THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30th April, 1968.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.40 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Health and Community Development)*; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Leader of the House)*; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries)*; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, *(Minister of Communications and Works)*; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, *(Chairman of Committees)*; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance)*; Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), *(Leader of the Opposition)*; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, *(Deputy Speaker)*; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. H. B. St. JOHN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

GIFT OF A SPEAKER'S CHAIR

Mr. SPEAKER: Before this meeting is further proceeded with, I have the honour to inform Honourable Members that the present Chair on which I now sit was duly presented to this Chamber by His Excellency Muni Lal, the High Commissioner for India, at a function in this Chamber on Wednesday of last week. On behalf of Honourable Members, I accepted the gracious gift of this magnificient piece of furniture, and I have received from His Excellency the High Commissioner a letter dated the 26th of this month wherein it is written:

"My dear Mr. Speaker,

I am taking this earliest opportunity to thank you sincerely for the courtesies extended to me during my short stay in Bridgetown. The presentation function was most impressive. It was indeed a great privilege for me to represent my Government at the happy occasion.

The gracious remarks made by you have been conveyed to the Government of India.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) Muni Lal."

I may mention that at the function in question last week there was, although small, a highly representative gathering of members in this Chamber in which the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph took full part.

Hon. J.C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the remarks just made by Your Honour would, I think, give the House an opportunity to express its deep appreciation of this splendid gift from the Government and people of India. I have consulted with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he agrees with me that it would be fitting for the House to express its appreciation in a formal Resolution which, with Your Honour's permission, I should now like to move:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House record its unqualified appreciation of the gift of a Speaker's Chair from the people of India to the people of Barbados, on the occasion of the Independence of Barbados.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appreciation of this Honourable House, together with the warmest greetings of the people of Barbados, be conveyed to the Government and people of India."

Mr. Speaker, it was quite some time that the offer of this resplendent Chair was made to this House on behalf of the Government and people of India, and we looked forward to it with great eagerness. Some of us who saw it in its former state, Your Honour too, did not imagine that it would prove to be the magnificent and very attractive gift which it now is. It symbolises the joint appreciation of the people of Barbados and of India for parliamentary democracy and their attachment to parliamentary institutions, and, not least of all, the deep and abiding friendship which exists between the two peoples.

Long before either Barbados or India had attained Independence, there had been a very historic connection forged between the people of India and the people of the West Indies generally. So much so, that the people of Indian descent have long found a home in several of these territories to the mutual advantage of themselves and their fellow West Indians. It is fitting, therefore that this House's appreciation of this truly magnificent gift should be formally conveyed to the Government and people of India with the House's deep appreciation being speedily known.

I am sure hon. members on both sides of the House will join me in supporting this Resolution, because although Your Honour, as we know, has already quite amply demonstrated our gratitude, the House would, on this first occasion since the gift has been received, certainly wish, on its own behalf, to make its full appreciation known.

Mr. Speaker, you have put the smaller Chair behind you, but it is a Chair which has an equally honoured association with the institution of Parliament in this Island. That Chair, which is now no longer in use by Your Honour, served this Assembly from 1874. If Your Honour could have been prevailed upon to keep it and use it just for another six years, it would have seen its century as a Speaker's Chair.

I hope the hon. members opposite will agree that that Chair be handed over to a Museum, with the House's approval of course, on the strict understanding that it is to be preserved as a historic entity and is not to be sold, conveyed, devised - I think these are lawyers' terms - or otherwise disposed of, and that a fitting inscription could, perhaps, be attached to the back of it indicating the number of Speakers of this Honourable House who have used it, and the respective dates of their tenures of office. I throw this out as a suggestion to the other side, which, I hope, will be taken up and acted upon. I, therefore, have great pleasure in moving this Resolution.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I begin with what the Hon. Leader of the House last said. I have not interviewed hon. members on this side, but I am sure their attitude will be the same as mine, not because they have to follow their Leader, but because their attitude to the gift and to the old Chair would be that of any sane, reasonable person.

I endorse entirely what the hon. member has said as regards the Chair. I think that it should be preserved for eternity. Just as we know that we can go in Great Britian, and we can see relics, either in the House of Commons itself, or in the British Museum, or any other place where old relics of the Institution of Parliament are kept, Barbadians should be able to go and say: "This is the Chair in which the great Speakers of the past sat."

As far as this very gift is concerned, I regret very much what I am going to say. I hope that members here present will not take it as a direct attack on them. I was amazed when I read that only five members of the House attended the function. There are times when we have to admit making grevious mistakes, and not make the admission for the sake of show.

2.50 p.m.

I regret that I was not able to come. I was in bed on the doctor's orders, just influenza and overwork. That may be true of some other hon. members, but we must say that it read badly to read that on such an historic occasion, and on the occasion of such a munificent gift, His Excellency the Indian Ambassador was not greeted with a great number of Parliamentarians and other people. The Commonwealth of India, or the Dominion of India, gave what the Press so often likes to call the defunct West Indies Federation, the gift of a Speaker's Chair too. I thought it was magnificent; but frankly, it seems to me, a layman, that more art and more work has been put into this Chair than in the Chair that they gave to the West Indies Federation. A magnificent Chair that was, different in colour, a magnificent Chair well worthy of a Speaker's Chair; but it seems to me, and reading from the time it took to make this Chair, that this is even a greater gift.

Now I say this just because it is true that I not only have a great respect for India as a Republic, as a country which has set an example to the rest of the world as to how - partly it is true after violence, but largely because they were influenced by the philosophy of non-violence of Mahatma Gandhi - India set the pattern to the rest of the British Colonial Empire to fight for independence and the chance of running their own affairs. I say what I am going to say now, not as sometimes Colonial people are apt to say: "I am just as good as you." Sometimes you get an absolutely illiterate, uncultured, stupid man, just getting up and hitting his breast and saying: "I am just as good as Mr. So-and-So." We, who have succeded in gaining independence in the Colonial Empire, do not have to say: "I want to run my own show because I am just as good as any Englishman." We do not say that we prove it, and India has set that example. Some of the greatest brains this world ever had and have today, we all know - especially among philosophers - are Indians, whether Hindu or Muslim, and we therefore have to respect and almost, you may say, revere India's accomplishments of the past and India's accomplishments of the present. I have the greatest respect for India as India; but also I wish to put on record that as to my acquaintance with His Excellency the Ambassador, Mr. Muni Lal, though not great, every time I have met him I have always felt what a great man he is, and I have always very much been struck by his normal action to claim for India the place which she deserves to have. I think that it is a very great thing indeed that we, in the West Indies, have Mr. Muni Lal as our Ambassador, and I ask people to believe that when he speaks of the affection which India has for the West Indies, that is not an empty statement. It comes from his heart. I have the utmost pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution and I endorse especially every word, not only as to our appreciation for the gift, but as it is further added in the Resolution, that the appreciation of this Honourable House together with the warmest greetings

of the people of Barbados be conveyed to the Government and the people of India.

