needs here.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

If the hon. member would give me a little time, I will find the information for him.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to speak in favour of this Resolution, as wherever British Justice is being exercised, it is necessary that a person accused of murder should be represented. In the past it was regarded as an honour by Junior counsel to be called on by the Chief Justice to defend one charged with murder. Today it is not so regarded by Junior counsel to be an honour. Litigation has increased, and the work of a barrister is more varied, and because of that, not long ago even Junior barristers transcended the traditional practice and are known to have refused when called on to defend one charged with murder, and it is therefore necessary that more provision should be made, rather than give an honorarium of £10. It was regarded as unjust for a Junior barrister to be called on to defend one charged with murder, because when a man charged with murder has to be defended by one given by the Crown,

it mean. that he or she is absolutely without any help, and often the cases are such that would take a senior barrister. I think that the Hon. Leader of the House may soon be able to tell the hon. senior member for Bridgetown the scale of fees, but as far as I remember, it is in the neighbourhood of £50. I do not want to answer if the Hon. Minister has the facts, but

the fees are very much different from what they were before. I do not want hon. members to believe that what is being paid now to Junior barristers or even to senior barristers can be regarded in any way as adequate for them to defend one charged with murder.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The question is _____

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a polite question and he said he would give me an answer if I gave him a chance.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter arises, so far as I can see, from a Resolution passed at a meeting of the Bar Association on the 12th March, 1965, and the Resolution was forwarded to the acting Chief Justice with a request that he place the matter before the Government. The Resolution said that a voluntary roster of barristers in order of seniority should be set up from which the Chief Justice should select Counsel to take the defence of capital cases, and that such Counsel should be paid a minimum of \$500 plus \$5 a day refresher after the third day in Court. 3.15 p.m.

This matter went of course to all the people whose opinions we thought it would be worthwhile to have and, eventually, the Cabinet decided on grounds which we thought were reasonable, that the fee payable to Counsel in a capital case should be fixed at \$252 and that a refresher of \$25.20 should be payable on the fourth day of any such trial, and the total amount payable in respect of any one case should be \$504.

That probably does not meet the original request, but it is much in excess of what has been the practice up to now, and we are certain that it would go a long way to enable poor people charged with murder to have the best defence available to them, although I do not say that those who found themselves in that position did not have the best defence available; but certainly the idea of a refresher after the fourth day is to make Defence Counsel more alert and lively. We are saying that this will enable Defence Counsel not to weary in their defence. Those are the facts. Because of this and because of the number of cases which we may have between now and the end of the financial year, this supplementary vote of \$1,520 is being sought.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I thank the Hon. Minister for this information.

The question that Head 5 - JUDICIARY - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 _ PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs, was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

In respect of Head 17 - Premier -Home Affairs, Item 31 (New) Special Refund, this item represents one curious case. We are asking for \$132 to pay a Mr. Banfield who is the legal personal representative to the estate of the late Thomas McDonald Thome who died on the 30th June, 1962, in the surgery . \" Private practitioner and the sum of \$131.21 was found by the Police on his person. In accordance with the law which regulates this procedure, this money was paid to the Accountant General to the credit of the Police Reward Fund in accordance with the Police Act of 1961.

There is no law which makes provision for the paying out in this matter of this money from the fund, so that in order to allow Mr. Banfield, who is the personal representative of the deceased, to get this money, we have to take it out of the General Revenue because the Police Act makes no provision to withdraw the money from the Police Reward Fund in circumstances like that.

I think I can tell the House that as a result of consideration given to this case, the Cabinet has it in mind that a more smooth procedure in accordance with the law should be discovered; otherwise, until the law is altered, money

in this respect will go into the Police Reward Fund and can only be paid out by a Resolution from this House.

1 beg to move that Head 17 stand part. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 24 - PREMIER- CABINET AND GENERAL Head 24 - Premier - Cabinet and General, was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Item 17 ~ Government Hospitality - the sum of \$12,000 is being sought. From the occasions upon which it has been necessary for Government Hospitality. the sum has increased not only in the numbers and varieties of occasions, but it has increased as well in the wide range of persons; and in the light of the expenditure in the first half of the financial year, it is considered that the vote should be supplemented by \$12,000.

I will say that I do not want hon. members to feel that this is anything other than a straightforward proposition because the expenditure in connection with the Queen's proposed visit is nothing at all to do with it. Apart from the activities already gone into this financial year, so far as I think, the House ought to know that this Island expects to receive possibly two distinguished Heads of State next year. I mean two foreign Heads of State-and most certainly one. We have to make provisions for this besides the other necessities for the balance of the financial year. Apart from this, there is a tremendous amount of activities going on in Government now. There are a lot of visitors coming to the Island - people who were asked from time to time to assist this Government by giving their advice. There are also people who come to us who want to see what goes on in this Island, and because there is sufficient evidence of their distinction, we entertain them. For all these reasons, which are quite genuine, it is necessary that

we ask for this supplementary provision.

I beg to move that Head 24, stand park Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person to oppose the voting of money to entertain Heads of State of various nations who may come here. I myself feel that such Heads of State - although the Hon. Minister has not mentioned who they are, are people for whom we should give a special vote from this House.

As I take it, Sir, this vote was \$12,000 and it was supplemented by \$8,000 earlier this year and now it is to be supplemented by \$12,000. That would make it \$32,000.

It is stated in the Note to the Item; \"The occasions on which it is necessary for the Government to offer hospitality have increase and in several cases it has been necessary for the Government to entertain large numbers of persons.\".

This has been always so in my view, since we have a responsible Government. The note goes on to state: \"In the light of the expenditure during the first half of the financial year it is considered that the vote should be supplemented by \$12,000.\"

Am I to understand that in the first half of the financial year we have expended \$18,000? 3.25 p.m.

The note says this: \"In the light of the expenditure during the first half of the financial year, it is considered that the vote should be supplemented by \$12,000.\" During the first half of the year you would have expended \$17 000 and that would have been done without the approval of the

Legislature. I do not know if that is so or not, but it does look so to me from my own calculations. Having set out here that for the first half of the year you have spent \$17,000, which would be up to the end of September, I would like to have some information. It is true that you have your Parliamentary Secretaries now, which would be the only increase in expenditure as far as Government members are concerned. I should like to know why it is that you have this tremendous increase. The members of the Peace Corps must be entertained, somebody connected with the Ministry of Agriculture must be entertained, and similarly in the case of somebody who is connected with the Ministry of Communications and Works or somebody connected with Civil Aviation. I would like to know on what basis this entertainment is done. The hon. member must tell us how this is being done. We cannot just sit here and vote for this thing to go on in this way. The increase from \$12,000 to \$20,000 is something which we would have to ask about.

In the year before, in 1963, the vote was \$12,000 and this year it will be \$32,000. You will remember, Sir, or you will have read that during the regime of the last Government, I joined with members of this Government to criticise the excessive expenditure on entertainment. I would be the last person to say that when dignitaries other than members of the Royal Family come here to Barbados, we should be parsimonious by way of entertaining them. I feel that we should entertain dignitaries in the proper way; I refer to people who come from Asia, Africa and places of that sort. I do not know whether that is included in this Resolution or not; but when you have an increase of \$8,000 and now \$12,000, that is

something which leaves us in doubt as to whether we should vote for this increase as it stands today or not.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the last speaker said that he would be the last person to criticise a vote of this sort. Well, Sir, I do not mind if I am termed the first person to criticise it. If we should read the explanatory note, this is what it says

"The occasions on which it is necessary for the Government to offer hospitality have increased, and in several cases it has been necessary for the Government to entertain large numbers of persons. In the light of the expenditure during the first half of the financial year it is considered that the vote should be supplemented by \$12,000."

Sir, this note tells us that the Government was entertaining very heavily for the first part of the year and surely the Hon. Minister should be in a position. (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear what I am saying; there are members here who are talking around the Table.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am appealing to hon. members to allow me to hear the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the Hon. Minister should be in a position to give us a breakdown of this money for the first half of the year, and let us know what has already been spent. We are now entering the seventh month of the financial year and If you have got so far as to say that you want \$12,000 to carry on, I would think that this \$20,000 has already been spent or very nearly so. The Hon. Minister will be in a position to tell us how much has been spent even for the first three months of the year because they were spending heavily for the first half of the year. It is of no use telling us that they were spending heavily and now they are asking for \$12,000 I am not against voting this money, but I want to know what I am saying "Yes" to when I vote for this amount. It is not good enough for us to be asked to vote this \$12,000 and we have only just voted in March or April the sum of \$20,000. If you are spending at that rate, I suppose that by next January you will be asking us for another \$24,000.

The hon. senior member for the City has said that he would be the last person to criticise a vote of this sort.

Mr. MOTTLEY; On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have never said that. I said that I would be the last person

to criticise a vote for the entertainment of Heads of State, more especially those who are coming from Asia, Africa and so on. I went further to say that such entertainment should be brought down by a Special Resolution to this house. That is what I said.

Mr. SMITH:

I thought that the hon. member had said that he would be the last person to criticize a Resolution of this sort. I can be termed the first person to do so because it is not good enough to ask us to agree to a money Resolution and we have not got any breakdown of it, There is a time when the present

Government criticised the last Government for spending too much money, even on allowances to hon. members who were doing the business of this country. We were criticised by hon. members who were sitting around this Table and now we must say \"Yes\" to a Resolution when we do not know what this money is being spent on. 3.35 p.m.

The Government must have a Hospitality vote because you cannot play a boy-in-the-yard when a person comes among you. Even at my home I would have to buy a pint and a half of rum instead of a nip when a friend is coming; so what do you think of the Government? Yet you should let us know how much money you are spending. It is not good enough and I hope the Minister will be able to satisfy us; otherwise I would not be able to vote for this. He must tell us how much was spent for the first three months, because he must be in the happy position of knowing from what he now wants.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to maintain a sense of proportion in these matters. Any Government, Mr. Chairman, provided it does so with the approval of the House, sets aside in its budget a certain amount of money for official entertainment. It bases its estimate from year to year first on what has gone on in the preceding year, and then by a reasonable assessment or evaluation of what is likely to take place in the following year. This can never be a hard and fast estimate, because there are always contingencies which cannot be taken into account and circumstances which are unforeseen. Now, Sir, \$20,000 were put in the Estimates this year. Up to the middle of September, \$17,302 were committed and how did this happen? This happened because in this year there were some extra-ordinarily large expenditures in connection with Government entertainment. For instance, I look here at random for April and see there was a party in honour of the Standing Advisory Committee on Medical Research to the tune of something like \$1,100. Then in May, for instance, the Queen's Birth-day Reception which of course, fell to the Government as distinct from the Governor, \$1,875. Then the party in honour of the Australian and West Indian Cricket Teams and local sports lovers - a very big one - \$1,745.88; and in that month of May when we not only had the Queen's Birth-day Reception, and a party in honour of the Cricket teams, we had a Civil Servants Conference here, and there was a party here in honour of the West Indian Civil Servants delegates. In that month alone, the Government hospitality came to something like \$5,789. Again in July, accommodation and transportation of the United States Thunderbird Jet Team, a team which paid a visit to the island, and that cost \$1,975, and then in August several big parties in honour of voluntary associations - Mental Health Association people, visitors to my own Ministry, party in honour of the Inter-Governmental Conference of the Regional Shipping, party in honour of the Caribbean Cane Farmers Association - all these were three big occasions, and the amount for August was something like \$4,197.

Now it would be unfair for me to pretend, Mr. Chairman, that for October, November, December, January, February or March we would in each case have to offer entertainment on this scale, but it has happened in this year that apart from the normal things like small luncheon parties or small cocktail parties which would well have been taken care of with the money voted, we have at least eight big occasions on which the entertainment itself cost nearly \$2,000 each. I was not hiding anything from hon. members;

I was very straightforward; but when you have the Queen's Birthday Party Reception, the Cricket team reception, the West Indian Civil Servants Conference, the Cane Farmers Shipping Conference and things of that magnitude in any one year, you cannot expect to spend less than \$2,000 on each, and this

is entertainment which we have to offer. As I told the Committee, there is nothing we have to hide; those are the facts.

Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the hon. member made a mistake or if he would like to correct what he said. He said that the entertainment at Government House for the Queen's Birthday Party was paid out of the Entertainment Allowance of the Government. I do not think he would willfully mislead the House, but I would like to ask him, if that is so, what is the Governor's duty allowance for. As far as I know, the entertainment for the Queen's Birthday at Government House has always been paid for from that allowance. If the hon. member would look at Head 1, Item 2, he would see that there is a Duty Allowance which pays for all the whiskey, rum, cigarettes and so on used at Government House in these circumstances, and I have reason to believe that there was no exception this year that the Government paid for. When the Governor invites you to a party, that is the Governor's Party; but when the Minister of Education or the Minister of Health requests you to attend a party, we have voted money to pay for that; so I want to know how this \$1,800 was paid out of this Head. This is rather strange and this is the first time we are hearing this. I realize that under the circumstances things must increase, Mr. Chairman, but in 1964-65 you voted \$12,000 and you went up by \$8,000 in 1965-66, Now you want to increase \$12,000 again. Something must have gone wrong. I am not going to be extravagant and say we do not expect to have this entertainment. I believe you should have it, but to go up in one year by \$8,000 and before the end of that year to come for another \$12,000 is extraordinary. We cannot sit here and allow a thing like that to go on. 3.45 p.m.

To tell us that an invitation by the Governor of Barba-dos - not by the Government of Barbados - to a party in respect of Her Majesty's Birthday is not paid for out of Duty Allowance but is paid for out of the Government's Entertainment Allowance, I don't know how to take it. The Hon. Minister knows well enough that his Ministry sends out invitation cards as well as the Ministry of Agriculture and the other Ministries. The invitation cards state: "The Government invites you to so-and-so." Therefore, I think it needs a lot more explanation before we can support it.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, I just want to say that this is not the first year that we celebrated the Queen's Birthday. This is celebrated annually; therefore, you need not try to make this Chamber believe that this is done for the first time this year. If \$12,000 was spent last year, and the Government came and ask to make it \$20,000 increasing it by \$8,000 and it is now coming for \$12,000 more, something is more than wrong -and we would be only idiots to sit and vote for this. You asked for \$8,000 to bring it to \$20,000, and now you are asking for \$12,000 more and you bring in the Queen's Birth-day as a reason when the Queen's Birthday was celebrated before I was born. I say if this is so, then we have to take off our hats to the last Government because they never spent money from this vote like this.

The Hon. Minister of Communications has just made a sottovoce remark. He is blue vexed because we are talking about the taxpayers' money, and he is getting very little out of it because only yesterday he was made a Pope. We can-not vote for this amount until the Hon. Minister satisfies us.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I was not here early, but from what I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition say and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - more so, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition because the hon.

junior member for St. Joseph is only looking for an opportunity where he can sing a chorus and, more so, when he is joining in a chorus with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - I do not

entertain what he has said on this matter. Of course, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gets on with these things when it suits him.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said it looks funny. I would say that there were occasions in the past when people found themselves making these unnecessary criticisms. These are not past days when there were ordinary members of the Government. These are days of a Cabinet system of Government: and if Government undertakes responsibility of entertaining, then the method of entertaining is not the question in point. The question in point is if you know that the money has not been spent on public entertainment but it is utilised for other purposes by Government. If you know that that is so, you should say so; do not say that something must be funny.

I have said already on many occasions in here that it depends on what type of entertainment the Government wants to undertake and is going to pay for. Do not talk about the Governor's Duty Allowance. Is anyone going to suggest that the Head of the Administration is going to keep the Duty Allowance and bank the money? Or, are you going to suggest that he is not spending the Duty Allowance, or that he is asking you for more money than he is spending? If you feel that it is corruption and the Government is not spending what it is spending, then it should be a vote of "No Confidence" in the Government. Therefore, do not say that it looks funny.

In Barbados, we have to get over this cheap sphere of politics. If you have to entertain people, you just have to entertain them. I feel those kind of days are over so far as this kind of debate is concerned. You are spending \$12,000. If you want to know how the money is being spent, say so; but do not say that it looks funny. The Government is there to give an explanation. You do not have to say in here that it looks funny. Members of the House of Assembly should not say so because we are in a position to say that we want an explanation. We do not have to talk as if we are not members of the Chamber. We have already agreed to the principle that the Government should entertain and we do not pass a Resolution on the basis that 'thou shalt not spend any more.'

Sir, I do not like this idea of your saying, something looks funny. That is a political gimmick as if you are in St. Joseph holding a mass meeting. It is time politicians in Barbados stop these innuendoes that all they are saying to each other is that each of them is a dishonest person, thus seeping into the whole of the community that the whole bunch of politicians are dishonest. You are talking as if

somebody is dishonest and everybody is doing it. The hon.

member by innuendo is saying it looks funny. That is the

sort of thing you are seeping into the community and it is going to backfire; and when it backfires, people do not like

it.

I have been in here for a long time and I would charge the Government for anything if there is cause

for it; but hon. members know that I have been very scrupulous even with my political opponents. I am the last person to accuse any-body by innuendo. If you do something which I do not like, I say so and I am not afraid to say it.

As regards this vote of \$12,000, how much does that amount mean in terms of public entertainment? A cocktail party costs you \$2 or \$3 per head. Members can make their own calculation. If a cocktail party costs you at the rate of \$4 per person, see how many persons you can in-vite from that amount. Sometimes instead of a cocktail party, you have a luncheon or a dinner party. 3.55 p.m.

Some Ministers have luncheon for people because it is not suitable to have a cocktail party on each occasion. If they are going to have a lunch, where do you want them to carry people for lunch? At "Ernie" in Nelson Street or do you want them to go down to Baxter's Road or King Street and call for bread and fish with the frying pan with the steam coming into your face? What kind of entertainment do you expect to have? If you are thinking in dignity of entertainment, then you must think in terms of that. I have at-

tended cocktail parties held at private people's homes, at "Miramar" and so on, and we know what they cost. I feel that when you add up and multiply it, the cost is not so great as what you think. This is a matter of \$12,000, but for whom and on how many occasions? Take this question of the vote for the Queen. There was an occasion when the Birthday vote for the Queen was increased, and it was explained why it was increased and therefore what we have here is nothing new. What I find is this; at this time it looks to me as if hon. members are looking for arguments that have already been passed. You pass a Resolution for something at Government House and the Governor paid for that at Government House. This is not the first occasion on which this sort of thing has happened, and now you are raising something as if you are breaking new ground. Mr. Chairman, I really cannot subscribe to this sort of thing. The Government Hospitality vote will always be subjected to treatment like this. You are dependent on the circumstances unless you are saying that you will not have any more entertainment after you have passed a certain amount, and you will ask the House if they are going to allow you to entertain any more.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. senior member for St. Philip caught my eye first.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, may I begin by saying that everything has to be related. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter did not mean to insinuate that when the Government spent \$12,000 a year on a hospitality vote, the entertainment should be held in Nelson Street or that they should entertain people with fish fried at some place in Nelson Street. Last year we voted \$12,000 for Government Hospitality and this year it is \$20,000 more. Even the hon. senior member for St. Peter must agree that in the context of what we can afford to spend on hospitality, the sum of \$20,000 is too much. There is no question about that at all. There must be extravagance somewhere. I can speak with experience of our expenditure on hospitality in relation to people coming here. From time to time there is a big entertainment to be put on and, occasionally, a Minister has an individual guest or a small number of guests whom he has to take to lunch or dinner. Invariably he goes to some hotel. Some Ministers like to go to their own homes.

I have done it myself; but it is not that the lists of entertainments referred to as having taken place this year is immeasurably greater than those which took place last year, or the year before or even three years ago. In any given year you will find things like intercolonial people coming in or trade missions or members of the Royal Family visiting here or something like that taking place. The question is whether the jump from \$12,000 to \$20,000 is warrantable. If you are in straitened circumstances, you have to watch your hospitality vote. Naturally, as a country gets more into recognition in the eyes of the world and people come to our shores, more entertaining will be done and that is why we jump the vote from \$12,000 to \$20,000. If in the ordinary course of events the vote went to \$25,000 we can cover it, but not to treble the vote in six months. I am moving that this amount be reduced by \$6,000 and all hon. members who feel like supporting it can do so, and those who do not feel like supporting it, that is a matter for the who do not feel like supporting it, that is a matter for them. I am sure that no member of the Government Bench can justify, up to now, the claim that another \$20,000 will be required this year. I cast my eyes back at what has happened so far and I cannot, for the life of me, think of our having already spent funds on events which will necessitate such an abnormal increase in the vote. I mean not even over and above any major events which have transpired last year or the year before.

If the hon. senior member for St. Peter had found himself today not supporting the Government, you would have heard his voice in here for the next six hours, not accusing any hon. member of corruption but of a wanton and wilful waste of public funds and not keeping any proper account on the Public Treasury of this island. Naturally, if people know that they are not going to be subjected to the scrutiny of Parliament or because their actions purely because of

public entertainment or games could be carried on ad lib, there may be the inducement to extravagance. But I do not suggest for a moment that the only way in which you can discharge your responsibility for entertaining is by spending larger and larger sums of money all the time. When there are special occasions for expenditure under this vote in this direction, special provision is made for it. For instance, we may - I say this advisedly - have to entertain Royalty next year and that is, as hon. members are aware, the subject of special provision for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved.
4.05 p.m.

