THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961 – 66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd August, 1966

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.45 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SEALEY and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform hon. members that there are no Minutes available for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:–

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1966.

Training Report for the year 1st April, 1965 to 31st March, 1966.

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:–

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1966.

A Bill to make special provision in respect of the preparation and publication of the registers to be used at, and otherwise in respect of elections held under the Representation of the People Act, 1957, or the Local Government Act, 1958, where the date fixed for the poll at any such election falls within the period commencing on the 7th day of September, 1966, and ending on the 30th day of June, 1967; and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Also on behalf of the same Hon. and Learned member, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 97 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 109 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, and Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 110 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter are all ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:–

A Resolution to approve of the lease by the Crown to Messrs. Central Foundry Limited of a parcel of land known as the Dock Site situated in the parish of St. Michael.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government to introduce legislation to provide for severance pay for all categories of workers in the community."

QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:—

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that there are certain members of the Barbados Police Force, namely writ-servers who for over five months have not received their cycle allowance?

2. Is Government aware that this is causing these officers much inconvenience and embarrassment?

3. Will Government immediately investigate the cause of this with a view to having this allowance paid at the earliest time possible?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:—

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that two road workers formerly employed by the Vestry of St. John and subsequently by the Southern District Council – namely Lenora Cooke and Etheline Brewster – have been retired from the service of the Southern District Council (one on grounds 'of age and the other on grounds of ill-health) over eighteen months ago and to date have received neither pension nor gratuity, although entitled to receive same?

2. Will the Minister investigate the cases mentioned without delay?

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

To Enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that school-leavers in France find lucrative employment with travel agents as guide on coaches for tourists who visit their shores on sight-seeing and educational tours?

2. Is Government also aware that there are many school-leavers in the Island who do not make up their minds as to the type of employment best suitable for their aptitudes?

3. Will the appropriate Minister issue a directive to travel agents, as well as the Taxi Association, requesting them to participate in a scheme sponsored by Government which will enable many Barbadians to be trained for such occupations with a view to assisting the tourist industry?

2.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to make special provision in respect of the preparation and publication of the registers to be used at, and otherwise in respect of elections held under the Representation of the People Act, 1957, or the Local Government Act, 1958, where the date fixed for the poll at any such election falls within the period commencing on the 7th day of September 1966, and ending on the 30th day of June, 1967, and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, be read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Question No. 97 was called.

Mr. BATSON:—

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Is Government aware that the Price Control Inspectors must have cars to take them out to do their duties?

2. Is Government also aware that the said Inspectors have to borrow money payable with

interest, from banks to deposit on the said cars they now use?

3. Is Government further aware that after paying the banks and garages monthly for the said vehicles, very little money remains?

4. If the answers to the above are in the affirmative will the Minister go into the matter with a view to bringing relief to the said Inspectors by placing them on the Established List which will entitle them to car loans from the Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:–

1. No Sir.

2. No Sir.

3. No Sir.

Price Control Inspectors are temporary staff, and it is not normal practice to grant car loans to temporary staff. They receive travelling allowance at normal rates. The future of the control of supplies and prices is under active consideration.

Question No. 109 was called.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:–

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:–

1. Is Government aware that persons living in the Northern parishes of this island, particularly in the parish of St. James experience much difficulty in securing the services of Justices of the Peace and as a result are put to much hardship and inconvenience?

2. Will Government recommend that the system of the appointment of Justices of the Peace in this area be revised with a view to increasing the number?

Alternatively:

3. Will Government consider the advisability of having Postmasters and Postmistresses of District Post Offices appointed Justices of the Peace?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows: "Yes, Sir. The Government is aware of the difficulty. The system of appointing Justices of the Peace in Barbados is under review by the Government, and at this stage is not considered advisable to have Postmasters and Postmistresses of District Post Offices appointed Justices of the Peace."

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 110 stands in the name of the Hon. junior member for St. Peter who I observe is not instantly in his place. I will allow the question to stand over until the next meeting of this House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE – CURRENT – NO. 13

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a supplementary provision under Head 17 of the Current Estimates which, as you know, deals with the Premier and Home Affairs. It is a new Item and the amount requested – $2,500 – is to be given to the Barbados National Trust on a dollar for dollar basis.

The purpose of the subvention is to assist the Trust in the restoration and preservation of the Signal Station at Cotton Tower and Grenade Hall which are two of the important survivals of the island's heritage. I am sure that all hon. members know of the excellent work that the Trust is doing in preserving these old monuments, and I am certain that the Committee will be glad to make this subvention.

As it is our custom in these matters, we always insist – except there are grave reasons to

the contrary – that the people who request this kind of assistance in Government should be able to show that they themselves are doing something on their own behalf. For this reason we are making this subvention on a dollar for dollar basis. We are only asked to provide $2,500 because the Trust is finding the other half of the required sum.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

3.05 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution. It is not commonly known the amount of work the National Trust does on behalf of the people of Barbados but it is very commendable although it is a new body not more than five years old. They have already shown by their work what a valuable body they are. There are many places in Barbados which deserve preservation and had it not been for them many of them would have disappeared already. Cotton Tower in St. Joseph is surrounded by a rather unsightly mass of over hanging branches and the Electric Company has to have some poles removed so that they can get ahead with the preservation of that site. I think many Barbadians know where that is. Respecting Grenade Hall in St. Peter, I do not know where that is, but I am told that they have made a register of all the old forts and signal stations around the coast and through their efforts they have managed to get either private persons or Government to assist in the preservation of this list of interests. I commend their efforts and would just like to emphasise again the valuable work that the National Trust is doing is something that everyone can be thankful for.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1966–67
No. 14 CROWN CASES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a request for Supplementary provision to Head 6 – Item 16 – Crown Cases. In the current Estimates there was a provision for $750 however, this provision is not enough to meet a commitment for which the sum of $839 is now required. The addendum reads as follows:–

"In an action brought by Messrs. A. S. Bryden & Sons Ltd., against the Attorney General arising from a difference of interpretation of the Customs Act, 1962, the Supreme Court granted part of the relief claimed by the Plaintiff.