We have not had the historic experience of British Guiana, now Guyana, and of Trinidad with regard to the mixture of Indians in our midst and perhaps because of that, we have been spared any friction between our peoples; but whether that is the cause of it, or because we appreciate them and they appreciate us, it is an excellent thing to know that our living together with Indians in our midst is a happy thing, and in the future we will continue to prove the harmonious relationship that both sides want. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very happy indeed to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, am I in order to reply to both speakers?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has his right to speak in this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, it is regrettable that after viewing such a lovely piece of workmanship in the form of a Chair, hon. members of this House did not see fit to show the honourable gentleman, Mr. Muni Lal, their appreciation. Sir, I was ashamed, and I would go further and say that I was shocked, to see such a poor attendance last Wednesday afternoon. The people and the Government of India took it upon themselves to show their appreciation of the people of Barbados in achieving Independence, but the people of Barbados, the representatives, did not see fit to show their appreciation. Sir, I was thinking that, after looking at that Chair and to see how you have adorned it, it was a happy day for your mistress to take you at the time when she did; otherwise there was a possibility that she might have lost you, after one of the good looking ones might be coming into this Chamber and viewing the Chair and you. We might have lost you at one sitting or other by one trying to steal you away. But the only thing they may not succed in doing is in taking you with the Chair, because it is too heavy. Sir, I sincerely hope, I do not want to say what I have said already, that hon. members will appreciate and respect the Chair; and I sincerely hope that the Chair will rule as magnanimously as the Chair of itself; that is to say, you should not give any member any latitude at all whatsoever. You should rule as one sitting in a Chair that has been sent to us from many miles away, as far as from India.

3.00 p.m.

Sir, I have one regret. I am still regretting that they did not see fit to help us with a Chair for the Chairman of Committees. I am saying that because I am expecting that everything that was not what it should be has left this Chamber with the old Speaker's Chair; but the Chairman of Committees' Chair is still here for us to tolerate.

Sir, I am going to take it on myself to ask the public and hon. members to give the Chairman of Committees a new Chair so that we will be able to receive what I will call in my language proper rulings.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I will note that there was no dissentient voice whatsoever on this occasion. I will ask Mr. Deputy Clerk in the absence of Mr. Clerk to take the appropriate steps immediately so that the subject matter of this Resolution may be duly conveyed.

HON. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House proceeds, there is a practical issue which has just arisen. There are a tremendous number of notices to be given on both sides of the House which will take us up to beyond 3.15 p.m. That will of course blot out Question Time. I am wondering if the other side would agree to my moving the suspension of the rules in order that notices can be given and in order that the full Question Time be done.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that we are here at this time means that we are confined to Private Members' Business. I entirely agree with the Leader of the House in order that to meet the particular circumstances questions can be tabled, answers given, Private Members' Business done and any Government Business that is to be done. I do not myself see any difficulty.

It is not often that I praise the Leader of the House , but I feel that he will be reasonable in anything that appears to affect the rights of members. I feel quite convinced that he will act like this.

HON. J. C. TUDOR: I think that the hon. member has always had the knowledge that I have acted in that way. I now beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 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.

PAPERS LAID

HON. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for twelve months ended 31st March, 1968.

An Account of the transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the quarter ended 31st March, 1968.

The Abstract of Statistics of Barbados for the year 1965.

The Customs Duties (Wet Water Concentrate for Use in the Combating of Sugar Cane Fires) Order, 1968.

The Caribbean Free Trade Association (Adaptation) Order, 1968.

Supplementary Agreement under Article 31 (3) of the Agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Free Trade Association.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1968.

HON. A.DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Twenty-ninth Annual Report and Statement of Account of the Agricultural Credit Bank for the year 1st June, 1965, to 31st May, 1966.

Financial Statements of the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation for the year ended 30th June, 1966.

HON. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1968.

HON. J. C. TUDOR: On behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, and Minister of Finance I beg to give notice of a Resolution that the sum of EIGHTY-FOUR THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY - NINE DOLLARS be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1968-69 Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1968-69 No.1 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

In respect to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, about which intimation has been given to Your Honour and to other hon. members, it is my intention to ask the Leave of the House to proceed with this Resolution later in the day's sitting in all its stages. Therefore I give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply later to deal with this Resolution after leave has been given.

I also beg to give notice that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Question No. 49 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, No. 91 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, No. 138 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James are now ready.

HON. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1968.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 110,141 and 146 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, are now ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 86, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is ready.

Also Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 133 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Also Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 134, asked by the hon senior member for St. James, is ready.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 137 asked by the hon. junior member for St. George is ready.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 153 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is ready.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 155 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 119 asked by the hon. junior member for St. James, is ready.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas: his query re - Traffic Signal detector pads.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. Is it a fact that most, if not all, of the traffic signal detector pads at junctions controlled by traffic lights have been covered by the Ministry and that detectors are no longer serviceable, with the consequence that the lights are now operating on a fixed time basis and cannot automatically adjust themselves to the volume of traffic approaching road junctions?

2. What liaison, if any, exists between the departments of Government responsible for maintenance of traffic lights and the departments responsible for controlling road traffic?

3. If the answer to paragraph 1 is "yes", will the Minister state on whose advice was the decision to cover the detector pads taken?

4. Will the Minister consider returning control of the entire traffic lights system to the Commissioner of Police who is still responsible for general traffic control?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member : his query *re* Fire Insurance for the Hilton Hotel.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,
To enquire of the Prime Minister:-

1. With what company has the Hilton Hotel been insured against fire since its completion?

2. If the insurance or insurances were placed through a local agency in Barbados, will the Prime Minister state the name of the agency?

3. Is the Chairman or any other member of the Development Board connected with the agency, if any, referred to in paragraph 2 above?