We already have additionally provided for other expenses at Culloden Farm; this is also being done extra. In my own Ministry, for instance, I am sure that I spent less this year in entertainment than I spent last year. I speak subject to correction, but I am almost sure I did. I cannot recall now any extraordinary occasion which involved more expenditure this year than last year. The biggest party I have ever had was when the Australian Trade Mission came here about three months ago; but all the items in connection with the educational officials or something like that coming in, my Permanent Secretary would say, "Well, Mr. Minister we have some money to arrange a dinner", and I would tell him to go ahead and make the arrangements, and he would tell me the place and the hour. We are only six months in the current financial year, Mr. Chairman. and I submit that if after nine months in the current year the Government sees justifiably that the vote of \$20,000 or \$26,000 is going to be overspent, they can come to the Legislature with a reasonable statement and presentation showing the manner in which this money had been spent, and having justified every member of this Chamber, they would move the expenditure. But I would suggest that in view of the extraordinary rise from \$12,000, to ask for an additional \$12,000 today is to demonstrate an utter disregard of what we can afford in terms such as this, and is certain to create the impression that in the realm of Government hospitality, there is no limit to what the country can afford.

Three or four years ago, Mr. Chairman, the amount was not even half of what this Resolution calls for today. Let us concede that with the advance of internal self-Government, with the more rapid interchange of officials between this Island and other territories in the area or even persons from further abroad it might involve additional expenditure; yet still I do want to say that to ask us to jump from \$12,000 to \$32,000 in one year is an example of an unprecedented rise in expenditure. If we were to duplicate this in other avenues of Government expenditure, the country would soon be bankrupt, and therefore I say to the Government, let us have a sense of proportion. Let us continue our entertainment with dignity: do not let us go into Nelson Street or anywhere else, but let us realize that the public purse is not entirely inexhaustible.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. WALCOTT rose.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, this is the second time I have risen to speak, and you have not looked in my direction.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition must set a lead if he wants the debate to proceed with dignity. There is nothing I want to say that cannot wait, because I have not lost my nerves yet. I too can lose my equilibrium in battles like these.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter came in and admitted he did not hear everything that was said, but he started off by accusing somebody of intimating some dishonesty. I am sure the hon. Minister would agree.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, I used words precisely and do not have to take them back. I have not accused anyone of dishonesty.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member accused members of implying dishonesty. He further accuses me of implying dishonesty.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order. If I wanted to accuse the hon. member of anything, I would say it without implication. I would say just what I mean. If the hon. member wants me to repeat what I said, I said that it was stated that something was funny in this, and I said that if someone felt that something was wrong or corrupt about this, he should say so, but not by innuendo, because there are too many innuendoes in this country about people's dishonesty.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Politicians have been implying dishonesty to each other, but nobody has implied any dishonesty in this respect in here at all. When I asked the Hon. Minister for information, he told us the necessity for the tremendous increase of \$12,000. He read out that among the entertainment which they had this year was that for the Queen's Birthday Reception, but I drew to his attention that we had passed in the

Estimates \$9,600 Duty allowance for the Governor which, I understand, is used for entertainment by the Governor, and is separate and distinct from entertainment by the Government. You cannot tell me that that money would have gone by May or June, because it would have been after three months. Nobody implied any improper or dishonest motives to anybody in this at all. But what we do say is this it does seem strange to me that the Government should be paying for the Queen's Birthday Reception entertainment. I have never objected to the entertainment which the Ministers have for dignitaries, because I do not believe in being parsimonious in this matter. I am at a loss, therefore, to understand how the Government can pay for Her Majesty's Birthday Reception, and that is why we feel that the increase seem to us very high at this stage. The hon. member was not here, but he started to make these suggestions, and I am glad that he has said that it is time that politicians stop accusing others of dishonesty, because it seems to do absolutely no good to the general public in Barbados. The suggestions of dishonesty have been going on for a long time, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows very well what politicians have suggested about himself and about me. 4.15 p.m.

How the Governor was brought into this was because of the fact that the Hon. Minister in reply to me that one of the big items would be the Government's expenditure on the cocktail party for Her Majesty's Birthday. If you had been in here long enough, you would find out that no Minister of Government is inviting you if the Governor is having a party. I am not implying anything to the Governor. Nobody is implying any improper motives to anybody in this matter, but we think it so strange. That is what we said.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I was defending the Government on this matter. I have been in the House long enough and my memory is good enough and I am going to remind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition of certain things now. I believe it was the same hon. member who criticised the idea that Government House parties were restricted to a narrow class of people and did not represent the community as it stood. When this Government took over the Government House reception parties - and I have not been always there - they brought a larger number of people to Government House than ever in the History of the Island, The point is that if you invited two hundred then, from two hundred you went to 1,000. Previously, you had the long Jacket people invited to Government House; now you have the felt hat people. I have heard it said that the invitations have gone from two hundred to five hundred.

I am surprised at the hon. senior member for St. Philip who has not only been a recipient but a person who has been permitting this. I do not know if today's speech by him is his first since he has resigned from the Government. If it is, I am amazed to hear his maiden speech as a member of the Opposition. He is criticising the Government on this matter when he said persistently that his Government is spending the money as wisely and prudently as possible for the years that it has been in office. Am I to understand that in less than a month the Government has become spend-thrift and is not spending the money with due consideration? It is the same Government that he said that is not only spending money prudently and wisely, but it has remedied

the imbalance that existed before. Now, today, the hon. member as part of the Opposition is chiding the Government for a vote which he has already participated in.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I rise on a point of order. I am not chiding the Government for any vote which I participated in. The

fact is that the vote which I participated in was increasing it by \$8,000. That is raising it from \$12,000 to \$20,000/ Now they are carrying it from \$20,000 to \$32,000.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member has participated in the Government's Hospitality vote already. The fact that they needed more money and he agreed to it shows that he has already participated in the original amount. Therefore, what I said was that I am sorry that he is taking part in a vote in which he has already participated. The hon. member cannot come now and say that he has not participated in the vote. It is really a very sad case that the hon. member is criticising a vote in which he has already participated. It is not a new item as one says, that we are going to buy a nuclear reactor and the hon. member thinks that the Government has no need for a nuclear reactor. But this is a vote in which he has already participated because he collectively agreed in raising the amount to \$20,000. This is a vote in which he has already participated.

Therefore, it is not a question of his absolving himself because when he was a Minister, he had collective responsibility. In effect, what he is saying today is that when he was a Minister, they spent money badly on the Government Hospitality vote because if they had not spent it badly, they would have no need for this vote today. It is unfortunate that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is attempting to have a reduction on something which he has participated in originally.

Sir, you cannot help people commit crime and then like Pilate, you wash your hands away. The hon. senior member for St. Philip wants to wash his hands. Up to a week ago, this money would have been brought down and he would not have said one word against it; but in the changed circumstances, he criticised it.

Let us use a hypothetical case. This is not the first vote which has exhausted the amount. It was explained in this Chamber already that the Government House Hospitality on the Queen's Birthday had exhausted because of the fact of the large numbers of people who were invited to Government House; therefore, the Government decided that they would supplement that vote. When the hon. senior member for the City said that this was not the first time that they had a cocktail party for people on the Queen's Birthday at Government House, that is true; but it is the first time that we have had invitations in such a large number. Why is it that the hon. member is making a row now that you are bringing in John Brown with the felt hat and before when you brought the fancy people, there was no row? Is it because the political character of the country has changed? When you have a cocktail party, it is known that the larger the party, the more expensive it will be. If the party at Government House for Her Majesty's birthday is larger than it was before and is of a number which is indicative of what is taken place in the nation today, then it would cost much more.

7.25 p.m.

7.26

THAT IS why I said that the hon. senior member for St. Philip has chosen the wrong debate in which to make his maiden opposition speech. He should not have chosen a money vote like this to make this speech. This is a money

in the Opposition for the last few years; but the hon. member has been a member of the Government for the last three years and this vote has been increased. It is not that you would have agreed to spend this money; we do not say that. the \$20,000, that looks as if it is a big amount. The question which you have to ask is this: Are you satisfied that the reason, which have been given warrant this expenditure? This is a question of policy. What the hon. senior member for St. Philip is saying is that the Government in which he participated up to a month ago, the Government which he

defended, was a Government which worked in the interest of this colony, and I can bring speech after speech in this regard. My position is not any different from what it was in this Assembly for the last ten years when I was a member of no political party, but the hon. member's position is different from mine. For the last three and a half years the hon. member was saying not only that the Government has been spending money carefully, but that it was taking care of every cent; but since he has left the Government he is now saying that it spends money badly. I say that if the Government is spending money badly, then the hon. member was participating in that. They would only need \$12,000 more during the time that the hon. member was there.

With collective responsibility, the hon. member was Deputy Premier and some of the vote was spent by the hon. member directly. He would have been at sometime or other responsible for this vote, at some time when the Premier was out of the island. What is the hon. member introducing now? When he was in the Government they were spending money carefully, and now he is not there, they are spending it foolishly. They have gone to sleep. You cannot get all this information to us in the few days during which the hon. member has resigned. For my part, I will support the Government always, if they are sound, and not otherwise. It is only in Barbados that we discuss the details as to expenditure of money on Government hospitality, because you are either satisfied that what is being done is done properly or that it is not done at all. I may make mention of Government House. I have heard hon. members say when it suits them, that you do not invite certain people to certain things and now that you are inviting a large section of the people of this island, are they quarrelling about that? All it means is that the kind of people whom you are entertaining now should not be entertained by the Government. All this introduces is the narrowness and class prejudice which want to show its ugly head in that you are making a criticism of a country which has budgeted for \$33 million and you are making a quibble of \$20,000 of \$32,000 by way of entertainment is extravagant? If you say that, where are you going to end in your thinking? You are not entertaining for the sake of entertainment. The hon. member was a Minister of the Government, and for him to suggest or to ask that this Government vote be reduced is a very improper thing in the context of things. All it means is that he was participating in the expenditure. The hon. member is saying that when he was a Minister he told his Permanent Secretary about entertaining people and he only had occasions to entertain people. All it means is that....

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. What I said was that occasionally if I had the odd person to take to lunch or to dinner, my Permanent Secretary would say that we should entertain So-and-So and he would make the arrangements as to the time and place. That is what I said.

Mr. WALCOTT:

And there are occasions when the Minister himself did that. I did not make any quarrel about this, because I did not want anybody to think that we were begging for entertainment. We find that the Chamber of Commerce is doing something and if anybody comes here, the Ministers would feel that

they should entertain people from the Chamber of Commerce. When you have to do these things, you do them in order to make people who come to the country feel comfortable. I am saying that we should not reduce these things to cheap political remarks, that you remember something. This is a case where the hon. senior member for St. Philip was a member of the Cabinet. He participated in the Cabinet decisions in relation to Government hospitality, and Government hospitality had a certain form to cover. If we are satisfied that too much money is being spent on entertainment we have to say the type of entertainment which we should provide, but do not let us say that \$12,000 is too much because you have asked for \$20,000. Mr. Chairman, if I am not mistaken, the hon. senior member for St. Philip gave that explanation in the House already in relation to the vote at Government House, and about the parties there being bigger than what they used to be and what the Government had to do. You go and search the debates of this House and see if the hon. member did not make that explanation to this House in relation to what the Government had to do in regard to this matter of expenditure. 4.35 p.m.

Only a couple of weeks ago, the hon. senior member for St. Philip would have been there saying that; so I would advise him to let the grass grow under his feet first and then make these criticisms, because in my opinion it is not the sort of criticism that would have any weight, I am supporting the Government. I supported the Government when they did not need any support from me, and I also criticised the Government when other people were supporting the Government. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition supported the Government because he said that the Government should be in power for three hundred years. I would never be so extravagant to say so.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am never afraid to admit what I say. In my remarks to a member here, I said that if my Party could not get into power, that this Party should be in power, but it suits the hon. member to take what I said out of the context.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I agree that the hon. member said that if his Party could not get in power, but what does that mean? The hon. member foresees a complete metamorphosis, but the people would have to be blind or foolish. Does the hon. member believe that the people in this country would go back to the days when they allowed the Conservative Party to sit down in judgement over them? He could not mean that. I do not believe that he would say that to his son, because the mere fact that the hon. member has seen their numbers being reduced from being a complete House of Assembly twenty-five years ago, and that the numbers have gradually diminished until they have got to four means that there is an arithmetic progression where the numbers are taking a retrogressive turn. When I came to this House there were eight Conservative members, and the number has become less and less each time, and it will reach the stage where people will allow him to hold the flag for sentimental reasons, but not for philosophical reasons. (Mr. MOTTLEY What do you hold yours for?) My flag is a flag that is indicative of the growing aspirations of the country. I can only hold my flag because I have nobody with money to back me. I do not have wealth to back me; so it is only my ideas that back me in politics, not money. Money could not back me, because I am too forthright a man and I am obliged to crush people's corns. Those who back me, therefore, back me for what I stand for. The hon. member, however, said something I would not say, because I would not say now or ever that if I could not get in power any Government must be in power for twenty-five years or three hundred years, because I am not going to dedicate future generations to any Government or Party notwithstanding what it does. I am not going to be extravagant to make a statement like that, or to say that any Government has any right to be in power longer than its

term unless it can justify itself.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was specific in what he said, but he would use any occasion to criticise the Government, and more so when he gets a lead from the Leader of the Opposition, because although they represent two completely philosophically different facets, yet you find this agreement. When I say that to him, it is quite patent, because the hon. member would criticise the hospitality vote, but he seems not to remember that a decision like this has already taken place at Government House where it was larger than the original vote. It suited hon. members to say that you did not invite different people to Government House, and now that they are being invited and the cost has gone up, they are saying that you are too extravagant. What they mean therefore is to drop out the ones you used to invite and only bring in the new ones as replacements. I cannot subscribe to that. Some people feel good at Government House, and if it is the last remnant of their social position, let them go. I would have been in agreement with the two hon. members if the Hon Minister could not explain. Let the hon. member call the occasions when he criticised the hospitality vote. I am one of those persons who said that the Leader of the Government should have a House, because the Colonial Secretary had one, the Commissioner of Police had one and the Chief Justice had one; so what is wrong with giving the Premier of the Island a house! You do not give him a house as a personal property; The last Chief Justice lived in a house which we brought, and now he is living in

his own house, and the present Chief Justice is living in the house. The hon. member said that the Premier has a house now, and it is obvious that when it comes to Government hospitality the vote is going to increase as night follows day, because if I were Premier I would be tempted to invite people to my own home. They would not feel the same way, but more entertainment would take place as a result of that. Do you think that anybody would question the Prime Minister of England if he invites somebody to come to chequers and sleep? The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago went to his private home and slept there; so if the Premier has a house, more entertainment will take place in his home than in a private home.

Mr. Chairman, we have been very prudent in a general way about spending money, but I would like to say to hon. members that there is no point in making these statements and then at other points making other statements. I feel that the time has come when members of this Chamber should begin to understand that the method in which entertainment is done and the way the country is run will be different, and you cannot run the country on any parsimonious, pork-knocking, hole-in-the-wall basis. When the hon. member talks about this in the context of Civil Servants salaries, he has gone back to the 1937 days.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I did not say in the context of Civil Servants salaries. I said in the context of the general financial commitments of the country and then I cited the instance of Civil Servants salaries. The Government does not only spend money on Civil Servants salaries.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Let us take \$12,000 and gave it to the Civil Servants and see how far you would get. \$12,000 mean nothing to them, but again it is spurious argument to say that because you spend \$12,000 which is 50% or 60% more in entertainment, that you should give that to Civil Servants. \$12,000 in the context of Civil Salaries cannot come to the same figures; you would have to talk about \$ 4 million or \$5 million.

What you have to ask is whether the entertainment you have done or expect to do is worthy or worthwhile. I would say that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was a member of the Government, and from the point of view of new matter I would have been able to see with him, but I cannot agree with him on an old horse like this. (Mr. CRAWFORD It is not an old horse.) It is an old horse, Mr. Chairman, because we are not voting for a new item; we are voting for supplementary provision of \$12,000 to the \$20,000 already voted, and the hon. senior member for St. Philip was a Minister of the Government and was responsible for some of the original money that was spent; so he cannot now say how much his Ministry spent. He would have to say that the policy in spending Government funds during the time he was a Minister was improper, and that by implication is what he is saying. All we can say now, therefore, is that he was aiding and abetting the Government in spending money badly. He did not resign on those grounds, and now that he is speaking against the Government for the first time, he is chiding them for spending additional money in which he was a direct participant both in entertainment and in being entertained. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I will try to clarify the situation. To begin, this \$12,000 which has been asked for has nothing at all to do with entertainment at Government House.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I said the Government Hospitality vote. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he does not understand the argument of Government House coming in today because we have had cocktail parties in the past at Government House and this is not the first time.

Mr. SMITH:

The hon. senior member for St. Peter wants to defend the Government, but he is catching the wrong bus. It is going to go around the corner and turn over

with him.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to be a man who can make a swing in mid-air -

a complete somersault - because all I said was what he said. I could not say what the hon. Leader of the House said because I was not in here when he spoke. What I said, both the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph repeated. They said that this is nothing new. We give the Governor a Duty Allowance. I said that going to Government House is not anything new because on former occasions we voted money from the Government's Hospitality vote for entertainment at Government House for invitees to the Queen's Birthday party.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph talks about catching a bus, and you would think that it is a bus which we are catching. If the hon. member would stop using these meaningless colloquialisms, he would do better. The hon. member said that this looks funny and the hon. Leader of the Opposition is always trying to cover up for him, but sooner or later the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will find out that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not a person for whom you can cover up.

(A VOICE:

You two will find it out.)

Mr. WALCOTT:

When it suits the hon. member to criticise the Government, he does so; but he does not do it when he should. I was present at the opening of Parliament, and the hon. member tried in another tune to say the same thing but he didn't have the ability to express himself. He expressed himself with all these meaningless colloquialisms.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is in charge of the Resolution, in reply to a question asked from this side of the House included the money spent at Government House on the Queen's birthday. He said that that is one of the reasons why this money has been expended. The Queen's birthday party at Government House has nothing to do with this vote. I am in agreement with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that nowadays the number of people invited at Government House has increased, but we provide for entertaining them by an entirely new vote which has nothing to do with this.

The Governor's Duty Allowance is about £2,000 a year.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I realize that the hon. senior member for St. Philip has to find occasions for attacking this Government; therefore, he has to catch as catch can; but I do not think I am disclosing Cabinet secrets or giving offence when I say that it is within his knowledge that the expense of the Queen's Birthday Party at Government House must be charged to the Government Hospitality vote. If he does not know that, he has been sleeping all these years.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I was saying, Sir, that the Governor is given a special Duty Allowance of £2,000 per annum for entertaining at Government House. As a matter of fact, the expenditure on the part of the Ministers for hospitality is what this vote is for. We have taken it for granted that the Governor is entitled to get certain Items free of duty, but the Governor's Hospitality vote is one thing; that for the Ministers is another.

You also provide for Culloden Farm separately to some extent. If you look in the Estimates, you will see under Head 24, the sum of \$11,350 is provided and the information is that it includes provision for wages of staff, uniforms upkeep of gardens and grounds, lighting and fuel, water, furniture and equipment and contingencies. Apart from this, extra provision is made for entertainment at Culloden Farm;

therefore, this vote which we are asking for an increase of \$12,000 is for entertainment on the part of the Ministers. Mark you, it was increased from \$12,000 to \$20,000, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter better than I should know whether or not the expenditure for the first six months of this year should warrant such a considerable increase. I said that I know of no reason for it. His argument is that my having participated in the expenditure of the last six months means that I should not say anything about it. I go further and say that I have not seen this expenditure; but from my own expenditure, it is

not more than

what it was last year; therefore, I see no reason why this year it should be increased from \$20,000 to \$32,000.

If the hon. introducer of the Resolution had given in de-tail any ordinary details of expenditure that the Government was committed to in the six coming months, it would be al-right. As a matter of fact, we do not know what it may be now. What the Resolution says is this: \"In the light of the expenditure during the first half of the financial year it is considered that the vote should be supplemented by \$12,000\" 4.55 p.m.

It does not say that the vote has been expended. What I am saying is that in view of the fact that we have other things to do besides offering hospitality, some attempt should be made to curtail the expenditure in this direction for the remainder of the year. We should make some at-tempt to curtail the expenditure on anything for the re-mainder of the year; let nothing be done on the same scale for the remainder of the year. That is all I am saying.

Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member who has just sat down....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. senior member for the City caught my eye first.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I did not know that the hon. member was speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior mem-ber for St. Peter came into this Chamber not fully ac-quainted with what has been said and he has been drawing a red herring across the trail; and you, Mr. Chairman, have been allowing quite a lot of extraneous matter in the debate. However, Sir, the whole argument is that the Gov-ernment is asking for \$12,00a more; and we are arguing that they used \$12,000 last year, they had an increase of \$8,000 and now they are asking for this \$12,000 which would make a total of \$32,000. 1 am suggesting that the only proper thing to do is to ask how you account for this expendi-ture. The Hon. Minister has explained that they spent something like \$17,000 for the first six months of the year and in the coming six months they anticipate greater ex-penditure. That is what we should go on. The Minister has replied to the effect that a Cabinet decision was taken in this matter. He did not say that before; he read out the various matters of entertainment which included one for the Queen\'s Birthday at Government House and other entertain-ments. I immediately said that, as far as we are concerned, in the Estimates there is an allowance for the Governor and from the invitations sent out we understood that the Queen\'s entertainment is always given by the Governor and not the Government. But the Hon. Minister has now said that a Cabinet decision was taken to the effect that the Queen\'s entertainment should be paid for out of the Gov-ernment\'s entertainment vote and not the Governor\'s al-lowance. It may be that he wanted to correct what he has said. Now the hon. Minister has gone further and said that it was a Government decision. It may be that he thought that he was giving out Cabinet

Secrets. However, Sir, we must not appear to be parsimonious because I said on the floor of this House that the invitations given out for the Queen's Birthday entertainment were not broad enough. The most people who were ever invited to Government House were there in 1963 and 1964, and again in 1965 you had a lot of people there. You tried to invite people from a wider range - what the hon. member would call those "felt hat" people. As a matter of fact, we know for the first time now that the Government had taken this decision that the Queen's Birth-day party was to be paid for out of the Government's vote. We never knew that. The Hon. Minister, reading from his files, said that the money which was paid- the \$18,000 - was paid out of the Government's entertainment allowance. I said that you have \$9,600 for duty allowance which I knew was spent in this direction. That included, not last year but all along. We know that we received invitations from a Minister to attend entertainment of some V.I.P. or from the Governor for the entertainment of somebody of persons

here, but for the Queen's entertainment you would come to no other conclusion than that the Governor's entertainment vote was being used. When we received an invitation for the Queen's Birthday party, that is paid for from the Governor's entertainment vote. When it is suggested to us that we are now annoyed because "felt hat" people are going to Government House and people from all walks of life are going there, that is nothing but drawing a red herring across the trail. When you say that we raise the question that we have been asked to vote \$12,000 - the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that we have had people who debated, for half a day in here, the question of the provision of a single carpet for Government House. That is not to raise the question of the increase of \$8,000 and then \$12,000, but I feel that the Government should take greater caution in these matters. If the Ex-Minister knew that the Government had taken a decision in this matter, according to the Hon. Leader of the House, not only in this year, but in previous years, to pay for this entertainment, then that is a different matter. I believe that the increase of.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is talking about drawing red herrings across the trail. The point is that if \$12,000 is paid for entertainment at Government House and all the other things given out as going on this year, what is the reason for this amount.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I anticipate that the decision to pay for the entertainment from this vote was made some time before the money was paid. The decision must have been made before then. 5.05 p.m.

I do not want to waste any more time on this, because I think the Minister has noted what I have said. Up to the end of the first half of the year the Government has spent \$17,000, and the Minister has told us that there would be Heads of State coming here. I would prefer to see a Resolution when such Heads of State come to this country as has been suggested by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, and I will therefore second the motion by the hon. member that this be reduced.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown will not vote against the idea of Royalty coming here, because he is one of those members who believes in those things, and feels that if he votes against it that they may put his name on a blacklist.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, I am not prepared to sit and allow the hon. member to say that I am not going to vote against something for Royalty because my name would be put on a blacklist. We have known each other for a long time, and he knows.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

That you are a Royalist.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member says I am a Royalist. I love an argument with the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, that is why I say this is only a political gimmick. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was a Minister of the Government. The hon. member says that the Minister explained that \$17,000 of this money was spent in the first six months which could include the end of September when the hon. senior member for St. Philip was a member of the Government. He now comes in here after his former collective responsibility and moves a motion against something that he spent. Now this is just like a man who would help somebody to commit a crime and then be the first person to go and be a star witness against the person who committed the crime of which he was a participant. The hon. member was a participant in Government extravagance. The hon. member forgets his own argument. He wants to know why it is that you spent this money last year and all these years, and you are spending more this year when he is one of the members that spent it. He is asking why he spent more money this year than he spent last year. Do you realize that if it were circumstances other than the Legislature or if it were something criminal the hon. member would wash his hands like Pilate after he had

helped to commit the act. The hon. member has assisted the Government in its over-expenditure and now he is the one moving a Resolution against the over-expenditure which shows that he is embarrassing the very Government of which he was a member. That is why I say that constitutional and political propriety must have some meaning in a Colonial territory. We want all the British parliamentary trappings when they suit us, but we throw them over-board when they don't. Can you see a British Minister in the House of Commons resigning and going in the House of Commons and voting against a money Resolution of which he was a participant? He would not participate in the debate; but the hon. member is so anxious to pull down the Government of which he was a member a couple of weeks ago, that he is joining in this unholy alliance against something in which he has participated. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown would have been silent as he has been in the past on a Resolution like this, because this is not the first time that he has heard that the Government hospitality vote has subsidized parties at Government House.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I object most strongly to that remark. The hon. member said this is not the first time I have heard that, but that is absolutely untrue. I would like him to tell me when I heard it and where I heard it.

Mr. WALCOTT:

This House has already passed a Resolution in here, and an explanation was given by no less a person than the hon. senior member for St. Philip in respect of the Governor's vote for the Queen's Birthday entertainment.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the hon. member did not say that at first. He said the Government's Hospitality vote; he did not say the Government House vote. On several occasions before we had Cabinet Government I heard that in here, but we are talking about the Government's Hospitality vote.

Mr. W ALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should know that the Government's vote can be spent on anything at all which the Government decides on.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says this is not the first time I have heard an explanation given about the Government's Hospitality vote. There are two different votes under two different Heads in the Estimates the Government's Hospitality vote and the Governor's Duty Allowance. I have heard several times in here of the Governor's Duty Allowance being overspent, but nobody referred to the Government's Hospitality vote.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, what is the hon. member saying? If the Government decides that they will spend some of the Government's Hospitality vote for entertainment for people at Government House, it is done. I am saying that it has happened in the past that the Government had a party at Government House where the Government paid for the party. They may have a party at the City Council, at Government Headquarters, at Sam Lords Castle or at Government House; it is the Government's decision to have a party and pay for it wherever they choose, and there is nothing improper if the Government decides that the Governor's vote cannot take care of the number of people they want to invite. There was a time when the Governor would invite people to Government House; there was no Prime Minister to tell him whom to invite, and it ended at that. The hon. member is opposed to this Resolution now; but if this had come up at the beginning of this Session when he made the remark about the Government being in power for three hundred years, he would not have opposed it. He agrees that the Government should spend money on hospitality; he agrees that the Governor should have a Duty Allowance, and I would say directly to the hon. member that in his own capacity in other functions he would have done a similar thing if he felt the party deserved similar treatment, and the money comes out of the Public Treasury. 5.15 p.m.

If the Governor decides that he is only inviting three hundred or four hundred people to Government House, but the Government decides that five hundred should be invited to Government House, are you saying that this is something

which you are not voting for? That is why I say how can I be asked to subscribe to this. The hon. senior member for St. Philip, who was a former Minister. is moving a motion against the Government's Hospitality vote. He is condemning the Government and saying that they are spending too much money on this vote when he was a Minister for more than six months of this financial year. What he is asking us to do is to condemn the action which he took when he was a Minister. The hon. senior member for St. Philip moved the motion and the hon. senior member for the City seconded it. That is the sort of alliance that you want to see taking place in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear. I cannot tell you when I resigned from the Government what amount had been spent under this vote. However, you can ask any Minister this. Any of them knows that I have always been super-sensitive to criticism on the floor of this House and, on account of that, I have been extraordinarily careful in bringing down matters to this House which would give the Opposition grounds for criticism. In other words, if I had been in the Government when it was disclosed that they had already spent \$17,000 under this vote I would have thought twice before I came down with another supplementary vote for \$12,000. My advice to the Cabinet would have been that you had already increased it by \$8,000; therefore, you should not go for \$12,000 more; you had better come with a Resolution for \$5,000 or \$6,000. And if later on the circumstances justify this for large scale spending under this item, you can bring down a supplementary Resolution for that.

The times are legion, without disclosing any Cabinet secret, that I have given this sort of advice to the Cabinet but what is happening now is that they are bereft of it.

I am not saying for a moment that the \$17,000 might not have been spent up to September 15th. I am not the Minister of Finance. These things come to the Cabinet piece-meal. Meetings after meetings, whenever amounts are due for approval, they are approved, but the total assessment would have come only when consideration for additional money became imperative. I doubt that there is a single Cabinet Minister who could have told you before this matter came before the Cabinet that \$17,000 was expended by then. Nobody keeps a check on it. I am saying that it is misguided and ill-considered advice on the part of any Government that it should unnecessarily submit itself to criticism on a matter like this.

It may be unfortunate, but on this matter the greater part of the expenditure may have taken place earlier in the year. In other words, from the 1st April to the 30th September you have more entertaining to do. I do know that during the second half of the year when the vote is getting near to its end, the Ministers have warnings to be careful, and expenditure which you would normally undertake you do not. You do have these warnings from the Minister of finance to be careful, that the vote is running out; therefore, in the latter half of the year, you would not spend as you would spend in the first half. It is not possible that the money spent in this direction during the last year could have been spent in the same proportion.

What I do know is that sensitive as I always have been to the manner in which hon. members of the House discharge their responsibility, I have never allowed myself to be subjected to the criticisms which would be introduced from matters of this sort.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, let the hon. member use his logical faculties and brutally examine what he said just now. He said \$12,000. Madness! you could not have spent more than \$12,000. I am not saying that you have not spent \$17,000 up to the 15th September. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In my first speech what I said was that it was madness to increase the vote from \$12,000 to \$20,000 in one swoop.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member said in his first speech that you could not spend this money; what has happened; what is wrong? He was speaking without knowing the facts. When the facts are revealed, he finds out that \$17,000 has been spent.

It is a question of behaviour. Obviously, no Minister keeps a check; but the ministers have a collective responsibility for what is going on in the Cabinet. They cannot surrender their responsibility. During the time the hon. senior member for St. Philip was a Minister, this expenditure took place then; therefore, how can he wash his hands out of it now?

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On what occasion have I washed my hands? I made my position crystal clear for a child to understand. I said that if I had been a Cabinet Minister when this matter was being decided, I would not have presented a Resolution for \$12,000 over a six-month period.

Mr. WALCOTT:

If I were a bird, I would fly. This is a supplementary vote. I spoke about the hon. member's political behaviour as a former Cabinet Minister; therefore you can excuse him. If it were something pertaining to the dry Council I could not excuse him, I do know that if this were the City Council, the hon. member would have justified it.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip is saying now "I do not know," but when he spoke at the beginning, he spoke ex cathedra. He said: "I speak with authority." 5.25 p.m.

Subsequently, "I do not know". How in one breath the hon. member could speak with authority as knowing these things and when I challenged him how could he be taking part in a criticism of the Government for something in which he participated? The hon. member said "No, I was so scrupulous in my Ministry that you could ask me how much I spent". That was not the point: The point was that during the time when the hon. member was a Minister, the sum of \$17,000 was spent and he needed a supplementary provision. Now the hon. member says "If I were a Minister I would not have spent this amount and therefore I am moving a reduction of the amount by \$5,000."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

I did not say that; the hon. member should not misquote me.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I am sorry. The last remark was meant to be a conclusion. (Mr. CRAWFORD Illogical.) Well, Sir, if I am illogical, I may be pardoned for that, but the hon. member is shifting. The hon. member criticised the amount of money which was spent; he was criticising the Government for being extravagant. The point I am making is that if they were extravagant, they were extravagant during the hon. member's time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

I never said that. I do not know if the hon. member was here at first. I was careful in my choice of words. I said that it either could be demonstrated that the expenditure was warranted or that they were extravagant. I did not say that they were extravagant. I do not know if they were extravagant. I have not been keeping any check on it. You can get my speech and read it back. I used about five or six

alternatives.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, it is an inescapable fact that during the period when the hon. member was a member of the Government, he was responsible for the actions of the Government and he participated in them. He cannot exonerate himself from that now. Therefore, if there has been any extravagance, the hon. member was a party to it. They spent \$17,000 when he was a member of the Government, and if that happened to be extravagance then the hon. member cannot be a person who is not a party in a vote like this. If this were something which the hon. member was receiving, then he could not vote on it because he would be a party to what he was going to receive. The hon. member was a trustee who was seeing about our funds. The hon. member has acted in the typical Barbadian fashion. The bell started to ring, and he does not know about the matter. A Minister or the Permanent Secretary would know. That is the favourite trend. They take the thunder when they say "We put these people in work" and when the people

are out of work they do not know anything about it. The hon. member is now pleading ignorance of expenditure; he was not aware of what was brought down, \$17,000 out of \$20,000 for the six months when he was a Minister. If \$17,000 has been spent, however it has been spent, it cannot be a question of the hon. member questioning the motives or actions of the Government or he would be questioning his own actions as a Minister.

The hon. member was a party to the decision and now they need more money. The hon. member is saying that if he had been there he would not have asked for this \$12,000. That is nothing to do with the fact that he is now criticising the Government in the sense of the proposed expenditure of \$12,000; the Government would not have had any need to come for this \$12,000 if they had not spent \$17,000, to which expenditure the hon. member was a party. If they had spent the amount which you said they should have spent, then they would have spent it.

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order. I never mentioned any figure which they should have spent; not one single time did I say that they should have spent any amount. I said that they have spent \$17,000 and they should have \$6,000 now and trim their sails to suit the cost. If you find that you still need money you can come to the Assembly and tell them what the warranty is and you will get your money. If you give them \$12,000, the tendency is for them to spend it; if you give them \$20,000 they will spend it; but if you reduce the amount you will make them cautious of the expenditure.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The hon. member says that if you give them this money, they will spend it. A Government of which the hon. member was a member for the last three years he is saying is so extravagant that if you give them more money they will spend it. The hon. member is speaking from first-hand knowledge. He says that you have to be cautious with them. The original argument is that the amount of money was \$20,000, and why are you going to increase it by \$12,000? I am saying that the hon. member should do his homework, and do not come out in these Opposition arguments too soon. The hon. member should wait for a better occasion. If \$17,000 was spent during the time when the hon. member was a Minister, I say that it is scandalous behaviour for him to come at this stage and begin to dissociate himself from the Government and accuse it of this expenditure of \$17,000 as being reckless.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, where does the hon. member think he is at all? If the hon. member is at a loss for words, let him control himself and study what he is saying. At what time today did he hear me say that this was reckless expenditure?

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must understand the English Language. I can, by implication, utilise different words from those which he has used. I did not use the language; he used it. The hon. member said that the \$20,000 which we voted should be given to the Minister to take charge of, and he took charge of it. Now you want an additional amount. The hon. member says "I am not saying that you do not need more money," and therefore that nullifies his argument. If the sum of \$20,000 is enough and should have been enough, there would not be any need to reduce the amount to any figure. The hon. member is admitting that if they are coming for additional money they should come for it with a different Resolution. 5.35 pm.

Let us examine the hon. member's argument. \$17,000 were spent when he was in charge of our destiny, and I would ask him not to wash his hands like Pilate from that period. He says that money might have been spent, but he does not know anything about it. Imagine a Cabinet Minister is hiding from the delegation of authority in Government by saying that he did not know anything about expenditure as if a Permanent Secretary, without the authority of a Minister, can spend money for entertainment. He spoke of how his Permanent Secretary would inform him how the money is to be spent. How can he say that in one breath, and come back now to have the vote reduced? If you spent \$17,000 in six months' time, do you believe you would have to have First Class Honours in Mathematics to do an ordinary unit-

ary method sum. to find out if you spent \$17,000 in six months, how much would you spend in twelve months? This is the basis on which you compute an estimate. This is an ordinary thing you do in Third Standard, and therefore you can do it now. The Government's argument is that if they spent so much money in the first six months, they are likely to need some more money, and therefore they have come for \$12,000 which would make the vote for the year \$32,000, because it looks as if they would spend \$12,000 more in the remainder of the year.

The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is asking to reduce the vote by \$6,000. Listen to the logic of the former Minister. He is thinking in terms of a small fish-shop. - not of Government - where if you want more to make the weight, you put in the scoop and add a little more to send down the scale. He is saying to come now for \$6,000. Imagine a former Minister of Government is going through the unnecessary procedure of coming with a Resolution again unless you are satisfied that it is too much! But the hon. member does not say so. He has fallen out with the Government; so hear now what he is saying about his former friends, when only two months ago, he told the public of Barbados that the Government spending was so prudent as compared with the party of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph when they were attacked about how to spend money. He got up and lambasted the hon. member on the basis of how the former Government spent money, and said that the Premier of Barbados was careful in spending money in spite of the pressures, what the Ministers have been doing, salaries not having been increased, and the sacrifices the Government has made. All that was said in justification of the Government that was in power for three years. The hon. member has only been out of Government for a couple of hours, so to speak, and they have so missed his guidance that he can say of a vote of which

three-quarters were spent when he was there, that it has been badly spent. During his regime the vote was spent in this way, but now he is leader of condemnation of his own soul. This is like a person carrying another to commit a felony, and is the first to witness against him. To put it mildly, this to my mind is the essence of parliamentary ineptitude, and it shows quite precisely that when it comes to political maturity, some of are still very far from understanding not only the proprieties of Government, and we would start the next day after we have been in Government like the hon. member to criticise the very things that we participated in.

I could not support the hon. member's Resolution for a reduction of the vote. If I had to support the hon. member's reduction of the vote, I would have to move that the hon. member in other circumstances should pay the amount that he feels it should be reduced by, because we would not have had to vote this money if they were as prudent as he said the Government had been. He is washing his hands from any blame; he is the blue-eyed boy, the bright boy, and had it not been for him this money would not have been spent; he is the person who has saved the Government from these embarrassing situations, but now he is no longer there, they need more money to spend. The hon. member's Resolution should have been moved before, but I would say to the hon. member that if this is going to be his attitude and conduct in the future, he will cut a very bad image as a politician with years of experience, one who has been in Government as long as he has been. He should choose his sights better. To the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I would say that not only did he participate in Resolutions of this character in which the Government came down and spent more money, but he agreed to the expenditure. I understand the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition now and I understand what is going on. There is an attempt at any moment to bring down the Government on any issue, no matter what it is; but I am not going to be any party to any of these unworthy alliances which only seek to damage the best interest of the people of this country.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

There is one thing that has been worrying me since I last spoke. The Hon. Leader of the House said that this figure of \$1,800 is the biggest expenditure....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I did not say it was the biggest expenditure; I said it was one of the big ones in the first half of this financial year.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

We asked the hon. member to give us a break down as far as he possibly could. I appreciate that no Minister would actually know what is being spent for the first half of the year as the former Minister has said, but if you take out \$1,800 for the Queen's Birthday reception, it works out at \$3,000 a month, and we must admit that this is being spent locally only. I know it is only for local entertainment, and that seems a little on the extravagant side to me. Besides that, you have in the Estimates a sum of \$11,350 for wages, uniforms, upkeep and so on at Culloden Farm. 5.45 p.m.

I understand that there is another \$48,000 for entertainment under Item 18, Culloden Farm. If I am correct, you are actually spending \$3,000 a month and another \$4,000 a month on Hospitality at Culloden Farm. (A VOICE: That is for eight Ministers.) It has nothing to do with the Ministers at all, I am reading from the Estimates. Take up your Estimates and look at them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair is still here.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

That has nothing to do with Ministers at all - absolutely nothing. The Ministers. vote come out of the Cabinet. Let the hon. member get up and say that that is incorrect. The hon. senior member for St. Peter does not follow what I am saying.

Mr. Chairman, I said that \$20,000 under the Govern-ment Hospitality has something to do with the eight Ministers. It has something to do with the Cabinet, but the \$48,000 has to do with Culloden Farm. This is really another \$48,000 put on to the \$20,000. Here you have \$20,000 to be increased by \$12,000. The amount of \$12,000 last year was increased to \$20,000. The hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that when it comes to money, I am not parsi-monious in doing things. The amount of \$12,000 last year was increased by \$8,000 and now you have come back for another \$12,000. Besides that \$12,000 you have here on page 15 another \$4,280.

What the hon. introducer of the Resolution did say was that they anticipated that they would have to expend part of this increase next year on Heads of State and that may be before the end of the financial year. That is why they have come for \$12,000.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I said that before the end of the financial year we may receive distinguished Heads of State. In case that they come before, we would have to come with another vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Do you mean to say that this has nothing to do with that? If that is so, that makes my case stronger. I am therefore asking for a reduction of this vote by \$6,000.

Mr. WALCOTT:

If I were in the position of the hon. senior member for the City, I would agree with him. He is trying to reduce this to the position of the Mayor of the Bridgetown City Council. All of us are not in the hon. member's position; therefore those of us who are not in his position cannot do it. I am talking about the Mayor of Bridge-town. We give the Mayor of Bridgetown something like \$200 a month for entertainment (A VOICE I only get \$30 a month.) An emolument of \$200 a month is paid to the Mayor and an allowance of \$50 a month. We are not dealing with entertainment because \$50 a month is not entertain-ment. The hon. member may feel that the salary of the Mayor should be more because of what is involved, but the last Government fixed it at that figure. The hon. member has chosen this occasion to criticise the Government on a supplementary vote which has come down six months after

it had been raised. I can bring a copy of the Estimates which can show year after year since this Government has come into power what the hon. member has been saying. the hon. member has chosen this occasion to criticise the Government although he was a big supporter of the Government because he has got on public platforms and praised the Government and asked me, why do I oppose the Government. Therefore, it shows that my position must have been consistent.

Money does not have the same value as it was, even a year ago; so it is stupidity to say that you put

\$12,000 in the Estimates last year; you came for \$20,000 this year and you have now come back for \$12,000. The sum of \$10,000 in 1961 does not have the same value in 1965. I know the hon. senior member for the City well enough. This is not a question in the same light as that which the hon. member entertains people at the Bridgetown City Council. He can entertain whom he likes. The triumphant captain of the West Indies Cricket Team came here and I never saw that he was accorded a civic welcome. May be, if somebody else was in his position, the hon. member would have wanted to know why they did not accord him a civic welcome. I am sure that the West Indies Cricket Captain is as much entitled to a civic welcome as when Sir Winston Churchill came here because he means as much to the Barbadian society as Sir Winston Churchill to the world society. I see people have come from Virginia and all parts of the U.S.A. as well as from down South and the hon. member has entertained them. 5.55 p.m.