Accordingly the Attorney General was ordered to pay the Plaintiffs' costs which were taxed on the 30th March, 1966. This amount is to pay the costs ordered by the Court, as the amount originally voted is inadequate, and it is considered that the original sum should be available to meet any further expenditure of this kind that might be required during the remainder of the financial year."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now agreed to.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and is the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations 1966.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) REGULATIONS, 1966

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, these regulations seek to control some of the unlawful parking which now goes on in the City of Bridgetown. They are made in the exercise of the powers conferred on the Director of Highways and Transport. The Regulations apply to private vehicles only.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I know that the next Order of the Day would naturally be Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, but I am going to ask leave of the House to let the hon. senior member for St. John take charge of that Order with the concurrence of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. In any case the hon. senior member for St. John is not now in his place, and I propose therefore to move the suspension of this Sitting for half an hour in order that he shall be able to do this when he comes.

May I just say to hon. members opposite that it has been represented to me that there has not been quite enough time to study the subject matter of the motion which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I have spoken to the Hon. Premier and I have suggested to him that perhaps it might be convenient for everybody if he merely makes his speech introducing the motion, and then I myself would undertake to move that further consideration be postponed until next week, and then let the debate continue next week when other hon. members on both sides of the House will by then have had more time to study the matter. If this is agreeable, then that is what I will arrange. Hon. members will therefore indicate whether this suits them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicate his concurrence?

Mr. GODDARD: That is what we would desire. Speaking on the motion for postponement.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I asked the hon. member if he would just indicate whether he agrees with the suggestion made by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. GODDARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

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

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

On Resumption:

RESOLUTION RE CARIBBEAN FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, to move a Resolution to ratify the agreement for the establishment of an Association to be called "The Caribbean Free Trade Association."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the concurrence of the Hon. Minister of Trade, I am asking leave of the House that the Hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. senior member for St. John, take charge of this Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Finance to take charge of this Order, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the 5th of July last year, the following Communique was issued, copies of which were sent to the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of British Guiana. This was the text of the Communique:–

"The Premiers of British Guiana and Barbados met in Barbados yesterday with officials of their respective territories and arrived at the following decisions which will be subject to formal approval of their Governments and Legislatures:

1. That a Free Trade Area should be established between the two territories not later than 1st day of January, 1966;

2. That they would welcome the participation in such a community to be known as the Caribbean Free Trade Area of any other territory in the region;

3. That a working party of officials should be appointed immediately to work out the implications of establishing a full customs union between the territories within the shortest possible time;

4. That the major objective should be a viable economic community and a common market within the context of early independence for all the Caribbean territories who so desired;

5. That the Secretary-General of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Governments of the United Kingdom and Canada, the major trading partners of the territories should be informed immediately of these arrangements;

6. Honourable L. F. S. Burnham and Honourable Errol Barrow also announced that their Governments had agreed to take part jointly in the Canadian International Exposition scheduled for 1967."

That was the Communique which was issued after a meeting held on 4th July, 1965, between the Prime Minister of Guyana and myself. Shortly after that, within a matter of two weeks, I was able to inform the Cabinet that the Chief Minister of Antigua, the Hon. Vere Conrad Bird had expressed his intention to be associated with the Caribbean Free Trade Area. The Cabinet then approved that he should be associated with the Community. Since that time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the three Governments who were the founders of this historic Community, the first of its kind in any British Commonwealth territories anywhere within the Commonwealth, met with their Officials in Guyana and started to function the Convention, to hammer it out and to shape it into tis eventual form as it was laid on the Table of this House some months ago.

The meeting was further adjourned to December in Antigua, and on the 15th January, 1966, the Hon. Lyndon Forbes Sampson Burnham, Prime Minister of Guyana, Vere Conrad Bird, Chief Minister of Antigua and I signed the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Free Trade Association, and according to the terms of the Agreement, it was necessary to seek the ratification of the Legislature in an exercise of this kind.

I should like to draw particular attention to the dates. On 4th July, the Prime Minister of Guyana and I met in Barbados at my invitation. By October, we had had a meeting of Governments, and by December the Agreement, as you have had it laid on the Table of this Legislature, was actually signed. So in less than six months three territories in the Caribbean were able to formulate plans for greater economic viability, whereas for the past 18 or 19 years no one has succeeded in developing any set of proposals which would give rise to the establishment of a lasting political association.
4.00 p.m.

This, Sir, is very significant. There are people who are talking about economic cooperation. Some of them would even like to see an economic community, composed of Central American countries, Cuba and Puerto Rico and even some of the countries on the continent of South America.

We are not here, Sir, to deal with pipe dreams or to supply copy to newspapers. The Governments of Barbados, Antigua and Guyana are concerned with the day to day problems of survival that confront the people in our respective territories. They are the very people who have criticised the Government of Barbados because it has in no uncertain terms, not only on paper, but in the Legislature made it plain that it is reluctant to take up the bills which the Colonial Office will be leaving behind in these territories

which the United Kingdom has exploited from the day or days that they were separately discovered.

They are the people who criticised the Government for not providing for aspiring lawyers and politicians to try to control the destiny of Barbadians from some remote place. Not one of these persons has apparently grasped the significance of the step taken by the first three countries of the commonwealth to establish what is in truth and in fact the first economic community in the history of the commonwealth nation. It is true that you have had in East Africa an organization like the East Africa Common Services Commission. We have had Regional Economic Communities with varying degrees of autonomy, with varying degrees of authority in trade and economic matters. It is true that Great Britain herself has been making tentative, and I would go so far as to say positive, overtures to the European Common Market. This exercise was prompted by the interest of Great Britain alone and was in no way connected with the expansion of Markets of countries of the commonwealth except the U.K.

It is also true that we have had bilateral trade relations like other countries such as the Agreement with the Dominion of Canada which has existed for over 41 years. It is significant that the 5th July when this communique was issued was the 41st Anniversary of the Canadian Trade Agreement and we were meeting in order to formulate new proposals which would be more practicable and of more benefit to the West Indian territories.

We have also had of course multilateral trade agreements such as G.A.T.T. which is now nearly twenty years old; but you have never had an economic community or a free trade area with any territories within or without the commonwealth.

We must realise that in the last quarter of the 19th century there was tremendous pressure from the Liberals in the U.K. to establish a free trade area which was not going to be established on a multilateral or bilateral basis. This was strictly an exercise dictated by the desire of the industrialists in Great Britain to have markets for their commodities, and it was an exercise which was dictated by the imperialist interests of the metropolitan country and not a desire to be of any benefit to the country to which their goods were exported.