4. What is the Government's policy with regard to conflicts of interest which may arise between members of Statutory Corporations which do business with or related to the Corporation or to Government property owned or controlled by the Corporation?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member: his query *re* Bathroom and plumbing fixtures at Hilton Hotel.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,

1. Will the Prime Minister state who supplied the bathroom and plumbing fixtures and electrical fittings materials used in the construction of the Hilton Hotel?

2. Were these or any other materials used in the construction of the Hilton Hotel imported into Barbados via the local agency of the Standard Agency (Barbados) Company?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member: his query *re* Journeys made via British West Indian Airways.

To enquire of the Prime Minister:

1. How many journeys have been made by Ministers of Government and Civil Servants travelling at Government expense on British West Indian Airways from January 1st, 1968 to date?

2. Were these journeys booked and paid for through a Travel Agency and, if so which?

3. Will the Government make an investigation as to whether the Agency or Agencies, if any, referred to in paragraph 2 above paid British West Indian Airways the legal fares as set out in their Licensing for the travelling concerned, or whether the highest and allegedly unlawful fare charged by British West Indian Airways since the devaluation of the pound sterling was in fact paid by the Agency or Agencies?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member : his query *re* Physical Development Plan for Barbados.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is it a fact that a Physical Development Plan for Barbados prepared under the direction of the Town and Country Planning Office has been in existence for some time?

2. When does the Government intend to publish the Plan , if in existence?

CONGRATULATIONS TO SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS ON HIS SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that since the last meeting of this House the hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition has attained his seventieth birthday.

In wishing the hon. junior member for St. Joseph (as I now do) happy returns of this occasion, I would venture to remind him of certain memorable words of the late Mrs. Julia Ward Howe (the American woman who was the leader of the Women's Suffrage Movement in her country; who was the first woman to be elected to the "American Academy of Arts and Letters" and who was authoress of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic")

Mrs. Howe wrote -

" To be seventy years young is sometimes far more cheerful and hopeful than to be forty years old."

This lady, hon. members will recall, died in the year 1910 at the age of 91.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to you, Sir, for reminding the House of the fact that I am beginning to get on in years. I do hope that I shall see many happy returns of my birthday, although it may not be so happy for some people whom I can think of - excluding, for the moment, the members of the Government.

I do feel that as long as a man or a woman feels that, physically, he or she has the energy to continue in public life, it is his or her duty, in spite of the sneers of others. Some people absolutely forget the number of old men, in politics and out of politics, who have continued to contribute in whatever way they could to what they felt to be the good of the community. 3.20 p.m.

Many and many an old person, even a surgeon, let alone a doctor, after seventy years, even after eighty years, has continued to give the benefit of his experience to his lest fortunate people. We need hardly remind the world - some people do not want to be reminded - of President De Gaulle who is still keeping the image of France before the rest of the world in spite of his age. We need hardly remember in British politics, Gladstone, old Asquith, or Lloyd George or any of the great older men who continued in politics, and I say that none of us, in any part of the world should claim that because in other parts of the world there were old men who still contributed to public life, they are therefore, by reason of that, entitled to continue; but a man would be completely wrong to continue when he felt that he could not really physically do it, and equally, he would be wrong if he felt that he could physically continue to help his people in politics, and he retired just because some of the younger

generation felt that he should give way and make room for them. I am really absolutely and honestly very appreciative of those who have wished me a happy birthday, and I promise them that for the future I shall not let them down. The day on which I feel that I really cannot contribute in the way that I hope I have succeeded in contributing in the past, I will cheerfully retire. I thank you again, Mr. Speaker. *(CHEERS).*

RESOLUTION RE DEATH OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING (JUNIOR)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, again before we proceed, I think this might be the appropriate moment, if the other side of the House agrees, for the House to record in a motion its profound sorrow at the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jnr., and I therefore beg to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy at the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jnr., the distinguished Civil Rights Leader in the United States of America and a Nobel Prize winner for peace;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Barbados be asked to forward a copy of this Resolution to Dr. King's widow." *(AFTER A PAUSE)*

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me from the other side that instead of the words " and a Nobel Prize winner for peace" this Resolution should read "a Nobel Prize winner for international and interracial peace". This amendment I accept.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the moderate terms in which this Resolution might be cast are in any way meant to disguise the profound horror and shock which have been felt in all parts of the world by the circumstances of Dr. King's death. We naturally use words of sober restraint in transacting parliamentary business of this formal nature, but this must not, of course, disguise, from time to time, how deeply we feel on the question of a particular moment. The manner of Dr. King's death has shocked the Civilised world inside and outside of his own native country, and has left us all aghast and staggered at the mounting tide of violence which seems to be sweeping the United States of America and other countries at this time of the Twentieth Century. Much has been said about Dr. King which could be said over and over again - the wide outlook which he possessed, the deep and firmly entrenched humanitarian instincts, instincts which were illumined by the Christian faith which he held with great vigour to the end. The distinguished leadership which he brought to the Civil Rights Movement at the time when it needed that kind of leadership badly, and the influences for good which he spread among the Negro Community of the United States and across the racial barriers of the whole world, the distinguished contribution which he has made to national understanding and the appreciation which it has gained for a section of enlightened American opinion in the countries of the world - all these and more have been his. But I think that perhaps his greatest contribution of his life and times must, in the long run, be assessed by the basic faiths which he held and which in form were the sheet anchor of his daily existence.

Many persons, I believe, in the centuries which have gone, have paid the supreme sacrifice for the things in which they passionately believed, and all of them, in their respective times and situations, were looked upon as religious or spiritual or political geniuses by their contempories. Dr. King was, I think each and every one of these. His stactics and strategy of non-violence in a difficult situation met, on the one hand, the suspicion and hatred of the White obscurantists in the Southern part of the United States, and the understandable, though somewhat misguided, suspicion of the Negro radicals on the other, who wanted quick results and wanted them in a certain way.
3.30 p.m.

Buffeted by these conflicting, though in some respects indentical forces on either side, he maintained his basic faith that if you want a peaceful world you have to preach and practice peace. He never tired of saying that he got his Christain outlook from Christ and his tactics from Mahatma Ghandi. Nobody, not even in his own country first of all and the rest of the world can rightfully assess what this tragedy would mean in the years to come.

This, however, we know that in a short life of under 40 years he sweetened and illumined the country in which he lived, and created for it through his own exertions a reputation of decency which other aspects of its life might well easily be lacking.