I do not quarrel about these things. If you feel that it is good for the tourist trade, you do it. Where the Government is spending money on the Tourist Board, there is no limit; and now today I am surprised, I am very surprised, to find the Hon. Leader of the Opposition joining in the condemnation of the entertainment of the Ministers on the ground that they are spending too much money and on the basis that it is the same Government that he said would be in power, but he is not now in power and the Government should go, I would not regard this as sour grapes, but in the light of the decision which has been made the hon. member is bound to see that the statements which he has made in this House today have not only given rise to a question of impropriety from the political point of view, but that they are lacking in logic from beginning to end.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to prolong this debate inasmuch as the points at issue have been clarified. Speaking from memory, since the institution of the Ministerial System in 1954, the Government Hospitality vote has never been properly estimated. I speak from memory, but I think that what I am saying can be borne out from the debates. Each year, probably for the last five or ten years, the Government Hospitality vote was never represented in any proper amount and we had to come for more money. Last year we came here for \$12,000 and the next time we came for \$6,000 in order to entertain the victorious West Indian Team from Australia. It was on the basis of that \$6,000 plus the \$12,000 that we made it \$20,000 on this occasion. We have spent \$17,000 in the first six months of the year, and it is estimated that we would spend \$15,000, and that is how the amount has been computed. In every year since the inception of the Ministerial System we have never had any proper or sound basis for estimating the hospitality vote. We never said a word on that occasion but now we are having this unnecessary debate..

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the last hon. member who has spoken. His memory does not serve him right. The hon. senior member for St. Peter will remember that he himself was the greatest critic of a Hospitality Vote in here. In 1960, as a matter of fact, it is very rare that there has been an increase in the Hospitality vote or an increase for the Governor that the hon. member did not offer criticism of it. (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman I express my view when I feel like expressing it. The hon. member takes one line at one time, and when he feels like doing it, he takes another line. The hon. member feels that other hon. members must take this very line. The hon. member knows that if he felt like criticising this vote as he did in 1960 you would have had.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order. The hon. member is only searching for an argument. The hon. member can-not say that I criticised an entertainment vote in 1960. I do not accept that. You cannot go back five years. Just like that I am not going to say what anybody should vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY; The hon. member cannot accept what I said, that is, that on several occasions he criticised this vote. The Hon. Leader of the House can support that. If he says that I cannot just get up here and say.....

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order. On the last occasion I criticised the last Government on many things, not on one thing, and I have also criticised this Government for many things. You cannot just say that the thing I criticised was the Hospitality vote.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I remember distinctly that in 1960 the hon. member criticised the vote. It was in 1961 to be exact....

Mr. WALCOTT. If the hon. member wants to be reminded in connection with the Hospitality vote in respect of the opening of the Deep Water Harbour, I told the Government that that was used as an election bribe.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if I wanted to use the same political gimmicks as the hon. member has used, then I could say the same thing, I could say that they invited "Felt-hat men" as an election bribe. Of course, I criticise when I feel like criticising. The hon. member knows that on occasions Head I of the Estimates dealing with the Governor's entertainment vote has taken a whole day in this House before it was passed, never mind a supplementary Resolution,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said that the debate on this Item has reminded him of the salt fish shop or something like that. Sir, What I am saying is this although, in my opinion, the Treasury of this country cannot be compared with a salt fish shop, on the other hand, the Treasury of this island is not the vault of the Chase Manhattan Bank

in New York City. 6.05 p.m.

We are told, Mr. Chairman, that this item according to the present estimate, will go from \$12,000 to \$32,000, and then we were further told just now that the visits of Heads of State expected here in the New Year will be additional, so that you can expect that this vote will be well over \$50,000 by the end of the year. Now in the cases of extraordinary expenditure, and extra-ordinary visits, provision must be made; but I repeat my conviction. Sir, that the best way to go about this is to make provision for the amount which I proposed earlier, and then when these extra visits occur you can bring down supplementary Resolutions for the additional money needed. I have seen endless debates in this House on \$2,000 or \$3,000 for a carpet for Government House. I have seen endless debates on small items like \$200, and it would be more than strange if we are going to vote \$20,000 with the possibility of being called upon to vote God knows how much more without any debate at all. If anybody thinks otherwise in this Chamber, he is sadly mistaken; and I am saying, Sir, that the members of the

Opposition who are in here have Just as much interest in safeguarding the public purse as anybody else. They are Just as obligated to seeing that there is no extravagance and no wastage in anything as anybody else. The hon. senior member for Christ Church himself-has conceded that in the past even when there was a small amount needed additionally for this vote, it involved additional debate; therefore it should surprise no one. The amount asked for on this oc-casion is entirely out of proportion with the amount asked for on previous occasions.

I have been casting my mind back to find out, if I could why there was this expenditure of \$17,000 in six months, and I think I have the answer now. Any Minister\'s Hos-pitality, any Governor\'s Duty Allowance, any expenditure under any Head must be conditioned not in the light of the whims and caprices of any Minister of this House, not be-cause of any inflated ideas of any Minister of Government, but must be conditioned by the capacity of the country to discharge all its commitments, and so long as I am sitting here, I will take every possible step to see that this is being done.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I presume that the hon. member was not seeing that it was being done all along, because he said that as long as he is sitting here he

will see that it is done. What happened when he was sitting over there? All this went on when he was sitting over there.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member need not play with words. I am just as good as or better at that than he, but he knows that when I said \"sitting here\" I mean sitting in this Chamber,

Mr. WALCOTT:

Precisely, The hon. member was sitting in this Chamber when the \$17,000 were spent; so I go back and ask him how he is going to get out of it. I am not a Royalist, but when you talk about Heads of Slate you must do something. If Her Majesty the Queen and H.R.H. Prince Phillip are coming here next year, let us be realis-tic. You are not going to get one hotel.....

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order, the hon. member distinctly heard me say and he knows him self that we have two other Resolutions before us today separate and dis-tinct for the Royal Visit, and I have made it perfectly clear that the Royal Visit is not included in this. There are two other Resolutions before us; one for a dollar vote and the other for money to be spent at Government House, which are nothing at all to do with this.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I am pointing out to the hon. member that this same argument was used when Royal people came here. Some of us feel that you should not raise these things, because people like that bring something. People like to see them and people spend money to come here to see them. What I am surprised at is that the hon. member is im-pervious to his own argument. because I thought the hon. member would have said that the \$17,000 spent should not have been spent; but that amount was spent during the time he was a Minister, What I am worried about is why is the hon. member questioning the expenditure which has taken place. That is why I say he does not seem to understand.....

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order, this is completely illogical and untrue and unfair. I am not talking about the past; I am talking about the present and future,

Mr. WALCOTT:

You can only have a future because you have this money spent already,

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I am not questioning it.

Mr. WALCOTT:

He is questioning it because it wants to know why you need \$12,000 in addition to the Amount you had originally. If you had not spent \$17,000 you would not need \$12,000, because you had a vote for \$20,000 and you spent \$17,000 and you now need \$12,000 as an additional amount. If you had spent the money in accordance with what the hon. member said, you would not need any further money, I say that \$17,000 were spent during the time that the hon. member was a Minister of Government, and he is initiating a Resolution to vote against the additional amount that is required. That is why I say it is strange behaviour, I could understand anybody else doing it, but not the hon. member who has been a member of Government for the first six months when they spent \$17,000. The hon. member should not enter the debate, whether or not he knew about it. The hon. member does not understand the niceties of political propriety. He seems to ignore that. The fact is that he was a Minister then and was a Party to what was done whether it was good or bad; and if it was bad conduct, he should keep his mouth shut.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, anybody following my remarks today and making the speech which the hon. member has just made means that he does not understand one single word that I have said, because I made it superlatively clear that what I am worried about is the possibility of spending \$20,000 more than the vote of this year. I have not directly criticised the expenditure; all I have said is that instead of voting \$12,000 you should vote half of it. That in itself would be a caution to the Ministers to be careful with their expenditure for the remainder of the financial year. If as is said other requirements are necessary for Heads of State and what not, then you come for the additional amount. I assumed and all of us here assumed that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy had included some

of the additional expenditure in this extra \$12,000. He told us about 15 minutes ago that we can expect an additional Resolution further and beyond this amount, which is all the more reason for exercising caution during the remainder of the financial year, I do not know whether expenditure for the first six months normally is heavier than expenditure for the last six months. It may well be that expenditure may be more from March to August than September to February, and I will give reasons. It is human nature if you have money there to play with that you may not be as careful or cautious as if you did not have it, and that is what I have been trying to explain today. You should therefore reduce the amount, and then if circumstances compel you to ask for more later and you can Justify it, you can have it,

Mr. WALCOTT:

Let us see if we can find an area of agreement since the hon. member has said in his closing speech

that he is not fundamentally opposed to the amount. You cannot be opposed to the amount and say to come for it in two stages, because you cannot have two stages of something you fundamentally oppose,

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order, I did not say that in my closing speech at all. That is about the third time I said that. I said it in my first speech when I moved the reduction by \$6,000, and that was the reason I gave for moving the reduction.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Look how illogical that is. You cannot say you can do it and come back later for the amount, because the hon. member knows that if he is opposed to this being too much money, the question of coming back does not arise. Let the hon. member bear in mind that we are not pitching marbles. The hon. member says that he is not now criticising the \$17,000 spent. He knows that \$17,000 have been spent, but he is washing his hands like Pilate from that, and I would ask members of the Opposition how they can vote for a motion by the hon. member who says that you should not vote for the additional money unless the Government can show how the \$17,000 was spent. 6.15 p.m.

The only way that you can vote against a supplementary provision is on the basis that the original amount was spent badly, but not on the hypothetical argument that the money was spent badly. If that is the case, when he was a trustee he also sided, abetted and helped those who spent it badly. What the hon. member does not seem to understand is the constitutional position in which he was six months ago. He was a party to his criticism. The fact is that \$17,000 was spent during the time when the hon. member was a Minister; so the criticism is not of the future. If the hon. member was willing to say that during his regime the Government spent \$17,000, but notwithstanding the fact that he was a member of the Government, he would caution the Government to exercise more care, that sort of criticism would be quite in order. What the hon. member is doing now in retrospect is criticising his own decisions because as a member of Government he participated in the expenditure of these funds which we are now talking about and he has laid a criticism on his past actions. But the hon. member has an ingenious way of absolving himself from blame by looking through the window.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this debate has gone on for some time although I made it clear in my opening remarks what the facts were. I made note of the extraordinary expenditure as a result of the Queen's Birthday Parade which was a charge to the Government's Hospitality vote, I pointed out that on the 15th September the total charges amounted to \$17,000, and for the rest of the financial year it seems that the sum of \$12,000 would be a correct figure.

We have heard a lot of debate on this matter and it has surprised me to this extent that it was not more than two and a half months ago that the hon. senior member for St. Peter reminded the House that the hon. senior member for St. Philip ably defended the Government from strictures by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the Government was extravagant in more ways than one, and the hon. senior member for St. Philip was at pains to point out that the re-

cord of this Government could bear scrutiny any time, day or night, because from the time we came into power we set ourselves high standards of conduct for the community.

It therefore came strange to us to hear his criticisms about the public expenditure. On every occasion before, the hon. senior member for St. Philip ably defended the Government on its public expenditure and now he has thought it wise to criticise the Government on this matter although he is familiar with the tremendous expenditure in the Government's activities.

It is true that we criticised the Barbados Labour Party for extravagance in this respect. We certainly agree that since we have come into power the expenditure in this direction has been increased; but there is the third truth. It has to be taken into account that for the money which we have spent, we have been able to provide more benefits to this country for what we have expended than all the Barbados Labour Party provided for what they had expended.

I do not want to speak of other Ministries than my own. I have entertained people on behalf of the Government here from Harvard University, The total amount which I spent may be \$500, probably on three occasions, but look what it meant to the Government! You were hearing people saying that the Ministry of Education was having all parties, but now they would reflect and say that we were doing these things so that we could get many things done for the Island. I have spent rather less than what I have got. As a result, we have people here advising on technical education in the last year or so, and the latest advice we have got it that we are likely to get \$2 million from United Kingdom Government Funds for an expansion of technical education. There are a lot of things which I can think of. Therefore, what is \$25,000 or \$35,000 if you have to spend it in this way for doing the work of the people of this Island when compared with the benefits which all the Ministers of the Government get for the country, even those who have left us. All of us, so long as we have been together at some time have been sharing in the particular benefits which have accrued to the people of this country. Our benefits far outweigh the people's money which we have to indulge in. There is no other way of looking at it.

I think I can speak for the Government. I can say this on behalf of the two Ministers who have left us. Each Minister of the Government would rather avoid having to be caught in official entertaining. The worry of it and the physical strain of it sometimes entail a lot, but it has to be done, 6.25 p.m.

Since this Government has been in power, I do not know where a hospitality vote has been abused. We have a custom whereby there is a proper arrangement made as to the entertainment which is going to take place from week to week, and we have tried with success not to duplicate any entertainment but to telescope it and make proper arrangements and fix proper dates. By so doing we can have two or three parties at the same time instead of having three parties on three different occasions, but it costs more in money, strain and fatigue. All of this the hon. senior-member for St. Philip knows and therefore I cannot accept his amendment to reduce this vote by \$6,000, by \$5,000, or even by one half penny. From what everybody knows, I cannot believe that the amendment is sincere. It is quite possible that the hon. member is searching for an area of agreement with this Government, but he cannot find it in this vote because he knows as much of this as all of the rest of us know. He knows the tremendous activity of Government. There have been quite a number of occasions on which it has been found necessary to offer public hospitality on the part of the people of this island, and there are certain Ministries which, because of the very nature of their work, have had to offer this hospitality. In the Ministry of Education or in the Ministry of Health which are the chief givers of Government hospitality, there is nothing to be alarmed at because they are the Ministries which have had a tremendous impact on the lives of the people, and there are matters which bring them into coin-

tact with overseas organizations with which the Government must of necessity, be in daily contact.

You could not have visitors to this island for more than a day and did not offer them some hospitality if the visit is to Government and has been in some important way connected with the furtherance of Government policy in this island. Mr. Chairman, cannot accept this motion: I do not see how it could be sincere. We have hidden nothing from hon. members; all the information which has been asked for has been given; and if it is possible that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to have something else, he is officially Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and he has the authority whenever it suits him, to call the Cabinet Secretary or the proper person or persons who sees or see after the control of this vote and ask whatever question he wants to ask. Nobody is trying to hide anything from anybody else. We cannot say that precisely \$9, 6.87, for instance, will be the amount that is required to the end of the financial year. We have not even taken into account the fact that there are certain assemblies which are going to be here in January, not connected with the Government, but with the University, and in which the Government must offer some sort of hospitality because there are University people and others who are coming here. If they are here in connection with a major education project such as the laying of the foundation stone of the new College of Arts and Science, would you expect the Government to ignore the fact that these people are here? All this forms Government hospitality in some way. I therefore cannot accept the action of hon. members who feel otherwise because this Government is expanding, and who forget that for every penny which we spend not only now but from 1962, some \$100,000 worth of benefit comes to this island in one way or other.

The question that the amount of this item be reduced by \$6,000 was put. and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Messrs. CRAWFORD, HOLDER, SMITH, SEALEY, LYNCH and GODDARD - 6.

NOES:

Honourables J. C. TUDOR, E.W. BARROW, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, N. W. BOXHILL, Messrs. LOWE, YEARWOD, CARMICHAEL, WALCOTT, and COWARD - 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The question has been resolved in the negative, 10 hon. members voting "Aye" and six hon. members voting "No". I declare that the "NOES" have it.

The question that Head 24 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 29 - PUBLIC WORKS Head 29 - Public Works - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head there is Item 48 - Government House - for which a supplementary provision of \$5,115 is required. The Note reads as follows-

In view of the expected visit to Barbados in 1966 of members of the Royal Family it is necessary to carry out structural alterations and improvements to Government House and improvements to furniture

and finings. To carry out these works supplementary provision will be required as under:

Head 29 - Public Works, Item 48 -Government House - \$5,115.00\"

I beg to move that Head 29 stand part of the Schedule. Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.35 p.m.

Head 35 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under Head 35 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools, Item 22 A (New), the sum of \$11,400 is needed.

If hon. members would look at the note, they will see, that under the arrangements between this Government and the United States Government of sending Peace Corps Teachers here, the Peace Corps programmes are generally financed by the sender, which is the United States Gov-ernment, and other participating Governments agree ac-cording to their circumstances to make some contribution to the cost of the programme, which contributions are not asked for, but are voluntary according to the financial situation of the host Government. Our contribution therefore is in the nature of a personal allowance of \$50 per person for each of the Peace Corps Teachers, and this sum to the end of the current financial year is equal to \$11,400. I may say that there are twenty-eight teachers currently engaged in our schools in this Island.

I beg to move that Head 35 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools, stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing this Head, but what I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister is that some of these Peace Corps teachers visit more than one school in the parish in which they are stationed, and what I have discovered in my parish is that at the St. John's Mixed School there is a lack of some re-pairs because water comes in when the rain falls. The same thing applies to Cherry Grove School, and I would like the Minister to look into the matter and stop the water coming in. There is also an inadequacy of space at the St. John's Mixed School, and I hope that the Minister will find it possible to do something about it.

The question that Head 35 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirma-tive without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$32,473 do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965 - 66 No. 19

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Ghairman, this Resolution for a small sum is to supplement Part I - Current, Head 19 - Fire Service, Item 15 - Medical Treatment. The amount provided in the Current Estimates of \$110 is not sufficient to meet existing claims due to the recent submission of accounts for two years in respect of professional services for dental treatment of members of the Fire Service. Supplementary provision of \$241 is therefore now required.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965 - 66 No. 21

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks the provision of \$1.00 as a token vote. The Resolution of course is in connection with the forthcoming visit to Barbados of Her Majesty The Queen and H.R.H. Prince Philip in the middle of February. Hon. members will appreciate that in this kind of exercise it is never possible at the earliest stages to be able to say with any accuracy what the preparations will cost, but we do know generally speaking what we have to do, and hon. members will see from paragraph 3 of the Addendum that because the pro-

gramme has not been finalised it is difficult at this stage to present a reasonable estimate of the expenses likely to be incurred for the occasions of the visit. But these will include the cost of decorations, illuminations, awnings, transport and the employment of additional Island Constables; but because it is necessary in some cases, if not in all, that orders should be placed early, and we could not do this until the House signifies its willingness to meet this item of expenditure, and of course as soon as we know accurately to the last penny what the full cost will be, the Legislature will be informed and will be invited to provide the necessary amount. I am afraid I cannot give hon. members the details of Her Majesty's visit because the provisional programme is still to be finally approved by the authorities at the Colonial Office and Buckingham Palace.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I am giving the green light to this Resolution, but I am also warning the Minister to be careful with the expenditure, because I would not be afraid to criticise if it is in my opinion too high when he brings it back before us.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965 - 66 No. 20

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution asks for supplementary provision of \$2,231. Hon. mem-bers will see from the Addendum that due to a decision that from 1st July, 1964 the Inspectors who use their motor cars or motor cycles on official duties should be paid travelling allowance at the rate prescribed in the Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Act, what was put in the Estimates will not be sufficient to meet com-mitments arising out of this new decision, and therefore supplementary provision of \$2,231 is required to meet the increased charges for the remainder of the current financial year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, now that this Resolution seeks to put these Inspectors on the same basis as the Public Officers, I am wondering if the Government considers placing them on the same basis by way of loans to help them with motor cars. 6.45 p.m.

I do not think giving them a fixed rate of \$32 a month and allowing them to use their own motor cars would put them in the same position as the other officers. It is of no use to help them with travelling allowance and then do not help them with something to travel by. They want some-thing to help them travel the long distances which they have to travel. They do not want something which would stick up all along the road. You would not be helping those people if you did not help them with means to obtain a proper car. It appears to me as if you are only helping them in one way, but not in the other way.

These people must have a proper machine to travel by.

like to find out from the Hon. Minister if the Government is not thinking so yet. The Government should try to help these people with loans so as to get a proper machine be-cause these people are doing a very good job; but they really cannot do it as they would like without a proper car. It is alright to run around St. Michael; but when you have to so up and down hills in the country it takes a good motor to do that job.

Sir, I would tell the Hon. Minister that if he brings down a Resolution for such a purpose he would not have

much trouble in getting it passed tills honourable Chamber. The Hon. Minister should bring down a Resolution with an amount of money to help these people to buy a car; otherwise this travelling allowance would be of no use to them.

The question that the sum of \$2,231 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without

division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 23

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$7,150. It is comprised of two items under two Heads, the first Head 24, Premier - Cabinet and General - Item 15, Relief of Distressed Barbadians abroad for which the sum of \$500 is to be voted.

The Note sets out very clearly that of the sum of \$550 provided under this item in the current Estimates, \$540 is

committed in respect of contributions towards the relief of Miss Edith Brathwaite, a destitute Barbadian in Rio de

Janeiro.

During the course of the current year, application has been received for relief payments in respect of four distressed Barbadians in Cuba, and the sum now requested is to enable payments to be made towards the relief of these cases to 31st March, 1966.

This matter has been carefully examined, and it is felt that assistance should be given to aid those distressed Barbadians in Cuba in keeping with Government's policy in the past. I beg to move that Head 24, stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH, HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Head 37 - Ministry of Health, Housing and Local Government was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The next is Head 37 - Ministry of Health, Housing and Local Government - Item 87, Medical Aid Scheme. We are asking for a supplementary vote of \$6,650, and the addendum explains the position very briefly but accurately.