In relation to Barbados this was done to this country up to the time that that Government took over. Recently in the 20th century we have witnessed in the U.S.A. when it was industrialising that it was not in favour of the idea of free trade. Now we have seen the need by the U.S.A. to find markets for its surplus production by talking about free trade.

The distinction between that and what we are now doing is that these are countries already industrialised while this exercise is to bring about an economic association between countries which are under developed and which have limited markets in order to create a better atmosphere economically and trade wise.

During the past ten to fifteen years we have witnessed the development of the European Free Trade Area. We also have the European Free Trade Community which is a result of the Treaty of Rome as recently as 1957. We have the South American Common Market and we have the Latin American Free Trade Area; and now we will have the Caribbean Free Trade Area.

At which ever part of the world you look today the trend is for countries to get together, particularly countries with complementary economies. They want to get together and pool their human and natural resources and remove all those obstacles towards the movement of goods from one country to the other by founding associations such as the one we have devised.
4.10 p.m.

What is a Free Trade Association. I think it is necessary to have our definitions clear and not to be confused as to what we mean by Free Trade. A Free Trade Association is basically an agreement between two or more countries to abolish tariffs, that is, duties on goods coming into the countries quotas which is another form of restriction whereby the movement is not inhibited by high tariffs or by a limitation of goods. This will be done for the protection of local industries and at the behest of the industrialists within the countries themselves. The Association has as its prime object the removal of all inhibitions – tariffs and quotas – against the movement of goods and services from one country to another freely. There is a distinction which we have to draw between a free trade area and a Customs Union. You can have a free trade area in which the countries agree to exchange goods without any quotas or any tariffs against those goods moving freely and you can have a full Customs Union in which you have an external tariff and an internal free trade. It is a necessary part of a Customs Union that the countries in the free trade area should have an external tariff. For the very simple reason that if you had a free trade within the area and then

one country was able to charge lower tariffs against goods coming from countries which were not within the free trade area, for example in Antigua you get no tariff or duty at all on Whiskey and that Whiskey could come into Antigua free of duty and then move to Barbados free of duty thereby causing Barbados to lose revenue on Customs Duty. It is absolutely necessary for you to have an external tariff on all goods in a Customs Union whereas in a free trade area you will not have it at this stage. As you can see from the communique which was issued on the 5th July and from the subsequent movements in the area that we will eventually move towards a Customs Union, and having a Customs Union we can then develop into a fully integrated economic community. There is no such thing – I would like to dispel and dismiss from people's minds a lot of wrong concepts which appear in news papers daily – there is no such thing as a European Common Market, it does not exist. It would have to have a full external tariff against the whole of the outside world. They have a partial free trade area in Europe not all of the tariffs have been rationalised, not all of the restrictions have been removed from certain commodities and they are moving towards a full internal free trade in Europe. What they certainly have not got is what the newspapers commonly describe as a European Common Market. It does not exist for several reasons because most of the countries in Europe are imperialists countries and they have special arrangements in the Colonial Territories over which they preside. It can be extremely difficult as was proved at the time of the early Federal exercise to establish a common external tariff in countries which have different levels of re-requirements for certain commodities and also because of the revenue which is not established by rationalisation of tariffs which may exist from one country to another. If I may simplify it quite a large proportion of the Government's revenues in the commonwealth Caribbean countries is earned from import duties. Import duties on imported commodities for one country are not on the same level as the import duties of another because Governments have requirements to raise their revenue and the only way that they can raise revenue successfully to meet the growing demands which are placed upon their resources is to increase from time to time import duties on certain non-essential items although in many countries even the essential commodities have to be taxed. This, of course springs from the fact that we are not manufacturing the commodities and therefore we do not gather a large amount of revenue from the activities of export industries and we have to rely very heavily on the duties on commodities which are imported into our country. In Barbados it may mean as much as 35%. As soon as two countries get together and they decide to have a common market it means that there must be full internal free trade and full external tariff on every single commodity. The complexity of the exercise then becomes a par because on all the goods imported into the country you have to strike a happy medium whereby the communities themselves will not lose the revenue from the rationalisation which you are undertaking. Rationalisation means that every country must pass tariff laws which make the tariff on any particular item exactly similar to that which prevails in the other country or countries in the agreement. According to the provisions of 1957 under which Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, West Germany, France, the Benelux countries and Italy went into the European Economic community which is the correct description of the association. They set out as an objective as we have set out that there should be a common entity. It has taken them from 1958 to 1966 highly industrialised as they are having a high level of agricultural production to the extent that countries like France are suffering if that is a correct description from an over supply of agricultural products. Despite all that and despite the tremendous upsurge that there has been in the economies of the six countries in Europe which signed the Treaty of Rome in 1957 none of these countries have been able to bring forward any great proposals whereby in 1966 or 1967 they can have a European Common Market. It does not exist but they are working towards the idea of a Common Market. I was therefore very amused when during the time of the last Federation only the Governments of Trinidad and Jamaica foresaw the impracticability of doing with the stroke of the pen what the European countries have not succeeded in doing within the passage of eight years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome. To those who are not initiated in the complexities of international free trade it is very easy to get up and say that this is a simple exercise in the same way that the Leader of the former Government thought that the separation of the Church from the State could easily have been accomplished in two lines of the Statute Law of Barbados by the insertion of a few words "the Anglican Church Act is hereby repealed". The same people went down to Trinidad and said we should have freedom of movement of persons and goods. We are still getting people writing in the newspapers about freedom of movement of persons and goods but nothing that amounts to anything that is of any value to international trade and business. If you know that you have certain objectives your next problem is to sit down and

study what are the arguments against the achievement of the target you have set up.
4.20 p.m.

That is what was done between the three Governments in 1965 in Georgetown and at Dickenson Bay, Antigua; and I want to say this right now: one of the reasons why we were able to arrive at some kind of consensus, I would like to call it perfect understanding, except that there is no such thing as perfect understanding on every single detail and where a comma should go and where a full stop should occur, but the reason why we had been able to accomplish this is because we had people who were dealing with practical problems and not political equations, and also I would like to say this without any fear of contradiction either now or in the future; as I have said about the framework of the Barbados Constitution, it has got to spring from the land itself; it must not be imposed from outside. Here was something which sprung from the minds and desires of the people themselves who were the elected leaders and representative leaders in their territories. We were not concerned with British economics or imperialism, and we did not have anybody from Her Majesty's Government presiding or even a person observing at any of our meetings, and this is very significant.