And so we leave him to the proper assessment of history which I know will place its full evaluation on his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, as I am never tired of saying on occasions like these, before someone's death can become a world wide tragedy or even a national sorrow, it is first of all a personal bereavement to his nearest and dearest, and I think that we ought properly to spare a thought for his widow and for his young children to whom his death must be the most earth-shattering event of all their lives; because as much as we know that this event has been felt in every corner of the world wherever there are decent, human and liberal instincts, it could not have been felt with such poignancy and sense of personal loss as by Mrs. King, her children, and his father, brothers and sisters.

It is to them that we first of all extend our heartfelt condolences, and further to his country and to the cause for which he died. I have no pleasure in moving this Resolution, I must say that; but I feel a great sense of responsibility in urging the House, as I know the House will agree, to set on record not only the sense of sorrow which it feels, but in doing so our profound and utter detestation of all forms of racial bigotry and intolerance.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I do not speak at any great length it is not because I do not feel as profoundly as anyone should feel on this occa-

sion, but because the Leader of the House has so eloquently expressed the sentiments of all of us not only in this Assembly but of this island, of our race and peoples everywhere who suffer under discrimination and who see what is apparently getting worse and not better.

In spite of the assassination of Dr. King, in spite of the fact that it will give a great deal of ammunition to the people who believe in violence, in spite of the fact that leaders, recently respected leaders among the coloured peoples of the world have been saying: "I told you so," that we will never succeed without violence, that non-violence is useless and stupid - in spite of all of that, our experience in the West Indies, with occassional lapses - like what unfortunately happened in British Guiana a few years ago - history has taught us that preaching constitutional reform will succeed even though it may take a long time.

I go further and I say this. It will always take less time to get things by constitutional fight than by violence. After all, to put it in simple and perhaps cruder language, if you have not got an army, a more powerful army than your Colonial oppressor, why fight? If Black Power in the U.S.A. can beat the United States Army, then it is their duty, not only commonsense, but their duty to the cause for which they fight to use violence.

Civil wars and even the history of the U.S. itself shows that if you are fighting for a principle, and you feel that by arms you can beat your oppenents then it is your duty to use your arms; but is it not stupid for any people in any Colonial territory to feel that they can succeed in throwing over Colonialism or putting an end to racial discrimination by violence? I think it is extremely stupid.

Ghandi was assassinated by a very stupid man - and I use the mildest adjective I can think of. India got her freedom not by these occasional outbursts any more than Guyana got her freedom. We here in Barbados can claim that never in the three hundred years of our history has there been any attempt by violence to get constitutional improvements.

In 1937 two English newspapers, commenting on the riots, said that the so-called riots of 1937 took the form of raiding potato fields and digging up potatoes, that it was not a riot but an anti-hunger outburst.

Barbadians have always been accused of boasting - perhaps we have something to boast about; but we were the first to get constitutionally the reins of Government. I do not want to take credit upon myself because I happened to be there, but I was the first Premier in the Colonial Empire that ever had any power given to him to deal with the Police Force, because the whole idea was that for the sake of security the Police must always be in the hand of the Imperial power.

Jamaica, that extraordinary nation, was surprised that Barbados should have a greater measure of self-government than was given to any other part of the Colonial Empire - in Africa, near East or far East or in American Colonial territories. Why did it happen? Not because I personally was there, but because the Barbadian people had proved to the British Government that they were determined by constitutional methods to seek for reform and not just to have riots, looting, burnings and fires.

Martin Luther King preached that and he died because of that. He was a firm believer that a subject people have never succeeded by violence. I am a firm believer, no matter what may happen in any part of the world, that if you have got a good case and you present it forcibly and without exaggeration, you will eventually win through.

You may find disappointments; but all history has taught us and will show that unless you have a bigger army, it is stupid to use force. I am sure that Martin Luther King did not look at if from what you might call that low attitude; I think that, just as Mahatma Ghandi did not preach that if you do not have an army you should not use violence and why fight, Martin Luther King preached as a matter of commonsense and principle that you should use non-violence;
3.40 p.m.

I feel absolutely sure that all those who may sneer now at us who do not believe in preaching violence - in spite of all that - the non-violent attitude to reformation and to reforming evil conditions and to getting the better of racial discrimination will prevail.

I seize this opportunity with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to speak on racial discrimination as it affects West Indians. As some of you may know, Mr. Enoch Powell is an extraordinarily brilliant, clever man. He is absolutely a profound Greek scholar, a Greek critic; he knows about Greek culture and so on. He is as good as most people; he could be a University Professor tomorrow and be one of the greatest. It is said that he writes English Poetry almost as freely as he eats and drinks. He has been said to be a man who steps out of the Renaissance. He is that type of scholar. But when he makes the speech which he makes, is it not abundantly clear that culture and great opportunities are not a guarantee that the human heart is there to treat your fellowman as you would have him treat you?

I cannot imagine a greater example of the necessity of thinking that a man's position, or his brains, or his ability, is not guarantee of his humanity. I think that we West Indians should put on record, and that is why I seized this opportunity because, as far as I know, there is not at present before the House any Resolution with regard to the present position in Great Britain, but we should seize every opportunity in this Island to protest most strongly against the blatant, open "Keep England White" preaching that is taking place in England today.

After all, when war takes place, they do not remember if a man is black or white. You are called

to the colours; you die for White England, and then you will find 50% or so of White England saying: "We do not want these Blacks!" We in this House should place on record, as strongly as possible, how much we appreciate the principles of people like Martin Luther King, and how much we deprecate the statements of the sort made by people like Mr. Powell.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that I have had this opportunity of supporting the Leader of the House in this Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, it is customary to keep the best wine, at any time, for the last. I do not know if wine can in any way be associated with the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, except for the precept that he led a life and followed in the footsteps of the Christ. We have it with us that the shedding of blood on that occasion was memoralized in the wine and the cup. For this reason, Sir, I think that at this stage, I would like to give what I may call a compilation of some of the violent attacks which were made upon Dr. Martin Luther King during the short period of 12 years, and, having told the House what he had to face until the hour of his death, I would then be in a very much better position to tell the House something of the other side of Dr. King's life.

Mr. Speaker, on the 30th January, 1956, less than two months after Dr. King became the Leader of the Bus Boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, the first time his name ever came into prominence as a Civil Rights Leader, a bomb was thrown on the porch of his home, but it did not explode and no one was injured.