It states that of the total sum of \$8,000 so far provided, expenditure and commitments incurred amount to \$6,787.90, leaving a balance of \$1,212.10. An urgent case for which treatment in Montreal, Canada has been recommended involves expenditure estimated at \$2,207.00.

This is a case in which a special eye operation has to be performed and it can not be done either in

Trinidad or Jamaica. In other words, the hospitals in these countries do not have the necessary surgical equipment to perform the operation, and it has to be performed at the Queen Elisabeth Hospital in Canada.

The gentleman in question has lost the sight in one eye already; and if we delay, he would most certainly lose the other eye. So we have come to get this supplementary to send him on to Canada for the operation. He is 57 years old.

In order to meet this expenditure and to provide for cases likely to arise during the remainder of the financial year, it is proposed that the item be supplemented by \$6,650.

I beg to move that Head 37, stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$7,150 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

6.55 p.m.

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to proceed with Order No. 2 which is the Town and Country Planning Bill. That is a Bill which has just been printed and circulated and hon. members would not have had the opportunity of studying it. I therefore beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE WAREHOUSING OF RUM IN BOND (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned Premier- To move the passing of the following Resolution- Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled \"The Warehousing of Rum in Bond (Amendment) Regulations, 1965.\"

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order on behalf of the Honourable and Learned Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking the indulgence of the House to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned Premier, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. (Pause) There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a Resolution to amend the Warehousing of Rum in Bond (Amendment) Regulations, 1965. The Resolution seeks the approval of the House of these Regulations which have been made under Section 59 (1) of the Rum Duty Act, 1906, a copy of which has been laid in this House. All the Regulations seek to do is to provide that the owners of bonds, the importers of rum, should pay for the services of Customs Officers which are required on a part-time basis at the rate of \$2.50 per hour. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Resolution concludes Government Business for to-day's sitting. In fixing the Order Paper, there will be Committee of Supply as the first Order of the Day and the other matters follow seriatim. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 26th October, 1965, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 26th October, 1965, at 2.30 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned

the House accordingly.

7.05 p.m.

THE

\House. of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th October, 1965.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assem-bly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH. J.P., Hon. C. E. TALMA. (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR. M.A.. (Minister of Educa-tion); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister / of Communications and Works); and Mr. J. B. YEAR WOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I regret to have to inform the House that there are no Minutes available for con-firmation at this Meeting.

Messrs. E. StA. HOLDER, F. C. GODDARD and E. D. MOTTLEY 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 com-manded to lay the following-

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police for the Quarter ended 31st March, 1965.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police for the Quarter ended 30th June, 1965.

Selected Monthly Indicators March - June, 1965.

Barbados Statistical Service Abstract of Statistics No. 4, 1963.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 5) Regulations, 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-

Resolution to place the sum of \$31,599 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1965-66, No. 24 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

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

Resolution to approve the "Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 5) Regulations, 1965."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that there is no mention of Questions on my Notice Paper for today, but I have the assurance of the Clerk that Questions by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph were handed in on time. There are also Questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas which, I have been informed, have been handed in on time. Let the hon. senior member for St. Joseph proceed with his Questions.

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

1. Is Government aware that there is a very dangerous bend on Highway 3 Joes River Road known as \"Back Gate?\"

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government, in view of the heavy increase of traffic AS A result of vehicles going to and coming from the east Coast road, and further in view of the fact that a school is being built nearby, and, in addition to the School's playing field there is to be a general playing field which will increase the risk of Accident, take the necessary action to have the course widened At the earliest convenience?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will the Gov- ernment cause an inspection to be made with a view of ascertaining what should be done in the circum stances?

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister-

1. Is Government aware of the inconvenience caused to residents in the Chimborazo- Sugar Hill area as a result of low water pressure?

2. Will Government. in view of the fact that many of these residences have water-borne systems, make an effort to alleviate such sufferings? 2.55 p.m.

Mr. BATSON:

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

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware that for quite sometime accommodation at the District \"D\" Court in the Parish of St. Thomas leaves much to be desired?

2.

3. Is Government also aware that the situation is so bad that very often Officers of the Court have got to stand. due to lack of sitting facilities while perform- ing their duties?

4.

Will the Minister go into the matter with a view to effecting improvement at the said Court?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware that there are buses op-erating without any proper means for passengers stop- ping the said buses when they want to alight?

Will the Minister investigate the matter with a view to bringing relief to the users of the said buses without delay?

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time. There are no answers ready. We will proceed now to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first item under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. senior member for St. Thomas, and that is to resume debate on a Resolution relating to the establishment of centres in rural areas to enable smallholders to dispose of their crops.

When debate on this matter was adjourned, the hon. Introducer was yet speaking. Does that hon. member now desire to continue?

Mr. BATSON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution introduced on the last occasion is a rather familiar one with hon. members. It reads as follows;

"WHEREAS the smallholders of land in the rural areas do experience much hardship in disposing of their produce profitably in the City of Bridgetown;

AND WHEREAS the major portion of the money they get is used for transporting the said crops to the Marketing Corporation;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government explore the possibility of establishing centres in the rural areas, thus enabling the smallholders in getting a better re-turn for their crops."

Since this Resolution was introduced, much water flowed under the bridge in that I discussed the matter with the Minister, and the information I have got has satisfied me somewhat. The Government has for sometime been exploring the possibility of assisting these smallholders, and have plans afoot to further help them. They have two or more vans operating and collecting the produce, and in view of the information which has been conveyed to me through the Minister, I am asking leave to withdraw this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Actually, it has not been seconded. Is the hon. member about to second the Resolution?

Mr. SMITH:

I only want to say a few words on it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The few words can only be said if the hon. member intends to second it.

Mr. SMITH:

For the purpose of discussing it, I will second it.

Mr. BATSON:

On a point of order, I begged to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution, but the Resolution has been seconded. I understand the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to be seconding the Resolution.

The Resolution, having been seconded, is opened to debate.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am sorry I was not in my place, but am I to understand that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has asked leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas asked leave to withdraw. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph rose and seconded the Resolution which had been previously moved by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

It therefore rests with Your Honour.. If the hon. member has asked leave to withdraw, I would have thought that that was what was before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before I put the request for leave to withdraw the Resolution before the House, the Resolution was seconded; therefore the Resolution, having been seconded, may continue to be debated.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. It is traditional and customary for a Resolution either to be seconded or be allowed to be debated. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph seems anxious to lend' his support to the Resolution, and the hon. member should know that all we have to do is to raise one hand and he cannot get it withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER:

When there is a request for leave to be granted, the House can always refuse such leave.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On a point of order, surely there would have to be a vote of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is one dissenting voice, leave cannot be given, Standing Order No. 24 (1).

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants to contribute something to the debate.

Mr. CORBIN and Hon. C. E. TALMA rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew caught my eye first.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I clearly understand that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has asked to withdraw the Resolution. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph rose to speak, and if he is going to second the motion for withdrawal, he has our permission to speak on the withdrawal. 3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thank the hon. member for his advice.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is Private Members. Business in which we find that the mover of the Resolution has elected to withdraw it and does not want to proceed with it any-

more. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas initiated it and he does not want to continue with it any further. He does not want any further debate on it. Therefore, there is no question of any leave of the House; it is a question of nothing before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I point out that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas cannot elect to withdraw the Resolution. The hon. member asked leave to withdraw it, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph seconded the motion that this Resolution be debated.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate your stand in this matter and I uphold all that you have said in this matter. I think hon. members should realize that the moment a Resolution is before the House, it is the property of the House and the mover of the Resolution can only with leave of the House withdraw it. This Resolution is now the property of the Chamber, and it can only be taken off with leave of the House. If that leave is only sought and there is a single objection to leave for the withdrawal it cannot be withdrawn and the Resolution is still under consideration.

As I was saying, Sir, the Resolution having been moved becomes the property of the House, It is not the member's property; it can only be withdrawn with the leave of the House. A single objector to the withdrawal makes it that the matter is still before the House, The mere fact that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph seconded the Resolution means that the House is in favour of the matter being debated.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely, this Resolution is not the property of the House until it

is seconded. The hon. junior member for St. Peter by virtue of his long experience has given Your Honour his experience; but I am saying this Resolution cannot be properly before the House until it has been seconded. And it was never seconded. The initiator of the Resolution moved that it be with-drawn.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The record of the House dis-closes that the Resolution has been seconded. I have been informed that the Resolution was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He may proceed, if he wishes.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am now beginning to find out how the hon. member wants to write a book.

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph not to anticipate the contents of any publication which is not in circulation.

Mr. SMITH:

I only hope that that book will be printed in England.

Now, Sir, before we go further, I think this is the second or third time that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas did a thing like this, that is, introduce a Resolution, get up and speak on it and withdraw it. By doing so, it shows that he does not want other hon. members to support or to destroy it. I cannot understand the meaning of it because the hon. member is certainly a member of the ruling Party, and I feel within myself that the Hon. Minister in charge knows something about these addresses before they come here; therefore something seems to be radically wrong if that hon. member has been told to start the ball rolling and then to withdraw the Resolution.

Anyhow, Sir, the Resolution reads as follows:-\"Whereas the smallholders of land in the rural areas do experience much hardship in disposing of their produce profitably in the City of Bridgetown.\\

Now, Sir, smallholders do not or cannot grow as much vegetables on their holdings as to make it profitable for

them to bring it into Bridgetown because in the first place, as I have said, they cannot or do not grow as much on their holdings to pay them to do nothing else but to eke out a livelihood from their holdings, It would mean more expense.

As the Resolution reads further:- \"Whereas the major portion of the money they get is used for transporting the said crops to the Marketing Corporation.\\9

As the Resolution states, it would mean more expense for these smallholders to take their reduce into Bridgetown by way of bus and so on and then to lose a day\\s work to sell them and things of that sort.

As the Resolution reads further, it is asking the Government to erect market places in some other places and to explore the possibility of establishing centres in the rural areas, thus enabling the smallholders in getting a better return for their crops.

I do not know in what way the hon. introducer means by \"exploring the possibility of establishing centres in the rural areas,\" because it will also take money, and a large amount, to establish these centres and to maintain them. 3.15 p.m.

I do not feel that in a particular area sufficient vegetables could be grown to make that a paying concern, because you will get it in small areas and it will take the same growers some time to take these things to the particular centre. What has been lost sight of in this Resolution is that we have people who do nothing else by way of earning a living, that is to say, they go from place to place and buy these things. You will find people from St. Thomas going to St. Joseph, to St. John and all the way around buying produce and coming back to St. Thomas and selling it and the remainder of the goods they will take to Bridgetown. That is a business for these hawkers. As soon as you erect a Centre or Centres it will mean that these people will be thrown on the unemployment list, and at the same time, the particular centres will be losing money because they will not be able to do as much in the way of turnover as would pay everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the hon. introducer of this Resolution because I do not think he would bring forward a Resolution of this sort on his own. He may have had complaints from his constituents-

and in order to convince them that he is trying to do what they have sent him here to do, he has introduced this Resolution. It is very nice of the hon. member-

to do so; but if we were to pass a Resolution of this sort, it will mean that in every district we would have to establish centres. You are not going to get the people from Porey Spring, for instance, going to Welchman Hall to sell produce; you would have to establish a centre in Porey Spring, one in Hillaby and one in Welchman Hall and, in the parish of St. Joseph, the same thing will apply. You would have to establish a centre at St. Sylvans, one at Su Elizabeth's Village, one at Surinam and so on. The question would be: would it pay to do that? There are those who reap such small crops that it would not pay them to take those crops to any centre, so that while we are thinking of helping the people we may not be doing them the service which is expected of us to do.

As I have said, Sir, we already have hawkers laid out to do that work; they do nothing else but go from place to place and buy these things. I do not think that the smallholders meet such a great hardship to get rid of these crops, and I do not think that by erecting these centres they will get as much for the items as the hawkers, because you have to take into consideration the cost of the disposal of these goods. I do not think that this proposal to establish these centres will work so well. I feel that the hon. introducer of this Resolution may be thinking in terms of a market rather

than a centre, because a centre would be a small place built just for the purpose of people going there, sitting and disposing of their goods. As the position is, very nearly every person in the country areas has his own trees and these things are obtained, and of those who do not have any trees, who will be going to the centres to buy these things? You will not get very many people going to buy breadfruit or pears when they can reap their own breadfruit and pears. It is the people in the City who do not have these things and who are forced to go to these central places to buy them. In the country districts a person who does not have his own produce can get what he wants. I would be very glad if the Government

were to see fit to establish these centres from the point of view that work would be provided for the people. If you are going to find work for the caretakers of these centres, from that point of view, by all means I will support this Resolution. I would also have to let the Government know that it will not be so much a paying proposition to expect the working-class people in the country areas who have to go to work at 7 o'clock in the morning to go to these centres which may not be opened before 8 o'clock and they may have to be closed at 4 o'clock. These people have their own way of getting their goods from the landowners for the next day. I do not think that this proposition would work so well as to help the people as the hon. member may think. The hon. member belongs to the City where these things do not grow, and he would not know about this matter so well. When you think of a place like St. Elizabeth's Village or St. Sylvans, nobody will have to leave his home in order to go to a centre. If you are going to put a centre at the top of Sugar Hill, nobody from St. Sylvans Village will leave there to go to Sugar Hill to buy these things, and nobody from Sugar Hill will go to St. Sylvans to buy anything, because they can get what they want directly at the door and I suppose at a much cheaper rate. 3.25 p.m.

I feel that the hon. member has been forced to withdraw the Resolution since he said that a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since this Resolution has been introduced and he had a talk with the Minister. I suppose the Minister might have advised him that it would not be a paying concern. In spending so much money in putting up these centres, because you would be doing nothing putting them apart. You would have to put one in each district, and they would only be white elephants in my opinion, because very little would go there. The people who bring the goods to Bridgetown are not the growers; the majority of them are the people who are trading. They go to the peasants and buy the goods and come to town with them; so I do not see how I can support a Resolution of that nature.

Mr. CORBIN rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has caught my eye, and I shall listen to him in a moment, but I should like to say this for the information of the House. In connection with the ruling which I gave earlier today, in a paragraph under the caption of "Withdrawal of Motions" on page 403 of the 1964 Edition of Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, and apropos of the motion therein is stated

"The Member who has proposed a motion can withdraw it only by leave of the House, granted without any negative voice. This leave is signified not upon question as is sometime erroneously supposed, but by the Speaker taking the pleasure of the House. He asks, "Is it your pleasure that the motion be withdrawn?" If no one dissents, he says, "The motion is by leave withdrawn". But, - and this is the relevant passage which I commend to the attention of hon. members - "But if any dissentient voice can be heard, or a Member rises to continue the debate, he must put the question at the end of the debate as the motion cannot now be withdrawn, even though the dissentient subsequently signifies that he has no longer any objection to that course".

As I am advised by the official record of the Chamber that the member who rose to continue the debate actually seconded the motion, I permit this debate to go on. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew is now on his feet.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution asks for a centre for the disposal of crops in the rural areas. I do not see

why the proposer wants to withdraw a Resolution like this, because it is a good one. Instead of asking for a centre, the hon. member should ask for a depot so that the people in the district would be able to carry their produce to that depot, and the Marketing Corporation would be able to send their vans and collect the produce for disposal. There would not be centres, as at Haggatts in St. Andrew, for the sale of the produce, but people would be able to carry their cucumbers, tomatoes and other vegetables to the particular depot and receive a ticket for the amount which would be sent to Headquarters where the hucksters would be able to purchase and distribute them among the community. This is one of the best Resolutions which I think the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has brought, and I do not see the necessity for withdrawing it. If you established depots in the several parishes, people would not have to go all over the Island trying to dispose of their produce. If you had one hundred pounds of cabbage, twenty-five pounds tomatoes, twenty-five pounds of okras or whatever it may be and carry them to the depot, then the Marketing Corporation could send their van for them, Is the hon, member asking for centres at which to sell the produce? I do not know what the hon. member is asking for. I will support the hon. member on the Resolution, but not on his withdrawal. I need not go any further, but I hope that hon. members who put forward Resolutions and Bills will understand what they are going to do before they do it; if not, they would be likened unto beasts that perisheth, 3.35 p.m,

3.33 p.m.

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. mover of this Resolution for seeking leave to withdraw it. I can see that a depot would serve no useful purpose in any part of the country district. You have various hawkers in the parishes of St. Thomas, St. Joseph, and other parishes who go around and buy fruits and so on from smallholders, and make a living by selling them in Bridgetown and other places, and if we were to put a market centre in any part of the coun-try parishes and encourage smallholders to bring their fruits there, we actually would put those hawkers out of bread and that is something which I would not support. We should never try to do anything to prevent any person from getting a livelihood and from working for hon-est bread.

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Speaker, giving this Resolution consideration, I daresay that the hon. mover of it had good thoughts for the small landowners in the various parishes, and every member of this House should think of the entire Island and not of any particular parish.

Reading from the Resolution, it begins by saying: \"Whereas the smallholders of land in the rural areas do experience much hardship in disposing of their produce profitably in the City of Bridgetown.\"

Now, Sir, the smallholders do not go to Bridgetown to sell their produce. The majority of people who buy produce from the landowners are hawkers and they go around and buy from the smallholders and then do the marketing in Bridgetown, Speightstown and other parts of the Island. Because of that I do not see where small-holders experience such great hardship.

In the second paragraph of the Resolution, it is stated: \"And whereas the major portion of the money they get is used for transporting the said crops to the Marketing Corporation..1

From my point of view, that is a very delicate question. I am wondering what price they must get to

make a profit, and I know that the Marketing Corpora-

tion sells the produce which they receive at a price that they can make a profit. I happened to be at the Marketing Corporation one morning and I saw a person who brought into the Corporation a large bag of spinach and that produce was rejected by the Marketing Corporation. I would say therefore that when you carry things to the Marketing Corporation, you have to be sure that those things are up to standard so that the Marketing Corporation would be able to take them. I think it is a very hard thing for one to carry produce there, and then for it to be rejected.

The Resolution states further: \"Be it Resolved that the Government explore the possibility of establishing centres in the rural areas, thus enabling the small-holders in getting a better return for their crops/\"

It is left for one to mink what is really meant by that paragraph, I am wondering if the hon. mover of this Resolution by that phraseology is referring to market centres. I cannot see for all my goodness or as a rustic person where those centres in the rural areas would be of very much use to the people of Barbados because the different villages in the rural areas actually produce the same thing.

An hon. member mentioned something about bread-fruits. It is known that the St. Elizabeth's Village in the parish of St. Joseph produces breadfruits which when you pass there smell like a vial of good perfume will also find such breadfruits coming from Melvin Hill and at Horse Hill, The people who live in those districts must go out and sell their fruits and if they depend on carrying them to rural centres which the hon. mover of the Resolution talked about, you will be putting hawkers but of work,

I do not think the hon. mover of the Resolution, as he comes from the urban parish, knows the set up of the people who live in the rural parishes. I do feel that in supporting a Resolution like this, hon. members who do so, will be forgetting how many hawkers earn their living by selling the produce of smallholders. They will be forgetting the many hawkers who walk from one part of the island to another to sell their produce. How-ever, I do hope that Government would soon see its way to establish a market in Speightstown.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution stands condemned before we have even begun to debate it because the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has been seeking leave to withdraw it. That leave has not been proceeded with and we are in the position to de-bate the Resolution.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph who is on my immediate right paid a left handed compliment to the hon. mover of the Resolution,

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.. I Just got up to explain that I paid a compliment to the hon. mover of the Resolution in good faith, I won-der what the hon. Junior member for St. Peter means by saying that I paid him a left-handed compliment,

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I was prepared to inform my colleague why I said that he paid the mover of the Resolu-tion a left

handed compliment. The hon. member did not compliment the hon. mover for anything substantial in the Resolution, but he complimented him for having the good sense to ask leave to take it off the Order Paper. I think the hon. member can fully understand my reason for saying so. 3.45 p.m.

Those who are much more knowledgeable than I, those who are in a better position than I to offer criticism - constructive or otherwise, have already pre-ceded me in speaking in this debate, and I have listened to them with much interest. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the hon. Junior member for St. James, the

hon. Junior member for St. Joseph-are all knowledge-able members who have experience of working land; they are those who know the peasants and they are those who live in the country. They know the habits of the country people and they know and they have said that a Resolution of this sort would completely throw these middle people who have been referred to as hawkers, out of business; they would not be able to earn a livelihood if this Resolution were to be passed. Therefore we have it from those hon. members and we accept it from them.