If you read the White Paper on Federal negotiations, you will see that every single federation the British have instigated has fallen to the ground, and there is a long recital, and it came right down to Singapore which disintegrated two days after I published the White Paper; and now we have Nigeria. The remarkable thing is that we had 39 people of all hues, complexions and races at Dickenson Bay, and not one was born outside the West Indies. There were Portuguese, Africans, Indians, Chinese, people of Eurasian descent and of European descent at that conference, but every single one of them was committed and involved in the community in which they were living. The only successful exercise which can take place in the West Indies is one generated and operated by West Indians themselves without the doubtful assistance of anybody from the United Kingdom, and I say that without any contradiction, and would like all West Indian Governments to understand that this is the only way we can ever produce anything – by doing it ourselves and not trying to run ours on the model which has been created out of the imaginations of people sitting at a desk at Whitehall. We have got to do it ourselves. The 38 Officers and Ministers I counted at Dickenson Bay all came originally from the four corners of the globe, and not one was born outside the West Indies; their grandfathers may have come from elsewhere. If you look at the Federal exercise, you will see that you have people from the R.E.C. days, big top-heavy economists turning out masses of documents and periodicals telling West Indian politicians what they should do.

I well remember that in 1952 the first discussion we had in here on Federation was because the Colonial Office sent down and advised the Governors that they should tell the Leaders of the Government that it was time to discuss the Standing Closer Association Committee Report of 1948. The debate was initiated in this Chamber because the Colonial Office said it should be initiated. That is how it was initiated with Mr. Rattever and the rest of them in Guyana at that time, because the Colonial Office said they should start discussing a federation; but the first time they knew about a Free Trade Association was through the Communique issued in Barbados from Barbados on the 5th July, 1965. I hope the moral is there for everyone to understand, but we still have a lot of colonial-minded people even in this Chamber, and unless somebody from outside the territory with a different kind of persuasion and complexion from the people who live in this country tells them that they have to do so and so, they are bound hand and feet with inertia, and they cannot get off the ground. They have to wait until somebody tells them to do something. I think it is a great credit to the Civil Servants and Ministers from Antigua, Guyana and Barbados that they were able to formulate a proposal which I am sure is only the beginning of a much wider and more lasting association in the Caribbean.

Now as to the actual Agreement itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to recite all the proposals, but I should like to read the Preamble to the convention. It reads as follows:-

"THE GOVERNMENTS OF ANTIGUA, BARBADOS AND GUYANA –

SHARING a common determination to fulfil within the shortest possible time the hopes and aspirations of their peoples and of the peoples of other Caribbean countries for full employment and improved living standards;

CONSCIOUS that these goals can most rapidly be attained by the optimum use of available human and other resources and by accelerated and sustained economic development;

AWARE that the broadening of domestic markets through the elimination of barriers to trade between the territories is a prerequisite to such development;

CONVINCED that such elimination of barriers to trade can best be achieved by the immediate establishment of a Free Trade Area and the ultimate creation of a Customs Union and a viable Economic Community for all the Caribbean Territories who so desire;

HAVE AGREED as follows:-....."

And then it goes into the Articles of Association, naming the Association and so on, and there are altogether some 37 Articles; and then there are certain Annexes. The first Annex deals with special arrangements for the progressive elimination of import duties on such products as are itemised under the Standard International Trade Classification.

In Annex "B" are certain rules regarding area origin for tariff purposes, but I will come to that in a moment and explain in greater detail. Then you have in the Schedule the Basic Materials List; and Annex "C" deals with the special arrangements for the progressive elimination of the effective protective element in revenue duties (hereinafter referred to as protective revenue duty) applied to such imported goods as are itemised under the Standard International Trade Classification dealing particularly with rum.
4.30 p.m.

Then, there is Annex D which provides for the progressive elimination by Barbados and Guyana of quantitative restrictions on imports consigned from each other of the goods itemised under the Standard International Trade Classification.

Annex E refers to the List of Government aids mentioned in paragraph 1 of Article 17. There are perhaps one or two definitions which may be new to members and who do not normally have to deal with these things. It may be of some assistance to explain why we have had to set these things out. For example there is the question of area/origin. It is very easy to say that you will have a free trade association with goods moving between one country and another; but there must be some criterion for establishing whether these goods have truly originated within the territories and not merely an intermediary or middle man of some one else's goods, but goods which really stimulate manufacture and production in the territories which form part of the Free Trade Association.

Therefore, Sir, certain descriptions will be found such as "area/origin" in order for goods to qualify for free movement or duty free importation into a particular territory they must be goods of area/origin. That has caused considerable difficulty because although we are attempting to expand our industrial production, like the U.K. we have to import a large proportion of our raw materials in order to manufacture the goods which we are exporting.

The U.K. for instance in the 18th and 19th centuries after the use of water-power and steam the U.K. built up an industrial programme on the export of textiles and cotton piece goods to countries all over the world. But the significant thing about that is that the U.K. did not grow a single bit of cotton so that all the cotton processed in the U.K. was imported from Egypt and the American colonies as they then were and later on from the Southern States of the U.S.A. and other countries which produce cotton. They also imported cotton to a limited extent in the West Indian Colonies.

The more cotton goods that Britain exported to Barbados, Russia, Germany and South Africa the more they had to import cotton. If Great Britain had a free trade area agreement with Canada for example, one of the first things that would have to be resolved was whether the goods manufactured in Great Britain from imported cotton qualified for free trade treatment. The criterion would be the interest of the importing country. If that country had a more developed cotton industry it is unlikely that that country would accommodate Great Britain by saying that cotton piece goods were of area/origin they would argue that a large proportion of the goods was from raw material imported from outside the area of the exporting country. The argument would be that if we allow you to export cotton piece to us on a free trade agreement we would be stimulating Egyptian cotton to the detriment of the Canadian manufactured cotton piece goods.

So, Sir, the formula which has been invariably invoked is one by which most countries in the world who are industrially developing build up their programmes by the process of importing raw materials and re-exporting goods made from them. The difficulty is that you cannot say that only goods produced in a particular country qualify for free importation. You have to think of some other kind of formula which would be equitable and which would do justice to what we want to achieve, that is the creation of employment and the stimulation of manufacture in countries of the area.