On the 23rd December, four days after Blacks and Whites rode on buses in Montgomery, Alabama, free from segregation and Jim Crow for the first time, a shot-gun blast was fired into the front door of Dr. Martin Luther King's home, but no one was hurt.

On January 22, 1957 a bomb was thrown once again on the porch of his home. This, too, failed to explode, and there was no injury.

On September 3, 1958, Dr. King was arrested and charged with loitering while on his way to a legal hearing in Montgomery, Alabama, which involved his co-worker, Reverend Dr. Abernathy.

On November 17, 1958, in Harlem, New York City, Dr. King was in a bookstore. In that bookstore he was autographing copies of his book "The Stride Towards Freedom," and a black woman, Mrs. Izola Ware Curry, stabbed him in the chest with a steel letter-opener. It was about seven inches long, and it was later discovered that it had been manufactured in Japan. The weapon narrowly missed Dr. King's heart. He was rushed to Harlem Hospital with the weapon still in his chest. His life was saved by the swift performance of an operation, and twelve days after the operation Dr. King walked out of Harlem Hospital without assistance.

On the 21st May, 1961, a mob of 1,000 Southern white people, angry about the freedom rights, threatened Dr. King with violence as he was holding a meeting attended by 1,500 Blacks in the First Baptist Church of Montgomery, Alabama. He was protected, then, Sir, on that occasion by the National Guardsmen who also escorted the Black congregation to their homes.

On September 28, 1962, during a convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, held in Birmingham, Alabama, Roy James, a white man, who described himself as a member of the American Nazi Party, struck Dr. King twice in the face, causing bruises and swellings. Dr. King did not press charges against him, but the police did so. James was fined a mere $25 and costs, and he was also sent to prison for 30 days.

On June 30, 1963, in Harlem, New York City, certain people of the militant group who did not like his non-violent policy, threw eggs at his car as he was on his way to speak in a Harlem Church.

On January 18, 1965, as Dr. King was registering at a previously all-white hotel in Southern Alabama, James George Robinson, a white man 26 years old, of Birmingham, Alabama, a member of the "White-hate-the-Blacks group" of the National States Rights Party, punched and kicked Dr. King. Robinson was arrested, tried on assault charges, fined $100 and sentenced to 60 days.
3.50 p.m.

August 5, 1966. On this date in Chicago, State of Illinois, Dr. King was struck on the head by a stone thrown at him as he was leading marchers past a group of angry Whites on the South West side of this City. After being struck by the stone, he stumbled, but he raised himself up and continued on the march. Later on that same day, a knife was thrown at him, but it missed him and struck a White youth in the neck.

April 4, 1968. That was when the last attack was made on the life of Dr. King and it killed him. A White assassin shot him in the neck as he was standing in the balcony of the Motel at which he was a temporary resident in Memphis, Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King was born on January 15th, 1929, at a comfortable thirteen-room two-storey house at 501 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Georgia. His father, Rev. Martin Luther King Senior., now 69 years old, was then, as now, the pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church of Atlanta. This Church now has a membership of over four thousand. The Rev. Martin Luther King senior., had married Albertha, the daughter of the late Rev. Daniel Williams, who, for thirty-seven years, had been pastor of the aforesaid Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta.

Dr. Martin Luther King was educated at the Booker T. Washington High School, Atlanta, then at

Morehouse, a College connected with the Atlanta University system. He next went to Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania, a school for graduate studies. There he topped the field in everything. He was President of a senior class, and won a fellowship to study for his Ph.D. at any University of his choice. He chose Boston College and studied there for his Ph.D. completing the residential requirements for his degree in 1953, having been in school for a period of twenty-one years without a break. In the same year, he accepted a call to pastor the Dextor Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama. It was there that he later met his wife, Coretta Scott. They were married on June 18, 1953, and four children were born to this marriage.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King died as a martyr, the first martyr of the Movement of non-violence which he preached and which he led. He was most dedicated and most renowned. Among the high honours that were bestowed upon him during the short span of his busy life, was the Nobel Peace Prize. This was an award with a Gold Medal and a Citation which he received at Oslo, Norway, on December 10th 1964. Dr. King received the amount of $53,123 United States currency, and what is remarkable about this, Mr. Speaker, is that of that sum of money, Dr. King never spent one penny on his family. He distributed it amongst all the Movements of non-violence that were in need of it. His death is a great loss to the United States, and I want to go further and say that it is a great loss to the world, for from his first efforts to obtain justice and freedom from injustice and oppression for his people, he had lived under the threat of death, but for him it meant nothing. At all stages he made it know that he was fully alive to the fact that death would come some day, and on the night before he was assassinated, he was the preacher at a big Church in Memphis, Tennessee, where the garbage collectors were holding their rally. If I were to quote from the sermon which he preached on that occasion, he said these words:

"I do not know what will happen now. We have got difficult days ahead, but it does not matter with me because I have been to the mountain top. Like anyone else, I would like to live a long life, but I am not concerned with that. I just want to do God's will."

Mr. Speaker, those words, to my mind, were prophetic. He knew that as he was engaged in the Civil Rights fight, murder might come to him at any time. When murder did come to him, it shocked the civilised world and you and I, Mr. Speaker, must have some sense of human feelings. We must be moved and touched by it all, especially when we look around this Honourable Chamber and see ourselves as all brothers of Martin Luther King and the people for whom he struggled most. His sudden and brutal removal from this earth was deeply mourned by people of all religious faiths and, Sir, I would not attempt to take this Honourable House along that solemn journey on that day, but it is known that all who had a conscience of feeling, all who have respect for human suffering and human dignity, all who have a love for peace and non-violence for which Dr. King fought and struggled hard, turned out to pay their last respects on that occasion.

Mr. Speaker, that was the day that many high-ranking Church dignitaries, many highly-placed people in the United States Civil Service wept, but, Sir, it was not a weeping for fashion. They were not professional mourners; they were all people who had been touched or moved in some way by the way in which Dr. Martin Luther King had pursued his course of non-violence. He was a true Christian; he was one who really and truly did turn the other cheek, so to speak, and when we look around and recall the death of the late President J. F. Kennedy, we must think in terms of those lesser mortals whose presence on that day, the day on which Dr. King was buried, as bearing testimony to the esteem in which this Christian man had lived.