This Resolution says \"WHEREAS the small holders of land in the rural areas do experience much hardship in disposing of their produce profitably in the City of Bridgetown.....\" That points to holders of land who

it is presumed, sell their wares in the City of Bridge-town. That would have me to understand that these vegetables are sold in Bridgetown at least not from their hands. It is the middle then who take these things to the City of Bridgetown, and not the small holders themselves. However, Sir, it does not appear that the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution does not understand the pattern of trade which goes on in the country. If he represents a country constituency, I think we could have been more easily informed or possessed of the information as not to be in a position to be asking leave of the House to have this Resolution withdrawn. This Resolution certainly points to small holders of land who have produce and who sell their produce profitably in the City of Bridgetown. It says in this Resolution that the major portion of the money which these small holders get is used for transporting the said crops to the Marketing Corporation; and in the last paragraph the Resolution is asking the Government to explore the possibility of establishing centres in the rural areas thus enabling small holders to get a better return for their crops. The idea is that these small holders would no longer be involved in transportation costs. If these centres were established, these small holders would sell less because buyers are found in the City of Bridgetown, If these centres were to remain in the country, the people from Bridgetown would not go up there to buy these products. The country people own or rent small portions of land and can buy products at not very expensive prices. That is what we have been reliably told; therefore it seems that some misinformation must have reached the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution, it is the middle then whose name has not been mentioned in this Resolution who would be going out to buy these goods -- the hawker or small trader. I will not offer any sort of left-handed compliments in my address. I would say that it is a good thing that an attempt has been made to withdraw this Resolution, because if that had not been done and arguments were being adduced in its favour, as was expected by the hon. mover of the Resolution, the debate would have been drawn out for a much longer time. Therefore, the Resolution has been killed by the hon. introducer before he began it and therefore it is almost non-existent.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of this Chamber that this is not the first time that a Resolution of this sort has been brought on the floor of this House. The terms of this Resolution, although they appear to be sound in principle, have proved to be impracticable and uneconomic and not in keeping with modern trends of development. When you consider the number of pick-ups and luggage vans which operate in the comparatively short distances in this island and that the livelihood of the hawker is tied up in the terms of this Resolution; one can clearly see the custom which we have gone through for all these years in a populated island like Barbados whereby the hawker or itinerant trader should be given the opportunity to make his own livelihood; in that way the whole theory of this Resolution has been explored many years ago.

I want to make it quite clear that the Marketing Corporation has one or two lorries and it actually employs casual workers who go on these pick-ups to the

plantations and peasant holdings and it purchases articles on the spot; therefore the question of transportation difficulties, as far as the Marketing Corporation goes, does not arise. Then there are those who earn their living by transporting crops and that is the regular pattern of our Marketing in Barbados, I could add quite a lot to what has already been said, but hon. members are already convinced that this Resolution will not serve any useful purpose. In order to establish depots you must have cold storage facilities, watchmen, clerks, book-keepers and so on, and the amount of expense involved in establishing these centres, apart from the question of equipment and maintenance, would be a very tidy sum.

As the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will remember, some two years ago the Government established a Market at Six Cross Road in the parish of St. Philip, that has been a "White Elephant" and it has been a problem and a headache to this Government because we are at a loss to know to what purpose this market should be put. We have established that "White Elephant"; and if we were to establish more of these "White Elephants" we will be putting these people to whom I have referred out of work. As to the hawkers, whose interest we have been trying to protect, we would be throwing them out of existence altogether if we were to do what has been proposed in this Resolution. Mr. Speaker, we shall never be a party to anything like that. We have always tried to protect the interest of all classes of persons including the hawkers. We are not going to throw the taxpayers' money down the drain in trying to create more "White Elephants" which will not be used and which will serve no useful purpose, 3.55 p.m.

Mr. BATSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that some hon. members pride themselves with a super-abundance of knowledge. We had the hon. junior member for St. Joseph making a speech. I remember when I first became a member of this House that I suggested that the speeches of hon. members should be broadcast to allow the constituents to hear their arguments at times. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph suddenly seems to have become a professor of the English Language. I wonder if he hears himself when he speaks. He is defining and analysing words. I never knew the hon. member was capable of such, but today he has informed this House that he is an authority on the English language. We then got the hon. Junior member for St. Peter associating himself with that ignorance. It is disgraceful that hon. members who are supposed to be responsible should behave in such a manner.

This Resolution was introduced because of the fact that many peasant small holders in my

constituency approached me on the matter, and although I tried in a way to convince them that it was impracticable, they still wanted me to put forward the issue. I represent a rural area; therefore I have to be guided in some measure by the people I represent. Since this Resolution was introduced, I have discussed the matter with the Minister, and he has given me the assurance that this Resolution would be impracticable from the financial standpoint, and that is one of the premises on which I withdraw this Resolution, Hon. members on the other side would like to criticise something, but I would like to inform them that Whether or not they criticise whatever I bring, it does not matter to me in the least. If they want to waste time criticising every simple matter, that is a matter entirely in their hands. My constituents approached me on the matter, I brought the Resolution under pressure, and I have now discussed it with the Minister who gave me the assurance that it is impracticable, and I am asking to withdraw it. I only rose, Mr. Speaker, to clarify my position, because some hon. members seem to feel that a Resolution of this nature should not be brought.

I therefore ask leave to withdraw the Resolution,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave of the House to withdraw this Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

1 object.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. That matter, I am advised, is yet before a Select Committee,

Order No. 3 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. Junior member for St. Philip. That matter, I am advised, is also being considered in Select Committee.

Order No. 4 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church is likewise before a Select Committee.

Order No. 5 Which stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is in his place, is to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1965,

Mr. MOTTLEY- Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to proceed with this Resolution.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I understand, is asking to be allowed to forego his proceeding with this Resolution this afternoon.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, since I gave notice of this Resolution

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what is the hon. member speaking now?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Before Your Honour spoke, I was asking to make a point of clarification. I would like to say that since I gave notice of this, the Government brought down a Bill regulating these fees, and this Resolution no longer serves any useful purpose on the Order Paper. I am therefore asking leave to take this off the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave of the House for the reason which he has stated to with-draw this Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted, and accordingly I declare this Resolution to be withdrawn.

Order No. 6 which stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not yet printed, and therefore we are not in a position to proceed with it.

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip who is not in his place, and Order No. 8 also stands in the name of that same hon. member who is not in his place.

That concludes the items under Private Members. Business, and though It is not yet 4.30 p. m.. Government Business may be proceeded with under the circumstances, and the first item of the Day is in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider a grant of sums of money for the service of the Island. 4.05 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 22 POLICE

Head 18 - Police - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Under Head 18, there are three items to be supplemented. Item 25 deals with the Unestablished Staff; Item 40 deals with Uniforms for Attendants, and Item 89 which is new deals with Ticket Machines.

Supplementary provisions are required for the following reasons:-

Two car parks require the services of parking attendants. This matter comes under Police. It is proposed to recruit three attendants for the purpose. The sum of \$2,047 is required to meet the cost of wages to be paid the attendants to the end of the financial year. An amount of \$374 will cover the cost of uniforms for the attendants and the sum of \$400 is required to purchase four ticket machines which will be used by the attendants,

I beg to move that Head 18 stand part, Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister what are the proposed fees to be charged for this parking lot at Independence Square and (2) the procedure which would be taken to declare that area a public place. We do not know what are the proposed fees and I think the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us something about that. Will the hon. member therefore give us some further explanation about that as well as the notification of Independence Square? I well remember when the Prescod Boulevard was named that there was an official ceremony. Now that you have reclaimed land from the Careenage for the purpose of a car park, I feel that this should also be officially named and published because things crop up from time to time as regards people being prosecuted in the area. I would like to know something further as to the use of this place for a car park as well as what it is expected the fees charged would bring in. I think that information would be useful to us,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I think the hon. member wanted to know what are the charges which we proposed to make for parking of motor cars at Independence Square. The charges are as follows:- 15 cents an hour for the first hour or part thereof; 25 cents for two hours 50 cents for over two hours; for those who use the car park every day \$10 a month.

The number of cars which the car park can accommodate is 168.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Can the Hon. Minister give the price for a person who wants to rent a number of spots for a month?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

This can be arranged. I think the hon. member also wants to know the procedure as regards naming the particular spot and its environments. This place was named "Independence Square" by order of the Cabinet and the difference between this and the naming of the President Kennedy Drive, the Princess Alice Drive and the Prescod Boulevard was that in the case of the President Kennedy Drive a certain ceremony was necessary because the Leader of the American people had done quite a lot. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition was present at the ceremony on the same afternoon, and he will remember that part

of that area was named the Princess Alice Drive and the Prescod Boulevard and he knows the reason why those highways were so named.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It is true to say that the Cabinet has power to do these things; but the position arises, if a person

commits a crime on that part of Fairchild Street, that it can cause a lot of argument among legal men. This area which you have called \"Independence Square\" may be vested in the Cabinet, and the day will come when some person may commit an offence there and the question will arise whether it is part of the public highway or what it is.

I think, the Cabinet having named this Place \"Independence Square\", that it will be really in the interest of the people if the Cabinet by declaration or any instrument, declare in the Press that they have given that particular name to this place so that one would know what is the procedure. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Social Services knows on what grounds I am basing my argument, and I think the Deputy Speaker of the House will be able to enlighten the House on the matter.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred to me, I will say this. No doubt the Government has its legal advisers and I will not in any way attempt now to travel on that sacred ground; but I will just await patiently the occasion when a poor taxi driver has a case before the law courts in respect of that area and he has me as his Counsel. 4.15 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which I would like to understand. We have here mentioned \"The New Car Park at Independence Square\". I have not heard that we have an Independence Square in this Island of Barbados. Where is Independence square, Sir? Will the Hon. Minister tell us where it is? I have never seen it in writing anywhere. The first time I have seen \"Independence Square\" is in this Resolution. Can the Hon. Minister tell me where \"Independence Square\" is? Has it been mentioned in this House before or passed by legislation? That is all I would like to know from the Minister.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I was thinking that as soon as the Government thought about the filling in of the Careenage so as to make a car park, that was for the purpose of relieving the congestion in the City area where the business houses are. I feel, Sir, that that car park would be quite a lot of help towards relieving private business people who have to do business at the Banks in Broad Street and all around the City. I feel that these people, Clerks and soon, who drive their cars to town in the morning and do not want them before the afternoon should be accommodated at this new car park. I thought that that would have been an ideal place for these cars to be parked and the spaces at the business-houses would remain vacant for the people who are doing business there. It is a fact that when one has to go to the Bank with money he should be allowed to park his car near to the Bank and the clerks who do not want their cars before evening should be allowed to go to the new Car Park.

You have a cross street there above Barclays Bank and at 7 o'clock in the morning the place is filled up by people who are parking their cars there until the after-noon, whereas that area should be allowed for the people who are using the Bank. When you have large sums of money in your bag to be deposited at the Bank or when you are taking away money from the Bank and you have to walk for these long distances, that is not a good thing for the business people; it would be a help to them if they could park their cars outside the business house. The Government has lost sight of that fact and is inflicting or imposing a sum of money for the use of this new car park, which will only keep people from going there. The only way in which they will go to this new car park is if they cannot get anywhere else to park their cars. This sum of \$10.00 a month sounds very small, but to some

people it is a lot of money. That is so because they have to pay all of their bills. I can tell you that for some people to pay \$10.00 per month for parking a car, they cannot even pay an increase of \$10.00 per month for somewhere to live. You will find that this will only cause the business people to leave their homes early-

lier and you will have the same congestion in the City and lots of money will be lost after you have spent it for the provision of tills car park. There are people who will go into Church Village and places like that and park their cars rather than pay this \$10.00 a month for this car park where they have to place their cars in the sun all the day long. You are not doing anything to help the car owner or the business man in this way. I think it is time that the Government should be trying to help the business people, especially those who are doing business at the Banks, If you want to do business at Barclays Bank at the present time, you have to park your car all the way down by the Bridgetown City Council. Another thing is that when people know that you are passing by with money, you never know what will happen. I say, Sir, that that cross street above Barclays Bank should be kept free as a parking spot for the people who are doing business at the Bank. Those business people will be remaining there for the whole day and now you are going to penalise people who will have to put their cars in the sun all the day long.

The big merchant has already made a place for his garage. He has somewhere already built for parking his car or, on the other hand, his chauffeur will drive him to his business place and then take the car back into the garage. When you come to the clerks who have to get to work on time, they cannot rely on the buses and therefore they try to get a motor car so as to help them to keep the job. I want to say, Sir, that the upkeep of a motor car is a job in itself. The upkeep of a car will cost about \$40.00 or \$50.00 a month and now you are asking these people to pay \$10.00 per month for parking their cars in the sun all the day long! Sir, I admit that the Government has spent a lot of money in order to establish the Car Park, but whose money is it? It is the money of these same people which has been spent, and some consideration should be given to these people. 4.25 p.m.

If you had asked them to pay \$5 a month, I would say nothing, because whenever you want taxes you know where to get them. You can put a tax on gasoline when-ever you are ready or you can put it on the purchase of a car; so the little pittance you are putting on them now can always be given to them, because it is the people's money and you are not doing anything to relieve the congestion in the City area. There are certain times when one comes to the Building Yard to do business in the Post Office and is not provided with a parking area. I am provided with a parking area on the days when the House meets, but not on other occasions when I have other business to do, or when I have to come and see the Clerk. You now have a parking area over there, but do not think that the persons who park in this yard early on mornings are going to stay home half an hour longer and then have to go in the parking area and pay \$10 a month or fifteen cents an hour, as the case may be. I feel therefore that whoever is responsible for this should go into the matter again thoroughly and try to relieve the congestion here, because if you remove some of them from this yard, you are sending them where they have to pay, while at the same time the business people need some consideration.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, under Head 18 which is for the new car park, -- and it is a new name -I too have got to say that I have received some information from the Minister as to the manner in which this car park has

been named, It was done by Order of the Cabinet, and the Cabinet is well empowered to call this place \"Independence Square\". But what interest. me a bit was the reply given by the Hon. Leader of the House to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. He said that there was some difference between the naming of

some square and that it is being entered in the Official Gazette, but he also said in connection with the Kennedy Highway that there was some necessity to have a function because it was named after a very eminent personality, the late John F. Kennedy, and on such an occasion when a road or highway is being named after such an eminent national personality for whom the whole democratic world had to {lay respect, it deserves some sort of celebration, but this particular new car park has had no function. The word \"Independence\" which is part of the name does not deserve anything. One road named after an eminent personality deserved some celebration, but the sort of Independence that is attached to this Square we have heard nothing about; it was so silent. After all there is something about a name; and if you call it \"Independence Square\", Inde-pendence must have some significance in relation to giving it such a name. The naming of the John Kennedy Highway or Boulevard was marked by some sort of ceremony and formality because it was named after an eminent personality, and there was not a drum beat about this square. As some Minister has said sotto voce, the Salvation Army might have been invited. What sort of Independence is this in this square? Is this a silent Independence Square and there is no rejoicing?

I have lived long enough, Sir, to know that there is nothing in a name, Certainly nothing has been associated with the Independence part of this square. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew who is nearest to me said he does not know where it is, and I think he is in some position to know where it is. We are however asked to approve of some money to pay for staff, uniforms and new machines to be used in this car park. I suppose nobody will follow me up on this, because it might need the sort of explanation that need not be-gin yet. I have heard that a sign has been painted though I have not seen it myself; but when you put it in a money Resolution, you certainly mean that the people's representatives are supposed to know about \"Independence Square\". We have been informed that this has been done by Order of the Cabinet. I do not know if it has been officially gazetted, but I heard the hon. senior member for St. James who was asked to make some comment say that as a lawyer he is not prepared to commit himself in here, but he thought he would be able to get off one of his clients because of this name. Somethimes these things suit lawyers. I appreciate wherever there is any easing of a traffic jam situation or wherever there is any easing of accomodation for people who have to leave their homes and come to town. I do not say that I appreciate toying with names, but the Resolution has my blessing for its substance, but not for its name. I cannot argue that the Cabinet was wrong, but I must say that if the President Kennedy Highway when so named was a matter for rejoicing, in my view any sort of independence, as I understand it, that can make a square should have had some too; but there was not even a drum beat 4.35 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, what we are today discussing is making provision for the Police to hire Unestablished Staff in the persons of car park at-tendants, the providing of uniforms for them and ticket machines. That is the subject of this debate before us. Only today the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, gave notice of a Resolution and also of regulations to be made under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, as amended by Sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

If you look through the body of those regulations you will see that the Director of Highways and Transport may from time to time specify, in respect of the Public Buildings courtyard - (a) any place on which the vehicle of any official may be allowed to wait, (b) any place on which vehicles of any category may be allowed to wait; (c) any place on which vehicles generally may be allowed to wait.

It goes on to state that any specification pursuant to paragraph (1) of the regulation may be by a sign erected in any part of the said courtyard, by means of letters or lines on the ground thereof, or in any other manner in the discretion of the Director.

The object of this amendment to these regulations is to include this car park which is named "Independence Square". This amendment goes on to state by inserting therein immediately under the figure and words "9. Fairchild Street" appearing under the heading "Name of Parking Place", and the words and particulars relating thereto under the other heading contained in the said Schedule the words, figures and letters as follows - (1) under the heading "Name of Parking Place" the figure, letter and word "9A. Careenage"; (1) under the heading "Description of Parking Place" the words "The area between the South Bank of the inner basin of the Careenage and Fairchild Street to the West of Probyn Street, and to the east of Bay Street";

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. What is the Hon. Minister reading from? Is it before us in the Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I take it that the Hon. Minister is enlightening the House on the Resolution before the Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Sir, I rise on a point of order. I hate to do this because the Hon. Minister would not usually do this, but I would like to draw this to your attention. Any Minister or member ought to know that when anything has been given notice of, it must be discussed,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

These regulations are already the law of the land. They have been approved by the Cabinet.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

With the greatest respect, the Hon. Minister ought to know that they only become law after they have been laid for forty days on the Table of this House. The Hon. Minister cannot debate them today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, these regulations were prepared by the Cabinet, signed by the Director of Highways and Transport who is the proper authority to sign these regulations and in whom power would be vested. They were approved by the Minister; so they became law after they were duly published in the Official Gazette on the 20th instant,

Mr. MOTTLEY:

But they have to be laid in here for forty days.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Yes; but they have appeared in the Official Gazette, already. All that I was attempting to do was to assist in pointing out that the Careenage Car Park has been embodied in the form of regulations which have been laid here and which are clearly defined for all intents and purposes. In other words, everybody knows that the Careenage Car Park is known as \"In-dependence Square.\"

This is embodied in regulations laid here and which have been duly gazetted and which, if not objected to within forty days, would become law automatically,

I do not think the questions posed by other hon. members of the Opposition dealing with this Resolution need to be answered because a lot of the opposition was not strictly on the point. I think when we are dealing with the regulations that we would have ample opportunity for going into the question with respect to the charges, and unless hon. members want to prolong this debate, I do not think it would serve any useful purpose to the Resolution.

The question that Head 18 -POLICE - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (5) SCHOOLS

Head 35 - Ministry of Education (5) Schools - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under this Head is Item 17 A which is new, Compulsory attendance in Primary Schools and Supplementary provision of \$6,138 is required,

Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members of this Committee will recall that some months ago, the Government intimated to the House and therefore to the country at large that it intended later this year to introduce compulsory attendance in some form in the Primary Schools, It is to honour that pledge that this Resolution is now brought before this Committee. 4.45 p.m.

I wish to say three or four things, however. The first is that this Resolution is not the final or last word in this matter. The policy of compulsory attendance will have to be included, in the first instance, in its own bit of legislation and finally in the new Education Act which is being prepared at the moment. Secondly, when I went into the matter, I decided that it would be better to advise the Cabinet to proceed with this matter in a limited way and to apply the policy, limiting it to a member of schools in three parishes. My reasons for that are as follows:- In the first place, the problems of school attendance must necessarily vary from area to area and from district to district. Secondly, there must obviously be problems of welfare and even of health involved in this exercise. You will notice that there is no provision made for dealing with absences from school which result from poverty or from other circumstances. I have deliberately not taken that into account because, as I have explained to the House a few minutes ago, this is the start of implementing the policy.

What I propose to do, as hon. members will see, is first of all, to appoint three School Attendance

Officers, two for the schools in St. Michael and one each for the schools in St. George and St. John and give them the following duties:- (a) To visit the schools in connection with and explain absences; (b) to visit the parents and guardians as a sequel to making enquiries at the school (c) to submit individual reports to the Ministry of Education (d); to check the weekly returns of attendance at the schools (e) to complete the registers of all children of Primary School age. That is interesting. The point is that I propose and I recommend to the Cabinet that when compulsory education is in full force it shall apply to all children between the ages of five and twelve years. This means that it shall apply to all children who attend either Government schools or private schools which are offering primary education at that age. A part of the duty of the School Attendance Officers would be to compile for the Ministry of Education a Register of children attending Private Schools as well as to keep a register of children who are attending other schools.

Another point is that my duty will be, of course, to keep close and almost daily contact and liaison with the Social Welfare and Probation Departments. As I have emphasised, I have not yet been fully able to advise the Cabinet on the wider and deeper aspects of compulsory attendance in schools. There must be other matters which have to be taken into consideration, and the range and depth would be kept until some machinery is set in motion. For instance, if you take the Primary Schools in St. Michael, you will find that some absences are clearly due to poverty, the lack of clothing and food in some instances,

but, on the other hand, there are some non-attendances in schools which do not spring from either of those causes at all. It is possible to see that children are going to school; they have left home for school, but some distraction has claimed their attention on the way to school. That is possible and it happens, but I do not say that it happens in the large majority of cases; but when children are on their way to school, they are half an hour or an hour late before they know where they are, and possibly they will go to school not in the morning, but in the afternoon. We need to set up the machinery which will enable us to determine whether the real cause of non-attendance is through poverty or the other causes of non-attendance through carelessness, distraction or truancy. I just want to tell hon. members that if they think that what we are now introducing does not meet the case -- In fact, it is not designed to meet the case. We are now asking for the appointment of School Attendance Officers to start the machinery going. Statistics will have to be prepared for a short period showing the nature of absences from school, the causes of those absences and whether the nature and cause of absences vary from school to school and from parish to parish and the extent of variation. The School Attendance Officers will have to examine and advise upon whatever aspect of the problem, and perhaps the most important aspect of the problem is to know whether and to what degree the provision of lack of provision of the mid-day meal influences attendance or non-attendance.