The formula used here and which was used in the European Free Trade area and the Latin

American and South American free trade areas is the formula of what is the area content of the particular commodity when it is finished. By using that formula you can do justice to the principle of the encouragement of manufacturing in the particular country as well as generating employment. We cannot set out any exhaustive list that such goods qualify and such goods do not qualify because you may get changing situations arising from day to day in the manufacturing industries.

There is a body which will preside over all these things and to which special public officers will be assigned. This council will examine complaints from manufacturers as to non-admission of their goods, and they will look to see whether these goods qualify. The goods fundamentally should originate within in the area, but that is impracticable from the point of view of international trade. We have decided on a 50% basis, that is, that the value of any materials imported from outside the area or of undetermined origin which have been used at any stage of the production of the goods does not exceed 50 per cent of the export price of the goods.

That will ensure less chances of changes from time to time, although goods which do not qualify today may qualify at some other time. Then you have the provision by which materials listed in the Basic Materials List which is contained in the document itself are automatically allowed free entry even if in their manufacture you have to import basic materials.
4.40 p.m.

There are already in the area several manufacturing concerns which although they import certain materials and although those materials in value would not qualify them for special treatment under the 50% basis that I mentioned before yet the manufacture of these particular products is so vital to the economy that you put them on the basic materials list which initially is the justification of the schedules which you will see in the agreement itself. I do not want to spend too much time on this exercise. I am merely dealing with what I consider to be the basic points which may create some difficulty in the minds of honourable members. There is one aspect to this which the manufacturers in this community will be somewhat interested and that is the question of trade deflection. If you find that as a result of the coming into being of the Free Trade Area there is a deflection in trade, from a country with which you have had traditional trade relationships, and especially creating such problems as balance of payments, etc. then the country suffering from this deflection of trade will be able to register some kind of protest against this deflection of trade, and as a result the new tariff interest of these arrangements could then be reviewed and revised for the guidance of the signatory Governments.
4.45 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair).

We are dealing, Mr. Speaker, with the economies of the Free Trade Area Agreement, and I was passing on now to some of the things which will no longer arise on the coming into force of this Agreement. I was saying that some benefits would no longer arise from the deflection of trade from traditional sources towards the countries which are signatories to the Agreement. As a result of the abolition of duties on goods exported from Barbados, let us say, to Guyana, and the retention of the duty on goods imported into that country from any other source, and the same exercise, of course, would apply if the goods were exported from Guyana to Barbados as well. There should be a stipulation on production of these commodities which are manufactured in Barbados because of the differential or the increased differential if we operate on the Imperial preference system, then the increased differential between the cost of the goods as from Barbados and from the outside world, this should encourage people to import more goods from Barbados and to leave out the goods which would be coming from abroad, and this is one of the main justifications for having a Free Trade Area because it is a formal agreement between countries to which every country in the international trading world have to pay due respect. If they then want to take advantage of this new trade differential between the countries in it – the Agreement itself – they could normally do this by acceding to the Convention itself, because no country which is a signatory to the Agreement can alter its standards as to the countries from outside to put them back on a competitive basis with the countries who are signatories to the Agreement, because in that way the Agreement would have no strength and no validity at all, because as soon as a country which was a party to the Agreement found a new-found friend, all they would say to the other two countries is that we will abolish all our tariffs and allow you to export into our country as well, and we will import from you, so it is essential that the countries in the Free Trade Area Agreement, although they do not have a common external tariff, as against outside countries. Yet it is

implicit in the Agreement itself that outside countries should not be in the same peaceful position as the countries who are signatories to the Agreement itself, because in that way you will be admitting through the backdoor – as I believe some countries in the Caribbean did and are still doing – admitting outsiders through the back door by trying to take steps before this programme is ratified by the three signatory countries. As far as Barbados is concerned, we have given an undertaking that we are not going to make any special arrangements with any country outside of those who were signatories to the Agreement, and if we, for economic or other reasons, get into a position of making special arrangements with any other countries, we would immediately notify the countries who signed the Agreement with us. And so the Agreement itself will be of particular significance in the stimulation of production of those commodities on which a high duty exists at the present moment.

4.50 p.m.

In some commodities, for instance, the duty is 30 per cent of the c.i.f. value of the commodity. In some commodities it is 40 per cent. It therefore means that the general duty is 80 per cent which is nearly twice the original cost of the commodity itself. If you abolish the duty between the countries which are signatories to the Agreement, it not only gives them a 40 per cent advantage over other Commonwealth countries who are not signatories to the Agreement, so in all the Caribbean countries or even the United Kingdom this will operate – it gives them almost 100 per cent advantage in the landed cost of the commodity over goods coming from, let us say, Western Germany, Japan and places of that kind. It is not therefore a pure political expression or a pious pronouncement or anything like that on behalf of the Governments. It is a matter or very real economic importance to the countries concerned, and it will also have this additional advantage: not only will it stimulate production and thereby bring about a situation in most industries which are exported, reducing the average cost in any particular industry, and reducing the price of goods inside the country itself because of greater production, but it will reduce the cost of the goods as long as you buy those goods from within the area, whether it is Barbados, Guyana or Antigua. Once you start this kind of exercise and get the right kind of manufacture going for which there is a demand within the countries, then the basic essentials will remain with us in perpetuity if we can concentrate on manufacturing not things which are of no significance to people's existence, but those things which really matter to the comfort of the citizens of the area, although some people may deem them luxury goods, but certainly not wasting time manufacturing paper windmills that blow around in the wind.

Let us take transportation for instance. We have recently seen the emergence of a company in Barbados to build buses. The average bus costs $25,000 and if there is a 40 per cent duty on the importation of buses to Guyana and buses came within the area of origin – I cannot tell you offhand if it does – then you can see that a bus manufactured in Barbados and sold to Guyana will probably cost, let us say, $8,000 or $10,000 less than one imported from the United Kingdom. I am only using this as an example; I am not saying that buses qualify. I can check and find out, but I am giving an indication of an industry which has just started, because nobody is going to buy a bus body built in the United Kingdom no matter how pretty it was, if he could get the commodity within the area which does not have to be 100 per cent as perfect as the one which is bought from the United Kingdom, if it is durable and can serve the purpose and have more or less the same life span. All these things will be calculated, and it will stimulate bus building in Barbados as against the importation of buses from the United Kingdom. That is one of the obvious advantages, and this kind of arrangement has stimulated production in the United Kingdom by 250 per cent in eight short years and increased the economic rate of growth in the community as a whole.