4.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, on that day men and women, despite their every effort at restraint - tears rolled down their cheeks; and a News Reporter of a very reputable journal in the United States, writing in respect of the Reverend Andrew Young and the Choir said that tears were glistening on the cheeks of members of the Choir as they sang the favourite hymns. What were the favourite hymns? With your permission, Sir, those favourite hymns were: "My Heavenly Father Watches Over Me." "Softly and Tenderly Jesus is calling," "Let the Billows Roar" and, Mr. Speaker, "We Shall Overcome."

I do not propose, Sir, to tire the House further at this stage; but Martin Luther King's death, I must say, has not brought home to the people of Barbados what it ought to have brought home to them. I cannot help recalling that on the day of his funeral some of the business houses in Bridgetown flew their flags at half mast, but some did not. I repeat: Some did not.

Sir, those are the things which have been noticed not only by me, but by many who have come to realise that Martin Luther King lived for a purpose and that he did not live in vain. With those few words, Sir, I heartily support this Resolution and I must say that for my part I have had to exercise considerable restraint; if not, I too would have let my tears roll down my cheek.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution on behalf of my party, my senior colleague not being in his seat. Every man's death diminisheth me and I am so much diminished, therefore, when a great man like Martin Luther King dies.

The news of his death was greeted on every side by manifestations of shock, surprise and horror. If there is to be any consolation for those who appreciated Dr. King's life and his work it may, perhaps, be found in the words of the poet, Horace - "Non omnis morietur" - he will not wholly die.

We are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the example which he has left behind him will remain as long as

men celebrate the achievements of those who fight for minorities by various means. It is not for me to go specifically into the various achievements of Dr. King's many-faceted life. It is too well known to bear repetition; but I would like to associate myself with the sentiments that have already been so eloquently expressed on the floor of this House.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Resolution concerning the assassination. I must say that Mr. King was one of the most dedicated men of his day. I am sure that he was a light that shone in the darkness. He was far away in the United States, but his light shone all over the world.

He sought peace and non-violence in trying to overthrow racial discrimination and in trying his best to live and exist between the black and the white. Mr. Speaker, the light shone in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not. He died, but his light will shine. As it is said, you will kill a dreamer, but you cannot kill the dream. The dream remains.

Dr. King sought peace and love. All he asked was that men should reason together. Any man of wisdom knows that this world was made not for one race, but for very man that is allowed to live in it, whether black or white and regardless of his position. They should all live in peace and have love towards one another.

A man cultivates the land, cuts the timber, builds houses and takes the iron from the ground and provides us with all sorts of transport, and yet in certain countries he is segregated. He cannot sit with certain other men. That happens in the United States, in England and in other big countries. How can they expect that we can live without food, without clothes and without proper houses?

Some people, Mr. Speaker, today feed their dogs on beef steak while their servants cannot even get salt fish. How can they feel good?

4.10 p.m.

But God looks down into the heart of everyone, and his day will come. There is a day that will come when every man has to give an account of his deeds before the just, righteous Judge. If he is in the dust, he has to get up and give an account of his deeds; if he is on the mountain top, he will have to come down; if he is in the bowels of a whale, he will have to come out and give an account of the deeds he has committed in this world against others.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Martin Luther King has performed one of the greatest tasks that any man in the world could ever thing of - making peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Even when he was reviled he reviled not again. He bore his punishment in order to get the nation together. In the midst of all this, Mr. Speaker, we shall overcome, somehow.

There is nothing that frightens a man more and causes the big people of the world to be more afraid than to see people fighting without weapons and ammunition. This is what the Lord tells us: "Peter, put up thy sword. He that fight with the sword shall die with the sword." We intend to fight this racial discrimination with non-violence. It is the only possible means of our future existence.

The death of Dr. Luther King has shocked the whole world. When I heard of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, it shocked my modesty. My heart yearned for a man of that type. He was a man who reminded me of the Good Saviour. He tries to save others from destruction, and not to fight and kill one another. That is what we are here for. Wherever there is goodness, you will find the opposition out to destroy it. Wherever there is light, they want to shut the light out so that the world will be in darkness. The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness will not comprehend it.

May God bless Dr. Martin Luther King in his grave, and those who, he leaves to mourn, I trust that God will keep them in peace until the perfect day.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this is the second time since I have been in this House that I am going to say anything on behalf of the death of any person. I got up in support of the Resolution, but before I speak on it, I want to make it abundantly clear that I do not agree with the first two speakers (the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition) in some of the remarks they have made. But since I have got up to eulogise someone, there is no need for an argument at this stage, but at a later stage I will bring out the points with which I disagree.

It is very ironical, Mr. Speaker, that a man like Dr. Martin Luther King, who traversed the entire Universe and visited almost every State in the United States preaching peace and love, should be cut down by violence. When I first started to speak, I said that I did not agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Martin Luther King's approach to certain matters.

Some 1900 years ago, Christ was on this earth; He preached love and peace to mankind, and He ended up on a cross crucified. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am one of those people who believe that a man's shipwreck should be my lighthouse. If you went down the road and you were attacked by hooligans, I would try to avoid going down that road, unless I armed myself to fight the hooligans. Christ, it is said, knew where he was going, but I do not know if Martin Luther King knew where he was going.

I know that we have such people like Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Malcolm X - he died at the hands of a gunman, and strange enough he has never preached race violence or hatred. But you have

people like Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael - people who I support 100% - who are yet with us. You get parasites like George Wallace, Ellender of Louisiana, Stetinus of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the world is comprised of three billion people, and I can say beyond a shadow of a doubt that more than 2 1/2 billion of the people who live in this world can only see a man, as long as the colour of his skin is different from theirs, as their inferior.

It is true that Martin Luther King had - maybe he was God-inspired, but I do not know. If I, Neville Boxill, were shot down by an assassin's gun, even if I did not die, I would say that I am somewhat of a violent temper, and maybe I had met my just reward; but it is extremely difficult to believe how people can go on fooling themselves that we can fight hatred and violence with love and peace. They are just wasting time.

Christ came on this earth, Mr. Speaker; He preached up and down, and nobody paid Him any mind until He shed His blood. It is after He was crucified that people realised that He was the Messiah. I am not preaching hatred or race violence, but I am a Negro and you can see me from a mile off. If the Negro man thinks, in this world today, that he is going to achieve anything without fighting for it, then he is making a sad mistake. Do not let anybody fool himself that the criminal who shot Martin Luther Kind, hated Martin Luther King to that extent that he would have bought himself a gun with telescopic lens to shoot King. He was only carrying out the wishes of minus 18 million of the 190 million people in the United States. It is all right for people to make a lot of sweet eulogies after you are dead. King is no use to us dead. You pass legislation in a hurry, but King is no use to us dead.