In this connection, I will draw the attention of hon. members to this matter. It has been reported to me that for the first four or five weeks of the establishment of the school meals extension service to St. George and St. John, school attendances have gone up and the average number of meals served at least in the last three or four weeks were over 3,000 a day. The total roll in these 17 schools in these two parishes is 5,218 or thereabout. It is estimated that 3,200, 3,500 or 3,700 avail themselves of the meal and the number is going up all the time. In the first week of the term, 7,678 meals were served; in the second week, 15,347 were served; in the third week, 16,500 were served and now in the fourth week, 13,562 were served and that is the week in which the first Monday in October was a Bank-holiday. Therefore, the children ate for four weeks, and at the last week the total number of meals served was 15,630. I am informed that the number already seems to indicate that it will be even greater this week.

Now, Sir, it is probably too early to say definitely that the level of attendance at these schools will be kept up because of the school meals, but it is a fact that for this term, so far as it has gone, there have been fewer absences in these 17 schools than would have been the case at this time last year or at any other time before the meals were served. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there may well be a necessary connection between absences from school which cannot be explained otherwise and the lack of provision of a midday meal, and that is why you need therefore to start the service off on the best possible footing. When legislation is prepared and brought before the House, hon. members will see that the legislation will contain all these aspects of the matter which should rightly be considered in a problem of this sort, The whole range of health, welfare and other services which are necessarily connected with school attendance will be considered in the legislation, but for now it is necessary to start on this basis, and it is for that reason that I commend this Resolution to the Committee. I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Hon. Minister and I understand and appreciate all that he has said, but I am not surprised that in this initial stage nothing can be done with respect to certain districts in St. James. I can assure the Hon. Minister that absence from at least Paynes Bay Girls' School is due to physical accommodation, It is the only open air primary school in

the Island of Barbados. At any time you pass you can see nearly the whole school outside in classes, and one has to be thankful when it is a sunny day; otherwise the school would be cramped and you could expect any effect when it comes to health. When the question of the Paynes Bay Girls. School was raised on the last occasion, I likened it to an outhouse where you put all the old rubbish. I believe that Educational Officers go to Paynes Bay Girls. School, and if they are doing their Job, they must have reported that it is very unsatisfactory. One would not be surprised if the lowest attendance in all the schools is found at the Paynes Bay Girls. School, and I am making a very gentle but strong appeal to the Minister that before the full policy is initiated there should be a building to house the Fitts Village Boys. School and the Paynes Bay Girls. School,

Mr. LYNCH- Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to compliment the Hon. Minister of Education for beginning to implement this necessary policy of compulsory school attendance. I would like to ask him at this stage, in as much as it must be very obvious to all that a great deal will depend upon the character and competence of those Attendance Officers, to appoint them on a basis different from what is usually used by Socialist Governments - filling the posts with Party hacks, called by others by more pejorative terms which I do not care to employ.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I really expected a different kind of remark from the hon. member than this one. First of all, at no point did I say how these people were going to be appointed. This is not a matter for me at all, and to speak therefore of his hopes that these people will not be party hacks I think is grossly improper.

Mr. LYNCH:

This is no criticism of the Hon. Minister, but I have observed what is happening in other Ministries, and I am warning him against it. These Party hacks are mentioned by others in more pejorative terms which I do not care to employ. I am not trying to say that the Hon. Minister would do that; I am only asking him to keep his eyes open and see that people of wisdom, experience and direction are employed, because these appointments are very high in importance and so much depends upon them in the early stages. Of course there would be go sanctions for the parents of those children who do not attend. No punitive measures will be adopted as be pointed out, and therefore it will largely be a question of gentle per suasion to send their children to school if they could. It will, of course, throw a greater burden than at present it does on the Bridgetown City Council which at the moment has to pro-vide for many of the children who attend school in the urban area not only food, but clothing.

It is well known to all of us who drive around in the Municipal area and even further beyond that many children can be seen disporting themselves on the public highway completely nude, and it is simply that they have no clothes to wear. If therefore they are to be dragooned into school, it is a very good thing and it must be borne in mind that there are other attending circumstances which must be borne in mind. Many a parent cannot send to school some of the errant children whom we see day-by-day because of the fact that they cannot attire them properly, and would not like to send them to school to be the laughing stock of their comrades. I am sure the Hon. Minister must have given some thought to this, and it will be a long time before we will be able to get all of our school population into the schools, because at the moment there is not the physical plant for it. It is not the Minister\'s fault, it is not the fault perhaps of anybody that we at the moment do not have the physical plant to get all our children in school. It is Just one of the burdens we have to bear for our super-abundant population and our insufficient means.

The programme therefore has to be attacked slowly, and perhaps it might be well to point out that the completion of the registers of all children of compulsory age may well be the first step, not that the visits to the schools in connection with unexplained absences win not go on.

The visits to schools on which unexplained absences are checked will deal only with those children who are on the register. The approach will have to be on the number of children of school age in the particular area and are there on the register of any school, not whether they attend, because that would not be known if their names are not on the school register. This is a problem for which you are going to need more and more money, and it is going to have to be attacked slowly. I sympathise with the Minister, because I am well aware of the insufficient means which he has to implement these programmes: but what I am offering him is not criticism, and I counsel him that the choice of the people will be so very important in bringing this scheme to a successful fruition; they should be people of character, experience and of competence, and not people who are being awarded for adherence to a particular Party, I am not saying that the Minister himself is doing it, but I have seen it happen in other Ministries, and we do hope that this particular Ministry will bear in mind that the Socialist approach to these problems is not always the best one, 5,05 p.m.

If there is one criticism of Socialism-- and this is not a criticism of the Minister but of Socialism itself - it is that is always loads any Government employing bureau with party hacks - not only in Barbados, bat wherever Socialists flourish. I am hoping, therefore, that the people employed to go around would be

people of proven experience and people with sympathy who will be able to discuss with the parents of children the reason why their children are not sent to school and are not present, and point out to them that it has been found necessary to do this in order that we can maintain with pride our place in the educational field and that can only be done if our educational system returns to the place which it once held. The Hon. Minister's problem is a more difficult one because of our population explosion, and because there are more children to be housed in schools - and, of course, because of the amount which he has to spend on education. Therefore, you can very well see that I am not criticising the Minister. I am only counselling him and I hope that he will accept it in that spirit.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if one is not acquainted with the surrounding means of the people of this country, one cannot honestly do -Justice to this Resolution. but my mind is so big and I think so much of the people of this country that I could not do otherwise but say that I commend thto Government on this Resolution,

Ever since I came into politics - and I came into politics 25 years ago- the hardy annual was compulsory education, I notice the phraseology used by the Hon. Minis-ter is not compulsory education, but the compulsory school attendance of children from 5 to 12, I notice the sanity with which the Government is bringing it about, not by speaking about measures to be placed upon parents for not sending their children to school, but Government has gone about it in such a way as to encourage the people to send their children to school and at the same time they are getting the necessary statistics so that when the time comes for them to bring the comprehensive system into being, they would have the statistics,

I speak ex cathedra of the Municipality, but I think I also have sufficient experience to speak on the other two parishes which the Government has set out in this Resolu-tion -- St. George and St. John -- to start this scheme. The Hon. Minister of Education has wisely begun the scheme in the Municipal area where the particular reason for not sending children to school is because of economic reasons. If it were a crime, you would have to build a wall around the entire Municipality. It has been purely because of eco-nomic reasons that parents are unable to send their children to school. That has been my personal experience. There are very few parents who do not want to send their children to school All parents, I think, would be glad to send their children to school if they were able to do so. However, it is a question of where you have all sorts and conditions of people. There are women who have children from different fathers, and the fathers would not even attempt to support the children, far less to think of sending them to school.

However, Sir, if I pass to the Great Beyond now, I have lived to see something which I have fought for years ago come into being, because as the Hon. Minister has said, this Resolution is making provision so that children from the age of 5 to 12 can go to school.

As I see it, I think the main necessity for these other two parishes must be the need for some Day Nurseries, What I find in these areas is that people keep the children of the ages of 5 and 6 at home to care the younger ones because they have no place to send the younger ones. Therefore, you should think about the establishment of Pay Nurseries for children under the school age in the country districts so as to allow the other children to go to school; so it would be a good thing if you can tackle it from that angle, I know that there are parents who work on plantations in the country areas, sometimes two or

three miles away. That is something which the Government has to face. It is not only the question of giving a child a hot meal or something to eat because I think the experience is, that with 99,9 per cent of the people, it does not matter how lowly is their position, their desire is to see that their children are able to read and write even if the parents themselves cannot read and write,

I am glad to see that the way the Government has done it, there is no question of bringing in legislation saying that you must send your children to school, and if you do not send them to school the fine would be X dollars, I think Government should be commended for bringing it about in this manner. If you bring in legislation to say that all children between the ages of 5 and 12 must be sent to school, if not the parent would be fined twenty shillings, or whatever the fine may be, it would certainly create a hardship.

Do you realise that some 6,000 children come from St. George and St. John? (A VOICE: 5,000) Today I am able to tell you that very many children from St. George and St. John attend Secondary Schools within the Municipality, I have seen and witnessed many children who come from poor parents have passed Scholarships, and their parents are not in the position to pay for them; but they are trying their best. Some of those children have passed and are getting into Harrison's College and Queen's College, 5,15 p.m.

I feel that this is a good gesture on the part of the Government, The note here says this: "The Government considers that steps should be taken to introduce compulsory school attendance in primary schools for children age from 5 - 12 inclusive." As you know. Sir, from your experience as a Headmaster, there are many persons who not only want education but Secondary Education, The feeling no longer is that a man must have brawn merely. In an Army, you must not only have big shoulders and be able to march, but you must know Mathematics, Physics and the like, It is a desirable thing for people to have education, I feel that this gesture on the part of the Government today of making a start in the way of compulsory education is a fine one. It is a fact that people need more clothing for their children this year than has ever been the case. In the area of the Belle and Salters and such areas you have a stampede of people coming in because they want to know that their children are in the schools. When I first went to the United States of America there was a man who could not read or write; his name was Billy Sandy. People would read the Bible for him and he would repeat the passage. People heckled him and he said this. "The trouble with you West Indians as against Americans is this your parents used to flog you to get you into the corn fields whereas our parents used to flog us to get us into the schools," I want to say, Sir, that the few Barbadians who would not send their children to school can be reckoned on the fingers of one hand, I say that it is a question of poverty. One of the first things which caused me to ask my colleagues to provide children with clothing was when I saw Bishop Bentley administering the Sacrament at St. Mary's Church. I saw five children on the steps who were literally naked. I want to say that the big job is not just going to be a question of providing meals for children, but there is also the question of providing them with clothing.

I have had the distinction that people from the parishes of St. Joseph, St. Philip, St. Andrew and St. Peter have come to me telling me that they want to get their children into the Secondary Schools in this island. A woman came to me with several children one of whom had got into a secondary School. She came to me in tears; she wanted clothing. Some people say that I clothe people out of my pocket and

indeed, Sir, I would do that if I were a millionaire. I have much pleasure in commending the Hon. Minister for bring-ing down this matter in this way. In a certain way it does not affect the parents. The Hon. Minister will learn that whatever you do it is the people that matter, and in this country you will have to provide the means whereby children should be able to go to school I repeat; I commend the Government on this gesture and I sincerely hope that it will work out for the benefit of all of us in this country. I want to say that I support whole heartedly this policy where children can go to school. Mr. Chairman, it is a very serious thing when persons cannot read or write. I was sitting in my office and a man came to me who was represented as being a doctor. He said to me: \"Your father gave me the first letter which got me into a High School in New York/. He went to the Sixth Standard originally and he ended up as a medical man from Harvard University, I want to say, Sir, that poverty is no crime. Those of us who find ourselves in certain positions must see to it that every child is given the opportunity of learning to read and write. Again, I commend the Government on making this gesture.

Mr. COWARD and Mr. SMITH rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph caught my eye first.

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to those of other hon. members who have complimented the Government in taking such a wide step as to seek the compulsory attendance of children at school. Mention has been made of the parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. John, but I do hope that the time will not be far off when the parish of St. Joseph will be fortunate enough to receive consideration as to compulsory education for the children and also the provision of free meals. What I would like to say to the Minister is this in considering the parish of St. Joseph for the provision of compulsory education and free meals for the children, I would also ask that a few Day Nurseries be established. As you know, Sir, there are people who are quite willing to send their children to school, but these children are breadwinners. Sometimes you will find that parents have a few children but because they have smaller children who cannot attend the school, the grown-up children have to be robbed of their education for the sake of the smaller children. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I will ask the Minister that he should take all of these things into consideration and not only deal with the question of compulsory attendance at school; but also to consider ways and means to help those parents to keep their children at some suitable places such as Day Nurseries. 5.25 p.m.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, the note to this Head says that the Government considers that steps should be taken to introduce compulsory school attendance in primary schools for children aged from 5 to 12 inclusive. This measure involves an important departure from traditional practice and all the implications cannot be grasped except through practical experience. It is proposed therefore that the operation should, at its inception, be limited to primary schools in the parishes of St. George, St. John and St. Michael involving some 44 schools. For purposes of operation the parishes would be divided into three areas:- (a) St. Michael (1); (b) St. Michael (2); and (c) St. George and St. John.

Now, Sir, why should there be three parishes only when no expenditure is involved? No expenditure is involved apart from that for the Officers whom you are ap-pointing, because you are not helping the parents with any-thing. I would understand if the Government was considering giving the parents who do not have the where withal to send these children to school as much money as to provide two or three

suits of clothes to send them to school. In that case

they would have to go easily and start somewhere, but in this case you are only asking for three officers. salaries and travelling allowance. I hope that the Minister will be able to tell me why only three parishes are involved. I would like to know if these Officers can compel these children to go into school, or punish the parents if they do not send them. If they cannot do that, what is the use of the Officers at the moment? Will they only report to the school or to the Government that A's child has not been to school or that there was an attendance of one hundred less than yesterday and only make such reports? If a parent knows that he cannot be punished or convicted for not sending his child to school, nothing will happen. The only way you do not see children in school today is if the parent does not have money to give the child for lunch or if it does not have clothes. There are some parents who cannot keep the children in school through lack of clothes, and the Government cannot compel the parent to send the child to school if it is not convenient.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On a point of order, the hon. member is really distorting the Government's point of view. Nowhere in the explanatory note to this Supplementary Resolution is it suggested that at this stage or indeed at any stage the question of compulsion will arise. This is a pilot scheme. If the hon. member understands that, he does not have to argue what would happen if parents do not comply. The whole point of this is to encourage them to comply.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I understand it very well. Here it is an Officer is going to encourage me to send my child to school, and I am going to tell the Officer that I am unable to do so and that the child does not have school clothes. What can the Officer do? This might happen in many cases in the district, but the officer would still be receiving his salary. What more can he do unless he is going to take money from his pocket and give the parents to buy clothes? I understand it very well, but I don't believe the Government understands it. I can tell you some-thing that happened not long ago. There was an accident at St. Joseph's School, and one of the children lost one of its shoes, and that child could not go to school for the whole week because she was shoeless and the parent did not have the money to buy a pair of shoes for the child.

There are two reasons why parents do not send their children to school. In the first place the parents do not have the wherewithal, and secondly, the parents cannot control them. They leave the children to go to school while they go to work and the children do not go. If the Government had some provision in this Resolution along with the money for the Officers to help these children who need help, they would be doing a good job; but in my opinion what they are doing here, though it is not wrong or bad, is only trying in my opinion to fool a fool, not intelligent people. The phraseology in this Resolution is very nice, because you are saying "compulsory school attendance" instead of "compulsory education".

5.35 p.m.

What is the difference between compelling me to attend school and compelling my colleague to go to school? I can-not see the difference. It is only a nice, cool way to put it. I think this wording is the wording of the Hon. Minister of Education. If it were the other way around, it would be a different wording. It is a very cool and nice way to word it, but it means the same thing.

You must be prepared to help those children to go to school. I think it was the Hon. Minister of Health who in this very Chamber said that several children are being prevented from attending school and deprived of a decent education through the inability of their parents to send them to school. If the parents cannot send them, the Officer cannot make them. It can be done through Public Assistance. I am a member of a Public Assistance Board and I can tell you that many people come and ask the Board for some assistance to send their children to school. They come with such stories as the father has gone to England and has not sent back one cent; the father has gone away and the mother who was not accustomed to working out now has to work and she can only raise enough money to feed the

children, but not enough to send them to school. When you send children to school, you must send them in such a way that there would not have to depend on other children. You cannot send them to be watching other children who are able to buy this and that and they do not have a cent to buy anything. Parents are not going to send their children to school to watch other children being able to buy an ice cream while theirs can only walk around. They are not going to do it,

I will therefore ask the Hon. Minister to go back to his Cabinet and let them know how this Committee feels about the matter. Let them try and muster enough money for a proper start.

Then again, the Government is only thinking of three parishes. If it were for the entire Island, it would be a different matter. I would say that they could not find the money, although they could find money to do other things, I see no reason why this Government could not set aside a certain amount of money to make a start throughout the whole Island. As I see it, the children who do not go to school are few because children like to go to school; they like to be educated. None of them wants to work in the fields, and parents want their children educated, You will be surprised to know how many agricultural labourers have children who are going to Secondary Schools and who are fighting hard to keep them there.

It is a question of clothes -- not food -- which makes parents unable to send their children to school; therefore I say that if it is a question of the child having three suits of clothes, you can think of providing them with two suits and ask the parents to provide one. This money which you are providing now should go to provide clothes, and I am sure that every one would go into school. You do not want any Inspector, That Inspector will only be drawing a salary, I agree that the employment of an Inspector would mean your relieving unemployment: but it is not going to serve the purpose because you cannot make a naked or ragged child go to school, nor can you expect the parent to do more than what it is doing. There are some women who are raising children without the help of fathers. The fathers have gone long ago. Even many wives have husbands who have gone to England and they would tell you that they have written to his address and cannot hear from him because he has gone through the eddoes and has changed his address. Imagine an Inspector going to that home encouraging that mother to send her children to school!

This Resolution is out of order. I do not know how the Minister arrived at it. I am not criticising the Government. The venture is alright, but the Government is only thinking of educating the children: it is not thinking of helping the children to be educated. As I have said, they are very few who would not like to be educated, and if the Government provided a few hundred dollars more, it would not harm.

Something is crossing my mind now, but I would not mention it because I know, Mr. Chairman, that

you would rule me out of order, I will only say that the Government can stop that for the moment and help to send these children into school. The Government has just opened up the way, but it is merely opening the door. It is Just like a stranger coming to your home and finding you partaking of a nice chicken, but you have your door just open and he cannot get in. You better had shut the door, The Government is opening the door and putting an Officer at their disposal to register the attendance and non-attendance of children at school, but not looking into the matter fully and trying to help the children to go to school.

I would ask the Hon. Minister, when the Cabinet meets again to ask his colleagues to re-consider the matter and see if you cannot squeeze a few more dollars to help parents to send their children to school. The Inspector is go.. ing to make his Report and say that he has visited twelve homes and has managed to get three to send their children to school, but the remaining nine homes tell him that they cannot get the money to buy clothes to send their children to school. Some ticket should be given to those parents to enable them to get clothes to send their children to school;

but leaving the matter as it is now, you would be doing

nothing.

5.45 p.m.

I hope the Hon. Minister will give me the reply which I would like. In this proposal there are only three parishes mentioned; there are the Parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. John. The hon. member is now leaving me to think; I want to know if the parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. John have the most voters or the most children. I am wondering if these areas are the hardest areas in which to land candidates at the next Election. I would like to know if the position of hon. members is weak in these areas and if they want to strengthen it. There is something in this mat-ter and I would like to know what it is.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Government on an important move such as this. I, too, am offering my full support in this matter. I know that the Government has started in a very sensible way, in appointing School Attendance Officers in order to find out the reasons why some children are absent from school. I have just heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that the Government should have first taken into consideration the children who want clothes and allow the Public Assistance Officers to do the job, I would like to tell the hon. member this.....

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I did not say that they should let the Public Assistance Officers do the job because those officers cannot do the job of find-ing clothes for children except they have the money also. If I mentioned the word \"Officers\" I meant the particular officers who are mentioned in this Resolution, that is to say, the School Attendance Officers, not the Public Assistance Officers,

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Chairman, I did hear the hon. member say that he thought the Public Assistance Officers would help in this matter. The position is this Some time ago a Public Assistance Officer wanted to prove a

case and he got about ten able-bodied men to go and apply for assistance. I am saying that the Government has to be very careful about these things, I feel that the Government is right in the direction they have taken. I have made enquiries of the Hon. Minister as to the children who cannot go to school because of the financial position of their parents, and he has assured me that that matter would have to be dealt with when the Education Bill is before the House. I want to let the Government know that when the case for Day Nurseries is put, the most needed case for compulsory education is in the parish of St. John. It is true that when the crop is in operation, parents go to work leaving their children, and the older children have to remain at home so as to take care of the smaller children. I am sure that the establishment of Day Nurseries would relieve that problem.