There is another aspect of this that we cannot ignore. Whereas just now I was dealing with the preference – and I do not mean preference in the technical sense, but I mean the consumer preference and the importer and commission agents' preference, it is cheaper as long as they are nearly similar or similar or superior in quality for goods which are manufactured already within the area. There is also the stimulation of manufacture of commodities which were never manufactured before, because for the very reason that there was no competitive market for the goods manufactured of a certain description, immediately – I do not mean overnight, but whenever you get a removal of the tariff on these goods – any industrialist in looking on the project again after a feasibility study will come to the conclusion that whereas it did not pay to risk manufacturing this particular commodity before, now that the tariff had been removed in a market the area and extent of which you are fully aware, it may create a drive for the manufacture of new goods which were never manufactured in any of the countries before, and from the creation of

these new manufacturing processes, the area as a whole can gain in certain ways. You would get from the economic point of view a more efficient allocation of resources, the necessary duplication of effort will be avoided, and waste will be eliminated. You would therefore get increased specialisation, increased efficiency, because of course you have greater markets, lower cost of production and lower prices to the consumer.

You would be surprised to know the number of enquiries we have had ever since we have entered upon this Agreement with Guyana not only at our Development Board but the Development Boards of the other signatory countries as well. We have had a multiplication and I might say a proliferation of the number of enquiries, and certainly much more positive approaches from industrialists abroad, although the combined market of Antigua, Barbados and Guyana is just about one million persons; but the point is that a market of one million persons is better than a market of 250,000 persons, and that is what we are really providing for industrialists overnight. People talk about a federal exercise with 500,000 persons living below subsistence level and migrating into Barbados and increasing our social and economic problems. I can say that nowhere in this Agreement is there any understanding about freedom of movement of persons, but it must follow as the night follows the day that wherever you have this Agreement, eventually if not sooner you are going to get the uninhibited movement of persons to the country that has the greatest number of industries, but this will redound to the benefit of the country as a whole. We do not anticipate that in Barbados there will be some influx like some racialists of the Opposition think, who talk about Indians rushing into Barbados from Guyana. If they go to Guyana and see the amount of land which barefooted Indians control, and which people in Barbados would want managers and overseers to look after for them, they would not talk about Indians rushing into Barbados. We are dealing with trade; we are not dealing with pious expressions about the brotherhood of mankind and the community of this and the other which the other people went in for. We are dealing with economics and practical matters.

5.00 p.m.

There are people who write to the newspapers or in the newspapers saying that there will be a rush of people from one country to the other. There is no mention in the agreement that anyone in any one of the other contributing countries will not be subject to the same restrictions already imposed on people coming into another territory to do jobs which people within a territory are qualified to do.

The point I would like to make, Sir, is that neither Guyanese nor Antiguans are the greatest offenders in this respect. The greatest offenders are the U.K. and St. Lucians. Last year 800 people came to Barbados from St. Lucia alone, and only 40 were skilled people. The U.K. is exporting large numbers of people to Barbados who, if they are specially qualified have to be given special inducements. When they are working for places like the Cable and Wireless and other regional organizations they get house allowances, 30% more salary than Barbadians doing the same job etc., therefore I repeat that our greatest threat is not Antigua or Guyana but the U.K. who are, on the other hand, imposing restrictions on our people going into their country.

As a matter of fact, Sir, the Prime Minister of Guyana has said in clear terms on several occasions that he will welcome the settlement of West Indians in Guyana. I remember at the Ottawa Conference when the Minister of Health and Community Development said that the immediate problem was that Canada should lower her immigration barriers the Prime Minister of Guyana said that he is not so keen on West Indians going to Canada when Guyana was there to be developed. That even caused a little misunderstanding between us because we realise that settlement in Guyana is a long term project, while Canada was there already.

We are justifying this agreement on purely economic grounds. Representations have been made by a malevolent section of the society that people will rush into Barbados from outside. At no time did we agree not to impose restrictions on members of the Free Trade Agreement which were less onorous than those imposed on persons from outside. Therefore Barbados, Antigua and Guyana have the right to exclude persons whom we consider undesirable not only on political, but on other grounds as well. We made that clear all along.

I regret therefore that the malevolent society and those on the other side will not be able to make political capital out of this. This was the sort of thing they made political capital out of in the old political federation in which the former Government played so prominent and disastrous a part.

I would like to say, and I think that other heads of Government agree with me that the F.T.A. as seen by the signatory countries is the first move in the establishment of a more

comprehensive and integrated Caribbean Economic Association, and that is why we have made provision in the agreement for the accession to the Agreement of interested parties.

I would therefore like to emphasise that this Association is not a narrow discriminatory bloc or an exclusive club but the first step in the formation of a Caribbean Economic Community. I say, Sir, that we are not an exclusive club, but at the same time it is only wise to warn people that we are not having any "Archies" in this association. If you join the Club you cannot join and form new rules to suit yourself. You have to abide by the rules as they stood at the time you joined it. I want to make that clear.
5.10 p.m.

The living standards of the people in the countries over whose destinies they preside, and if all they can do is to go to conferences and sound off, then they are not concerned about the people. We are concerned about the people. Come in as anybody else on the floor as a floor member, not as a President. We do not want any well diggers, because this is a building up Association, and we are not having any new fellows with any new-fangled ideas, because these people do not know what this is all about. We have, of course, looked for precedent to those successful operations of a similar kind. We have looked at the Latin American Free Trade Association; we have looked at the European Free Trade Association, the Treaty of Rome and the European Economic Community. After the Legislature has approved the Resolution which was given notice of, and the passing of which I am moving today, Sir, it will of course be necessary for us to have certain statutory and other instruments in order to implement the expression of the Legislature of this territory, and the ratification of the Agreement for the territories concerned. I propose shortly to bring in a Bill which will be entitled "A Bill for the Caribbean Free Trade Association Act of 1966", then there will be A Bill for the Rum Duty (Amendment) Act, 1966; a Bill for the Consumption Tax (Order) 1966, and the Customs Caribbean Free Trade Association Order, 1966, the Caribbean Free Trade (Arrangement of Bills) Regulations, 1966. There will be in all seven separate bits of statutory instruments which will be necessary for the implementation of the Resolution which I now have great pleasure in moving be now passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the passing of this Resolution, and I reserve the right to speak on it later on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. F. C. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of a Resolution which I could not have given notice of earlier today, and when leave is given, I am asking the indulgence of the House in order to proceed with it in all of its stages, because it is an urgent matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the House is asking leave at this stage to give notice of a Resolution. If there is no objection, I will grant leave to the Honourable Leader of the House.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Health and Community Development, I beg to give notice of a Resolution for the sum of thirty thousand dollars, Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67 No. 15, Head 41, Item 136, Rental of Quarters. I also beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply immediately to deal with this money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House resume Committee of Supply, and that the instructions while the Committee be to consider the Resolution for $30,000.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1966–67
No. 15