Four hundred years, Mr. Speaker, is a long time for anybody to wait. We have been waiting for 400 years, and up to now all we have managed to get are the crumbs from the other fellow's table. It is time that we become more positive in our approach to these matters. From what I have said here today, I may be branded as a racist, but that is all right with me. George Wallace is branded as a racist, too, but he goes all over the States; his child can go to school free, and nobody worries about the colour of his child's skin.

I know what I am, and I know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. I have lived in the South for quite some time. The hon. junior member for St. Peter read something about when Dr. Martin Luther King came into prominence. Ironically enough, Mr. Speaker, I was in Alabama at the time. This is the kind of thing that you will get all the time. Surely, we will get more Martin Luther Kings, but it is also sure that they will be cut down by the assassin's rifle.
4.20 p.m.

Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It is because we are living in a sick society. Man has failed and the world has failed because man within himself is a failure. It is all right for us to get up and talk a lot of sweet talk, and we do not see that anybody is being any different from us and all the rest of it; but it seems to me that in this sick world in which we live, even here in this country, you see that the red-skinned, straight-hair type, although he will call you by your name and you, most likely, can call him by his first name, all of this never used to happen before, of course, - you will notice that when you are invited to the home of these people for dinner, if you are fortunate enough to be so invited, in nine out ot ten times they go from one extreme to the other. They either overdo this trying to make you believe that you belong to something or if they get a few drinks in their heads, they cannot help telling you what the position is. Well, Sir, I know what the position is because I have told you that I lived in the south of the United States and I was not there for any one day; I was there for a considerable time and I know what it is.

You see Baptist Churches for Whites only, so you are preaching to God and you have to preach to a White God. There is another thing which I have been noting. Martin Luther King was cut down just before Good Friday, somewhat reminiscent of why we were celebrating Good Friday. Sir, this is not an attack on anybody; this is how I feel. I cannot remember reading of any one Minister among us having the courage to get up in his pulpit and talk about the injustices that are being created not against humanity but against Black people. This has been going on for too long. As I said, when I began to speak, 400 years is a long time for anybody to wait. If you have more people like Martin Luther King who feel that they can achieve anything or they can achieve their objects by being pacifists, getting hit on one cheek and turning the other cheek, that is all right with me; but I support the methods of Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown, as I have said already and I will say again. I have been watching that a lot of blood has been spilled recently, and when you take a census of the amount of blood spilled, you will notice that it was only Black people's blood. We cannot go on with this nonsense all the time, fooling ourselves that what has happened in the United States will not happen in England. There are no Martin Luther Kings in England. They only thought that they pass legislation, but a human being should be treated like a human being. You will see for yourself as to members of the Democratic Labour Party, the Party which is in power how, because of political expediency, what has happened. There are four million Blacks in Rhodesia and Ian Smith went on a British battleship and told Wilson that he could fly and get wherever he could go, and he walked off the British battleship; but the British went to Uganda and kidnapped King Freddie. They sent a plane, called him to the Governor's house, put him on the plane and in England he was ostracized, vilified and everything for ten or eleven years. We have been so well brain-washed that none of us have had the courage to get up and say anything because we do not want to offend our White master, because if we say anything against the Colonial Office, when we go to

England they will not come and meet us. As far as I am concerned, I have no use for England. Those are the sort of things which you see perpetrated against us, and when I say "us", I mean people looking like you and me. We cannot go on any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Resolution because in order to win a Nobel Prize, you have to have some sort of stature and character; but, as I said before, I have never agreed with Martin Luther King's method, because Christ has been here before him and this leaves us to ask if Christ did not die in vain. Let them preach it in the pulpits; let them preach it on the housetops that I said so. I am wondering if Christ did not die in vain because Christ died so that men might be free and might live with each other. Christ died over 1,900 years ago, and a man is being hated today, not because he is a crook, not because he is a thief, but because he is black. God in his wisdom knew why he made us in this way. It may be that we are the people who will survive the atom bomb, who knows? No one can question God, but what I do not fully understand is this; in less than an hour after John F. Kennedy was shot down, Lee Oswald Harvey was shot. It is now almost a month that Martin Luther King has been shot down and a criminal Starvo Galt can still be at large. This proves conclusively that he has supporters, that it is somebody at this time who is sheltering him. You must not be surprised if you hear that he is being sheltered by George Wallace or any of the persons whose names I have called, because they will all do it. Martin Luther King was not short of that because as far as I can see, you cannot go on losing life and blood and you do not spill any. If you want to achieve anything, you must shed blood. That is how I see it. I am not a violent man, but nobody is going to make a fool of me. Don't think that you are hitting me on one cheek and I will turn the other cheek, because I do not know where I am going after I have finished.

Mr. Speaker, in support of the Resolution, I must say how deeply shocked I am, I would not say, as other speakers have said, that the world is shocked. Do not let us fool ourselves; the world was not shocked. A few people in the world, and most people like you and me are the people who felt it most because we felt that Martin Luther King was doing something in order to achieve an object. The other people felt it and, as a result, he was cut down just as you would cut down a rattle snake or something which has never contributed anything to this society.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put this question to the vote - and I propose to do it in the usual manner when we are mourning the death of any person as a Chamber - that we do so standing for two minutes; but before I actually ask hon. members to rise with me and indicate their approval of the passing of this Resolution, I will associate myself with all the sentiments contained in this Resolution, and this Resolution, hon. members will recall, reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy at the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jnr., the distinguished Civil Rights Leader in the United States of America and a Nobel Prize winner for peace;

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Barbados be asked to forward a copy of this Resolution to Dr. King's widow, to the President of the United States of America and to Rev Dr. Ralph Abernathy."

Will hon. members rise in their places for two minutes to signify the passing of this Resolution?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare this Resolution unanimously to have been passed, and, in the absence of the Clerk, I will request the Deputy Clerk to take the appropriate action without delay to ensure that the terms of this Resolution are duly and promptly carried out.
4.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the other side that the Chairman of Committees has intimated to me that he does not feel at all well, and would like to be excused from his duties as early as conveniently he can be so excused. This is the first day that he has come out of bed after an illness.