I am sure that there are many more children going to school now because of the school meals programme. I commend the Government on taking such a step as this, and that in itself is creating another problem. That is, the problem of space. I would like to get the assurance of the Hon. Minister that the question of space at the schools will be looked into, so that as soon as compulsory education comes into effect, there will be no need to say that the problem at the schools is the problem of space.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, on this question of compulsory education I am not against that at all, because it is a good thing. What has been brought before us, however, is the question of a pilot scheme. It was a question of a pilot scheme in respect of the school meals service, and now it is a question of compulsory education, it is also a pilot scheme. This is a pilot scheme and the parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. John have been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand that. What about the other parishes? I am suggesting that if the Government wants to bring about a scheme of compulsory education, it should be brought about for the whole island because it is a good thing. I am saying that the whole island should be dealt with because the Hon. Minister knows how much the island has

suffered because of the lack of education. The Hon. Minister knows how the children could not get any education; and now that the opportunity has come for us to deal with this matter of compulsory education, the Government is dealing only with the parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. John. That is where the chief bosses are; as a matter of fact, that is how it appears to me,

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this pilot scheme; let us deal with the whole island. It appears to me as if this scheme will never be extended to the parish of St. Andrew. I hate this matter of trying out a scheme. Compulsory education is a good thing for the children, but do not let us select certain parishes which are to benefit from this scheme. The Hon. Minister believes that he is trying, but trying what? Let him bring this thing into force and let it be beneficial to everybody. I say: let compulsory education be introduced for the benefit of the whole island. I have seen that big men cannot reckon their money when they have worked for it. Mr. Chairman, it shocks me to see that there are men who are forty and forty-five years of age and who cannot reckon their money after they have worked for it. 5.55 p.m.

The Minister should bring about compulsory education for the eleven parishes and not select three only. I do not like this pilot scheme. There should be compulsory education for all or none at all; there should be free meals for all or none at all, I hope the time will come when I will be able to stand in this House and talk plainly and let every man know what is my opinion. I am not going to bottle up myself anymore. Some time ago I asked something of one of the Ministers and he said I will learn, but all of us will learn one of these days. We have all come from the low bracket, but those who have risen to a high

bracket believe that the others know nothing. But the Most High God said that he will raise up the base things to confound the wise and prudent, and will enlighten our darkened understanding to the knowledge of His truth, and he will kindle our affections that we may appear fit to do the things that he will have us to do and let the wise be confounded. I have stood silent for these many years, but they shall hear what the fool has to say one of these days. The same stone that the builders reject shall become the chief corner stone. Let us think of the underprivileged people who do not have money in the eleven parishes and help them. I will support this Resolution, but I do not like this pilot scheme. I will support anything that this Government brings that is good, but if it is not suitable, I will condemn it.

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for \$6,138 is for a scheme, whether you call it a pilot scheme or not. As far as I can read from this, compulsory education is not in this at all. We are accustomed for ages to talking about compulsory education, and I dare say that our minds are thinking that way, but this Resolution has a different shade of words. It is for compulsory school attendance, and as the hon. member who has just sat down has said, in a case like this I feel it should be for the whole island. If a parent is not in a financial position to send a child to school, nothing can be done to him. As far as I can see from the scheme, it is going to give the Education Department at the end of the financial year very good statistics about the absentees from school, and I dare say that these Officers may be getting calls as to why and where these children do not attend school.

Many speakers this afternoon have touched on nursing homes. Now these are very essential things in the districts. Only this year I was speaking with the Headmistress of St. Silas Girls' School, and she told me that one of her troubles is that during the crop season lots of parents keep some of the elder brothers or sisters at home. She made the suggestion that if she had anywhere up there she would start a social centre. In three days' time I was back in Orange Hill, and that lady had got the disposal of a building to start a Day Nursery, I told her that when she got things on a footing, I hoped she would not be lazy in seeing what the Government could do to help. These things are very essential in the country districts, but I certainly can only say that this is a different shade of words, and members are talking about compulsory education. This is a scheme in my opinion to get the statistics probably for compulsory

education to come, but this is only for compulsory attendance, because when the Officers go around the areas and to Mary Jane in the village and three of her children are in school and one is at home, the officer cannot compel her to send it to school. 6.05 p.m.

This Resolution is seeking to get the statistics of school attendance throughout the island, but is taking into consideration only the parishes of St. Michael, St. George and St. John. You are talking only of compulsory school attendance, but there is nothing in this Resolution of compelling anyone to send to school their children.

I do feel that Government in bringing down this Resolution has to pay attention to the setting up of centres in the rural areas where parents will be able to carry their young children, thereby allowing their elder brothers and sisters to be able to go to school. Mr. Chairman, you are from the City, but I am from a rustic part of the Island and I know the facilities and the life of people in these parts. However, I do hope as a result of this pilot scheme you would be able to get statistics of attendance of children as well as the non-attendance and in the years to come you would get something better in the education of children in Barbados.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I must say, first of all, that I like to hear certain hon. member speak be-cause it is only when I hear them that I understand how good and sensible this Government's policy is. But there are some members of mis House who would come down on the silly side of this question. There are some hon. mem-bers who seem to be unable to read everything with understanding. I must confess that before I vote for something I must understand what it is all about, and if I read something, I understand it, and if I quote from it, I know what I have read.

Now, Sir, if you read the explanatory note to this Item, you will see that the Government is implementing a policy, and the note goes on to say that this policy is such an important departure from the traditional policy that all the implications cannot be grasped at once, except by practical experience. Since I do not know everything and therefore have to learn as I go on, I have to devise a type of policy which would enable me to know as I go along. Everybody knows how to advise a Minister, but nobody knows exactly how to do anything. It is the Minister himself who has to formulate the policy and, unfortunately for me, since I do not understand everything, I have to do things as I go along.

I would have been as critical as other hon. members if I knew as little about it as some hon. members, but as I happen to know something more about it, I have to proceed with caution.

Of course, I have seen the legislation in other territories as regards compulsory education, but here in Barbados I am faced with a unique situation. I am faced with a situation in which the percentage of school attendance is probably about 95, and literacy about 98; therefore, me problems of compulsory attendance here would be different from, say, a place where the literacy of the adult population is only 4 percent.

All of these things I have to take into account. I cannot rush blindly and do things since I do not know all the implications; therefore, I have to proceed with caution.

I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. When I decided that there should be a new replacement for the St. Andrew Girls' School, I deliberately took away the priority given to the new school at St Thomas. When I decided that there should be a new school in St. James, as the hon. senior member for St. James reminded me, I shifted around my priority. There is no question of favouritism. When there should be a new replacement of a school in St. Joseph which, I hope, Her Majesty the Queen would be graciously pleased to open on her visit, I changed around priority. I therefore do not pick out parishes and help. St. Lucy has got the least of all of the educational benefits that I can think of as well as in St. Thomas, but that cannot be helped. Therefore, the ques tion of my picking out parishes is just wild talk. Nobody who looks at me should accuse me of that.

There is another thing. It is all very well for hon. members to get on the floor of the House and urge the Government to put forward proposals which initially and finally mean an increase of public expenditure. You cannot have it both ways. If you want me to build more schools, you must say whether you want me to build them here or in Montserrat. You must tell me if you want me to look after St. Lucia or Barbados. When the time comes that the question of establishing the Welfare Services for the children should be considered at a fair level, the matter will be dealt with; so all who want these things had better be care. ful how they talk about them because they would eventually have to pay for these

things. Therefore, hon members must not run off on to these by-ways.

To say, however, that because I have chosen to recommend three parishes in which this scheme should operate initially and I have therefore necessarily excluded other parishes, hon, members who said so are wide off the mark. Do you recollect what the Ministry of Education has done? Do you remember that we came in here and introduced our policy of assistance to the Secondary Schools? Do you know how many parents have complimented us - and our policy has been so thoroughly successful that you will be surprised to know that of the 1,256 pupils who took the entrance examinations this year -- that is to say the 11-year-olds -1,240 have been placed in some Secondary School or the other, either in a Government-aided Secondary School or in an Independent School? When you can develop and expand the educational system which does not take so very much out of our slender resources, it speaks very well, 6.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this Island have not yet caught hold of the fact that they can have anything they want in the way of education so long as they can pay for it., therefore, when you put these extensions to the Government you can have them if, at the same time, you are recommending to the people of this island that they should pay whatever is required of them. Even without additional taxation we have managed to extend the benefit of free secondary education over a large number of pupils, that is to say, 1,240 out of 1,256. I should like to say, Sir, that there is no other country in the Caribbean which could give you this record. We have done this because the House has placed the necessary funds at our disposal. If you want me to do anything in education, I will put up all the schemes to the Government provided that they are sound. If you want us to do these things, if every time you say that we should spend more money on the schools, that we should do this, that and the other, all of that calls for added expenditure. If you want these things you must have additional expenditure. That is all I want to emphasise. If you urge this thing and that thing on the Government, then you must be prepared to pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, when we say that it seems good to implement our policy in this fashion, hon members should believe that we know what we are doing. I have refrained deliberately from using the term \"compulsory education\" because this is not what it is. The most that the Government can do is to see that there are facilities for education, and if measures need to be employed they will have to be employed, so that the children should be in the schools, I deliberately did not use the term \"compulsoryeducation\" because there is no such thing. When we have gone further into this matter and we know what the nature of the problem is, of course, I shall be in a position to advise the Cabinet and get their approval for recommending something to this Committee. Mr. Chairman, I will not be pushed into fields of endeavour which have not been carefully studied, and let hon members remember that if they pursue anything without prior consideration it will only lead to disaster, I am convinced that everything which the Government has done in the way of education so far has been sound, but people seem to have forgotten that we are still running the Govern. ment and we are doing a tremendous amount of work for the people of this island. That is so in matters of education,

in matters of health, in matters of trade, in fact in almost every aspect of Government. If we were to embark on a course merely because people say that we should embark upon it, that would not be the test of good statesmanship. I am convinced that whenever we bring something before this House, we bring it on principles which we can defend. On rational grounds a case can be made out for whatever we bring before this House. If the grounds are irrational you may make out a case for something, but you may not

succeed in pushing forward the end which you want to serve. If we knew as little as some hon members, we would urge these things; but because we give a minute study to things, we act on the principles on which we are acting.

On this question of compulsory school attendance, you have to set up an organization in order to see what percentage non-attendance is due to the children, and what percentage is due to lack of co-operation on the part of the parent. Unless you have that knowledge, you cannot administer anything. In the last place I want to say that I repudiate most emphatically that anything is being done on the basis of favouritism or on the basis of picking out some parishes at the expense of others. The aim of good government is the ultimate end of priorities. When priorities are-supplied, that is the end of the matter until there are good and sufficient reasons for re-arranging them.

The question that Head 35 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

**HEAD - 37 MINISTRY OF HEALTH, HOUSING,
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
(6) SOCIAL WELFARE**

Head 37 _ Ministry of Health, Housing, Local Govern. ment and Community Development (6) Social Welfare -was called,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is Item 174 -- \"After-care of Patients from Lazaretto\" - and supplementary provision of \$684,00 is required. The explanatory note informs us that the present allowances payable to 38 former inmates of the Lazaretto were last reviewed in 1962 and they varied from \$18.50 to \$42.00 a month according to need. It is proposed to grant a general increase of \$3,00 per month to each of these persons with effect from the beginning of the current month. I beg to move that Head 37 stand part of the Schedule,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD - 39 MENTAL HOSPITAL Head 39 - Mental Hospital .- was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, there is a new Item, namely, Item 39A Laundry Allowance, In this connection, the sum of \$25,073 is required to pay a laundering allowance of \$7,00 per month to each member of the staff of the Mental Hospital who is provided with uniform. This payment will take effect from the 1st April, 1964 until the end of the present financial year. This is over a period of two financial years. The male and female nurses and the domestic staff are the persons to whom this allowance will be paid, I beg to move that Head 39 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that Head 39 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon, J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$34,716 do now pass.

Hon, C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that

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

6.25p.m.

On the motion of Hon, J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER re-sumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. N. W. BOXILL, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

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 make provision for the orderly and progressive development of land in both Urban and Rural areas and to preserve and improve the amenities thereof, for the grant of permission to develop land and for other powers of control over the use of land; to confer additional powers in respect of the acquisition and development of land for planning; and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Hon, member on this

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what has the Hon, Leader of the Opposition risen?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I have risen to ask the Hon, Leader of the House

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am not sure that that procedure is correct - to rise and ask anything of another hon, member.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Through you, Sir, I wanted to ask the hon, member not to proceed with this Bill this afternoon as we have not yet got through it You will realise that it is very voluminous and it is still being studied. We

shall be ready next week to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think the Hon, Leader of the Opposition has said enough to make it clear that which he was seeking to do, though I am not sure that he was at all in order.....

Hon, J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the hon, member did intimate to me his desire, and it is all right with us on this side. I have already given him my word, but I would like to assure him that we are going to proceed with it next week.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I certainly would like to assure the hon, member that

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would not like any more talk across the table. I gather that the Hon, Leader of the House is letting the hon, member know that this matter will be proceeded with at the next meeting of the House.

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 passing of a Resolution requesting Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to convene, at the earliest opportunity, a Conference to arrange the constitutional, financial, defence and other details incidental to, and arising from, the assumption, by the People of Barbados, of Sovereign Nationhood within the Commonwealth in 1966,

Hon, J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, when I was on my feet a moment ago, I ought to have moved that Order No, 4 be the next Order of the Day under Government Business. I now so do.

Hon, C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE WEST INDIES (EXEMPTION FROM BETTERMENT CHARGE) ORDER, 1965.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This Order also stands in the name of the Hon, and Learned member for St. John, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The University of the West Indies (Exemption from Betterment Charge) Order, 1965".

Hon, E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, towards the end of 1964 the Government gave consent to the Cave Hill Development Project, and the sum of \$715,000 was provided in the Estimates of 1965/1966 to meet the cost of land

acquisition, roads, storm water drainage and administration. The basic capital cost of the Cave Hill project which is for the provision of low cost housing, middle income housing and other social amenities such as schools, Fire Station, Police Station, Playing-fields, Church and so on, is estimated at \$284,000 at current prices, and in view of the large volume of expenditure which will be involved, this House was asked to approve of the Order entitled \"The Betterment Charge (Cave Hill) Order, 1965 which was laid on the 24th June this year. 6.35 p.m.

This Betterment Charge Order under the Land Development Duty Act would make it obligatory for all persons who occupy land in that area, purchasing or developing land to pay a development charge to the Treasury which would assist the Government in regaining some of the expenses which the Government undertook in developing that area.

The purpose of this Resolution is to exempt the University of the West Indies which has been allocated approximately three acres of land in that area from the provisions of that Act. As the University is an institution of learning and not a profit-making body, it should not be called upon to pay this Development Charge.

I should like also to remind hon. members that the Government of Barbados undertook to provide the site for the College of Arts and Sciences for the Eastern Caribbean at the Cave Hill site to the extent of no less than ten per cent of the total cost of the United Kingdom grant for this purpose. It would therefore be manifestly inequitable if the University was called upon to pay a Development Charge as new improvements take place at the University site from time to time.

It is for this reason that I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (EXEMPTION FROM BETTERMENT CHARGE) ORDER, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the day likewise stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier, the senior member for St. John To move the passing of the following Resolution \"The Urban Development Corporation (Exemption from Betterment Charge) Order, 1965,\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, much of what I said before would apply here to the Resolution which we are now considering, but in this case, the Resolution is to exempt the Urban Development Corporation and its successors in title from any Betterment Charges that may be payable in

accordance with the provisions of Part HI of the Land Development Duty Act, 1962.

Now, in this particular case, as regards the Urban Development Corporation, I do not know at this

stage whether the names of the persons who have been appointed to this Corporation have been confirmed. It may be that the authorities are waiting for acceptance of the nominations which have been made by Government; however, it is necessary that we should get on with the development of the middle income and low cost houses in Cave Hill.

The whole object of the exercise is to make it possible in view of the exorbitant prices which are paid for land by people who develop land, by the small number of people who hold the majority of land and their agents and their assigns, the people who hold up the whole community to ransom on the grounds that they have a commodity which is scarce and, therefore, without any or very little capital investment the community must pay a ransom until the end of creation to those people, the Government has to step in in a variety of ways. The Government has to institute the ownership of housing to tenants of the Housing Authority, the Government moreover has to make available to the people of this Island parcels of land to which they may move their houses when they are evicted by the people who aspire to be lords but who only manage to reach the first round of landlords and not lords of the realm.

Therefore, the Government has to move at tremendous expense people from the swampy area in the vicinity of the Constitution Swamp and the Government, moreover, has plans to carry out further urban removal - what used to be called slum clearance. When I say the Government, I mean this Government. The Government also has to set in train urban development in those areas where the people are living in overcrowded conditions and where living conditions are deplorable. This is a social evil in which corruption and political chicanery thrive, and that is the position which this Government is trying to ameliorate and to amend.

To this end, in furtherance of our desire and declared intention to improve the physical and living conditions of the majority of people of this country, the Government has purchased nearly five hundred acres of land to the north east of Bridgetown. It is called for the want of a better term "The Cave Hill Development Project," It is not in Cave Hill; it is land formerly owned by the proprietors of Husbards, Oxenards and Rock Pleasant plantations. It stretches from the north of Cave Hill to the boundary of the Government Housing Estate at Thorpes in the parish of St. James.

Eventually, we hope that 4,000 or 5,000 units which can accommodate 20,000 people would be constructed in this area.

In the same way, we the Cabinet and the Government - and I make bold to say the Government of all time, whether some hon. members like it or not - will govern by the will of the people and the grace of God. In the same way that we have allowed the tenants of the Housing Authority to own their own homes, since we have no desire to be landlords, by the payment of ten per cent of the cost of house construction, what we are doing in the new Urban Development area -- and I do not know what the name is going to be, it may be called "Independence Park" for all I know; we have "Independence Square"; so there is no reason why we cannot have "Independence Park. ., The unfortunate thing is that if I decide that tomorrow, there is nothing that anybody on the other side can do about it. 6.45 p.m.

I think that a national monument should be erected in the parish of St. George at Market Hill - a monument to the collective wisdom of the political parties on the opposite sides of this House. In this area we are trying to introduce house ownership, not the ownership where a contractor charges an appreciable sum for the construction of a house and then the house owner has to get the materials from

one of the large commercial concerns in Bridgetown and then a mortgage is allowed of 60% of the value of the

house and the house owner has to find 40% of the selling price of that house. The maximum that you can get on a mortgage is of the order of 60% of the cost of the house. Sir, I do not know that there are many people in Barbados who could afford to do that sort of thing. A house costs from \$12,000 to \$30,000 or \$40,000 and there are not many people in tills country who can provide as much as 60% by way of solid cash so that you can have a mortgage for \$12,000.

We will make the whole property available on the down payment of 10% of the purchase price of the property. I forgot to mention that the whole question of land tenure and property ownership is one which is exercising the minds of the people of this country, and there are sharp differences of philosophy which exist between the people on this side of the Table and those on the other side of the Table. I am referring now to the Bill which was passed earlier this year in respect of the Tenantries Act and the security of tenure of persons who occupy house spots in tenantries so as to prevent these persons from being ejected and sent to every part of the country. As I have said, Sir, if we are going to encourage people to own any property of which they may be proud, whether it is a question of low cost housing or otherwise, we are saying that in order to facilitate such ownership we will put in facilities of a high standard such as water, natural gas, roads, playing fields and electricity -all of these things we have to provide. There have been no existing roads other than cart tracks upon which we may build a foundation, and therefore we have to start from scratch because the first road which is to lead up to the University Site is under construction and will be ready for the opening of the University by Her Royal Highness at a later date. If you are going to say that you are going to make it easy for people to own their own homes and you are only asking them to pay down 10% on consideration, I may say that we do not think it equitable even to ask them to pay the betterment charge which might increase the cost to those potential owners of the properties.

Mr. Speaker, I ought to explain something which should be well known to hon, members. It is that the scheme is being operated on a mortgage basis. The Government will be guaranteeing the payment of the mortgage so that if you pay down the sum of \$1,200, that amount of money which you have paid into the Urban Development Corporation monthly will not only cover the interest on the outstanding loan of \$10,800 or \$12,000 but it will also cover the repayment of the principal. There will be a policy of insurance on the house itself and a policy of assurance on the life of the house owner himself. In the event, let us say, that the house owner unfortunately passes away within a month or so of acquiring that property on which he made payment, automatically his widow or children or beneficiaries will benefit to the extent that the whole property immediately becomes free of the debt whether it be \$10,800 or \$12,000 because the Life Assurance Policy would be used to pay off the outstanding debt or mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, we have to re-state these things from time to time because people either do not remember or they want to forget them. They want to call it an act of oblivion in so far as the social problems of this island are concerned. I want to make it clear, however, that this Government intends to press on and continue with programmes of this kind in spite of what is taking place to the contrary. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution to exempt the Urban Development Corporation and its successors in title from the payment of betterment charges do now pass.

Hon, N. W. BOXILL:

I beg to second that.

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

6.55 p.m.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL
DEVELOPMENT AREA (CAVE HILL)
ORDER, 1965**

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Special Development Area (Cave Hill) Order, 1965.\\\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I have explained at length the implications of the Land Development Duty Act, 1962, and the Addendum here fully sets out the reasons which compel the Government to introduce a Resolution of this kind.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE DEVELOPMENT
DUTY (CAPITAL GAINS) (CAVEHILL)
ORDER, 1965**

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day, No. 7, stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Development Duty (Capital Gains) (Cave Hill) Order, 1965,\\\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is similar to the one which I have Just moved, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE \"THE BETTERMENT CHARGE (CAVE HILL) ORDER,
1965\"**

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order stands also in the name of the Hon, and Learned Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Betterment Charge (Cave Hill) Order, 1965-\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Order is similar to the one which I have Just done, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

HON, C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon, J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today\'s Sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 2nd November, 1965, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon, C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 2nd November, 1965. at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 7.03 p.m.