HEAD 41 – QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL – was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, an amount of $18,000 was provided in the Estimates for 1966–67 under Head 41 – Queen Elizabeth

Hospital Item 136, Rental of Quarters. At the 31st May, 1966, the amount spent from this vote was $17,038.85, leaving a balance of $961.15. At the time when the Estimates were prepared, it was not anticipated that there would have been the great recruitment of doctors for the Hospital as has been the case earlier this year. There has been great improvement in recruitment, and as providing accommodation is one of the conditions of their employment, this meant an increase in expenditure in this vote. At present the amount of rental paid for doctors' quarters is $4,400 per month. It would therefore be appreciated that this would necessitate a tidy supplementary.

I do not think that any member of this Chamber would object to this supplementary provision, because we all need medical care at some time or other. I may point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is going into this whole question of doctors' quarters. Six Maisonnettes which have recently been constructed are occupied, and there are another six under construction which will soon be completed, but even with these, it is still necessary to have this provision because we yet have to rent quarters for doctors. It would appear as though we would need in the near future at least twenty additional quarters for doctors. I know that hon. members will feel that $50,000 a year is a tidy sum to pay for doctors' quarters, and they may contend that it would be better to construct houses. This is what Government is doing. As I said before, it was not anticipated that there would have been such an influx of doctors in the earlier part of this year.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I do not see how anyone could contend that it would be better to construct houses than to rent unless the Committee was furnished with some figures as to the cost of construction of a maisonette in order to compare this figure with the rental. As a matter of fact, Sir, this is the manner in which the whole affair should have been presented to the Committee. We should be told the cost of a maisonette, we should be given some idea as to the period for amortisation of the cost of the maisonette making proper allowances for depreciation and maintenance charges, and then when we have on one hand the capital cost of a maisonette and the period it would take in terms of comparative rental to amortise this cost, then we would be in a position to compare whether or not it is cheaper to build a maisonette or to rent one. I have my own idea about the matter, but there is no reason at all why we should be concerning ourselves today with guessing. This is not time for guessing these things, and the hon. member must have the appropriate figures, and therefore should be in a position to afford the Committee an opportunity not to contend on the basis of guessing, but to contend on the basis of the figures he presents in Committee.

Obviously, Sir, if you extend your hospital accommodation, and you require an increase in medical staff, it follows as night follows the day that the staff cannot live on the beach and you are bound to provide quarters for them; but in asking the House to agree to provide finance to rent nineteen more quarters, and simultaneously we are being told that you have constructed six maisonettes and you want to construct six more, the correct thing to do is to give us some approximation of the cost of the construction so that we can decide for ourselves which is the better idea, and whether it costs more to build our own quarters or to rent. Naturally, Sir, considering the long term requirements of this kind of accommodation, it is far better for the Government to construct its own houses, but there is no reason at all why we should not be given some comparison as to the two methods of providing quarters which are more or less involved in the Resolution before us.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I heard the hon. member, but as he went on talking he saw the fallacy of the argument on which he started to build his premise. He started off by asking for a comparative statement to be produced in order to guide the Committee as to whether it is wiser to rent or to build these houses, but as.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution said that it is most likely that hon. members would contend that it is better to build than to rent, and all I said is that we should not be asked to contend on the basis of guessing.

5.30 p.m.

I rise on a point of order. The hon. introducer of the Resolution said that it is most likely that hon. members would contend that it is better to build than to rent. All I said was that we should not be asked to provide this money on a basis of cost. The Committee should be in a position to examine the figures.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member said that these figures should be given. He went on to say we

should know so that we would be able to know if by the capital cost the amortization would work out at a cost associated with construction and if it is cheaper to do so than to rent. However, as he went on he saw the folly of the argument which he was building up.

This is not an argument today of capital cost, it is that you have to rent to provide quarters for the doctors. The Hon. Minister explained that to rent is not the policy of the Government. The policy of the Government is not to rent houses permanently, it is the Government's intention to build houses. Therefore, to ask for figures to determine if you should rent or build is a different thing altogether. There is a difference between the two.

If it were a question of renting, we very well could say that the Government should rent a hospital rather than build a hospital. It is not the policy of the Government to rent houses to provide quarters for doctors; it is the policy of the Government to build houses.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To begin, my argument is a little more varied. The Government is going to build houses and the Government should take into consideration the capital cost of these houses extended over the normal period of time they should last, plus the maintenance, insurance, taxes and so on, to see whether it would be cheaper than renting. A building costs more to put up by the Government than by private enterprise. Therefore, there are two solutions if you are housing staff. Either you are building or you are going to rent if building a house is not as economical. All you have to do is go into the matter carefully on the basis of seeing what the house would be worth after it is built. You have to see whether it would be more economical to build by taking into consideration the amortization, that is to say, taking into consideration the expected life of the property, whether it is twenty or twenty four years and if it costs X pounds to build it, you divide the X pounds by the expected number of years and you arrive at the amount which this will be after taking into consideration your insurance, maintenance and so on. You will be in a position to find out whether you will be saving money by building or whether it will be cheaper to rent a building. I said what I did for the reason that I know from the cost of one of those maisonettes that the difference is not very much.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to pursue a matter like this, because it is trash. The Honourable Member talks as if amortization of the cost of a house for 25 years is what somebody wants you to do for the period of amortization, to liquidise a debt on a property. It is not machinery you are dealing with, it is a building, and you do not demolish it in the 25th year. This building had been built over 50 years, but you must not carry an amortization plan on the building for 50 or 60 years because it is going to last 75 years because you want to liquidate a debt in a shorter period. The Honourable Member's argument has fallen down. Government's policy is to build houses or to provide houses permanently for doctors working at the Hospital, and the Honourable Member is telling us that the Government should abolish its policy and find out if it is better or cheaper to rent a house than to build a house. The public is responsible for providing hospitals, accommodation for the doctors. Therefore, it is the public sector's responsibility to create the construction that would occur from this. I am saying that the Honourable Member's argument about renting against constructing cannot be an argument, because as you go on you must see that if the Government agrees – and we agree – that you must provide accommodation for doctors at the Hospital, it follows that the construction of quarters will be one of the things that you will have to provide.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I have said already I am repeating. One of the main reasons for getting these figures today is to be able to compare the cost of construction by the Government with the cost of construction of private enterprise, and the consequent revenue which Government can afford to rent as compared with the rent charged by private enterprise. When you talk about amortization cost of a house over a given period, it does not mean that it disappears. What is meant then, Sir, is that at the end of that period you have to embark upon major capital expenditure to make the house ample, because after a certain period the roof will fall in.

5.50 p.m.

What it means then is that at the end of that period you have to embark upon major capital expenditure to make the house habitable, because after a certain period the roof would fall in or the tenants would sink through the floor. People are building houses that in ten years you have to put in new window and door casings, but what I am concerned with is the original expenditure before you have to embark upon additional capital expenditure in order to make the house continually habitable.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Philip is well aware of the fact that it costs just over $30,000 to provide a three-bedroom house for a doctor. He is also aware that this $30,000 odd include fixtures and furnishings. If the hon. member took that figure and could determine whatever percentage he wants, he can see that it is better under the circumstances to build than to pay over $300 a month for a house as is being done now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, if you pay $300 a month for a house, that is not my mathematics. If you are paying $4,400 a year for nineteen houses, that is an average of $231 a month and not $300.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member should ask for is a breakdown of what is being paid for some of the houses. The Government is paying as high as $300 a month rental for some of these houses, and some of them are not as good as those built by the Government for the officers. I have known of cases where some of the doctors have had to be moved out of the houses because of cracks and because of the location. If you ask a junior medical officer to live at St. Lawrence, when he is called to the hospital at 12 o'clock or 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock in the night if he is in charge of a surgical or medical ward, by the time he arrives at the hospital, the patient is dead. It is therefore better for the Government to provide accommodation as close as possible to the hospital.

For the benefit of the hon. member, we are in some instances paying as high as $300 a month for houses and as low as $100 a month for others. What has been responsible in the past for the high cost of building a house is that whether a doctor was living in a unit by himself or whether he was married with five or six children, a three-bedroom unit was provided for him. That policy has changed. We are today constructing houses at a cheaper rate than before because we are making provision not only for three-bedroom houses, but for two-bedroom houses and for bachelors quarters. The cost of the particular unit therefore, will vary in accordance with the need or the type of unit you are constructing. At the University of the West Indies some junior medical officers live in a single room; some of the registrars also do, but we do not want to give them that sort of accommodation. What we are doing is giving them a house to suit their needs. The policy of a doctor who is a bachelor living in a three-bedroom house has changed.

As I informed the Committee, the whole question of doctors housing is being currently examined by a Committee which, will soon hand in its report to the Ministry of Health. We have already begun to place doctors in quarters according to their needs, and as the new quarters are completed, those who are occupying houses which contain more room than they need will be moved into smaller units, and those with large families will move into the larger units. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it would serve any useful purpose to say any more on this as I feel it is a waste of time. The arguments can only be stupid especially when people know the facts. When people know and pretend not to know, it is sad.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in a way my question was already answered when the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was forced to admit that the question of the cost of construction of these maisonettes is under review. That is the answer to the whole thing for the simple reason that you built a maisonette for $30,000 apart from the land, you add another $6,000 or $7,000 for the land according to the space used, which is nearly $40,000 for a house, and you could not rent a $40,000 house for $100 a month.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I did not say that the cost of a house was $40,000. I said it was just over $30,000, and as I pointed out in my address, it is now costing us much less than that because we are not building any houses that would not suit the purpose.

6.00 p.m.

I did not say that the cost of a house was $40,000. I said it was just over $30,000. As I pointed out later in my address, it is costing us much less than that, because we are not building houses like those which were built before, we are building houses for doctors who are bachelors. We are building quarters for bachelors.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that it was a question of your putting up a building for $30,000 apart from the cost of the land.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that I was talking of the future. I said that this is done now; I was not talking of the past or any future.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not talking of what happened before; I said it was not only building a house for $30,000, there would also be the cost of the land. Therefore, when the Hon. Minister said that the policy of Government was not changed,

he misunderstood my question. As soon as you are doing that the other things do not arise at all.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of $30,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that brings to an end Government Business for today's session.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until today week, Tuesday the 9th August, 1966, at 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for the adjournment I want to bring to the Government's attention a matter of grave importance. There are subtle attempts being made by persons especially along the west coast in St. James, to undermine the Government's policy. Since the Government has been creating public entrances to beaches there are certain persons who go to the beaches with their dogs unleashed and in many cases these dogs are of a ferocious nature and they prevent other persons from using the beaches. I think that practice should be stamped out and if it is not stamped out, Government should bring down legislation to stop it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we are very grateful to the hon. senior member for St. James for drawing this matter to Government's attention and for me to state categorically that such practice would be not only contrary to Government's policy but is seriously condemned. It has been stated time and time again on the floor of this House by Government's spokesmen and from Government headquarters that any facility created in the Island are facilities primarily for the people of this country. That is the Government's policy, therefore, it should be known by people who live in any part of the Island that they are not to regard their private property which touches the sea as in any way excluding the inhabitants of the Island from access to the beaches. I want to make this very clear because I think it ought to be known.

The Government stands four square on this policy and there would be no reneging. So far as we are concerned, the people who are affected in this respect should take this as a warning and I think a word of warning is sufficient.

Secondly, any such statement of Government's policy should be sufficient to let the people in this Island know that facilities which have been created, and which are to be created, are facilities for the use primarily of the people of this country and while we feel that these facilities should be shared by visitors, they should be enjoyed in conjunction with the people of this colony.

6.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the motion for the adjournment, I would like to discharge the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Bill to amend the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society Act, 1851. That Committee has reported, and I wish to thank Honourable Members who served thereon for their services to this House in that action, and I hereby discharge them.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This House now stands adjourned until this day week at 2.30 p.m.

6.12 p.m.