I would like to suggest that we proceed with Government Business first in which we have Committee of Supply, and after that come back to Question Time so that the Chairman would be able to get off earlier. Question Time will be fairly extensive from what I can see.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House has not told hon. members how many Questions are on the Order Paper. Surely the House can readily agree to the appointment of a Deputy Chairman.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Very well, 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 TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Reply to Question No. 49 standing in the name of the Hon. junior member for St. Joseph, Page 3, right hand column.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: To enquire of the Prime Minister:-

What is the Government's policy towards

(a) alignment.

(b) non-alignment with the countries commonly called East and West in the current cold war between them?

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

The foreign policy which the Barbados Government proposed to pursue was outlined by the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs in his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 6th December, 1966, on the occasion of the admission of Barbados to the United Nations Organisation. This address is contained in Appendix 11 of the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs for the year 1967 which was laid in Parliament on 12th March, 1968.

The various international issues on which the Government of Barbados has exhibited its independence of judgment are set out at paragraphs 28 - 40 of the Report referred to above.

The statements in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Prime Minister's address clearly indicate that in all matters of international affairs Barbados intends to pursue an independent policy and that it reserves the right to make decisions on all international issues without prejudice to or against any other state, great or small.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Supplementary Question. Does the Hon. Leader of the House really and truly believe that the Government of Barbados can pursue an independent policy in external affairs? Can anyone please Russia and the United States at the same time? That is share hypocricy. I am asking if the Government really intends to pursue an independent policy merely because the Hon. Prime Minister says that at the United Nations. Can anyone do it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are several issues involved in a question like this. No one is suggesting that Barbados, or countries bigger than Barbados can pursue the sort of policy which the Governments of the United States of America and the Soviet Union can pursue.

At the same time, if it is possible for a country, whether it is as small as Barbados or as large as any other country, to bring independent judgement to bear - that is to say judgement not directly influenced at the behest of any other power - I am saying that an independent foreign policy does not mean a totally isolated foreign policy, but a foreign policy arising out of one's own judgement of what is best for the country.

I cannot put it in any other way. I am sorry that the hon. member used the word "hypocrisy" because I do not think that it applies here any how; but that is the context in which an independent foreign policy is predicated. It is not independent of anybody else in the world or in the United Nations, but independently arrived at having regard to the particular interests of the country which are best to be served.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: The hon. member is a first class expositor of point of view in eloquent language that do not necessarily mean anything. Does he say that the policy of this Government, if Russia offered to give us a substantial sum of money to develop Barbados, and the United States offered more or Canada or Britain offered more - or say, less - would be to take the greater offer from Russia? Would he sit down in the Cabinet and agree with that?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot assist the hon. member by answering a hypothetical question. What he must do is to get the Russians to make an offer and then I may be able to answer.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: There are members on the other side who are more in touch with the Russians than I am, especially those who drink.

4.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member putting a supplementary question?

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I await it.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Does the hon. member know that? Instead of asking this side of the House to ask Russia if they will produce the money, he should ask some of his colleagues. I do not go abroad just to spend the taxpayers' money; I go to International Organisations at which I get a lot of International news.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot detect the question.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: I will put it this way. Does not the hon. member know that my informers are International people? If I make a statement, I do not make it for the sake of making a point in a debate, but because I know certain things. I know, and I put this to the hon. member if he does not know, that many non-British people are anxious to know what are the reactions of the former British Colonies towards the Cold War, because some Colonials are very glad to get rid of the British South African territories. I am putting the question, and I am asking if he does not know these facts. Some people are anxious to be finished with the British, and they say: "Let us join Russia." What is the attitude of the Barbados Government?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, with the source of information at the hon. member's command, if this were the policy of the Barbados Government, he would be the first to know it.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: I asked a simple question to get a simple answer, because other people outside of Barbados are wondering whether the West Indian Islands are so happy to throw off the British rule - as they put it, that we are on the side of Russia. That is the sole reason for asking the question. Why cannot he give a plain answer? If I were in the hon. member's position, do you think that sort of silly answer that nobody will believe would be given?

Mr. SPEAKER: No comments, please.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: I will ask my final question. Does the hon. member's answer mean that the chances of the Barbados Government coming down on the side of Russia on any question that may come before them are as great as coming down on the side of the West: Great Britain, the United States and Canada?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No greater, no lesser, Mr. Speaker.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: If that is true, then we will have to get rid of this Government by violence or other means.

DISREPAIR OF HIGHWAY AT SHOP HILL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 85 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. It is at page 5, right hand column.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the public road linking the highway at Shop Hill with the highway at Cane Garden via Ham Pond and Whitehall Village, all in the parish of St. Thomas is only partially surfaced and is generally in a very bad state of repair?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have said road repaired at the earliest opportunity?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. Only a section of the road linking Shop Hill Road with the Highway at Cane Garden is owned by Government. The remaining sections which comprise Shop Hill Tenantry Road, Ham Pond and Whitehall Village are privately owned.

2. Consideration will be given to the repair of the section of the road owned by Government when the road works programme for 1968-69 is being prepared.

CONVEYING SICK PERSONS BY AMBULANCE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 86 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. It is at page 5, right hand column.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that the ambulance service for conveying sick persons from throughout the Island to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other institutions and places for medical treatment, is hopelessly inadequate and very unsatisfactory?

2. Would Government care to centralise such ambulance service as are now available by bringing them under one or more centres of control with a view to reducing time wastage; and having such ambulances as are now available, manned to provide a 24-hour a day service?

3. Would Government consider the plight of persons requiring such ambulance services - chiefly young girls and old people - and the hours such services are found to be in demand - chiefly at night - and seek to equip the available ambulances with a wireless system for linking them to Police communications, or instal a walkie-talkie system connecting the ambulances with their own central headquarters, for efficiency of service?

4. What ambulance service (excepting police in accident cases or other emergencies) are now available to the public on Sundays and Bank-holidays?

5. Will Government examine the feasibility of providing transport services for patients leaving institutions for the sick on discharge, other than ambulance, except in cases where the patient's condition demands ambulance transport, and which should be certified by a doctor?

6. Will Government see to it that the suffering public requiring ambulance services, are not denied this through having all ambulances garage-serviced the same day?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

"1. No, Sir.

2. Yes Sir. The matter of centralisation of the ambulance service was considered over ten years ago, but rejected at that time. It has again been under consideration during the past year, and proposals for centralisation have been included in the draft Development Plan which is now under study.

3. Yes Sir. The proposals include a V.H.F. system of telecommunications.

4. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the City and Southern Districts of the Interim Commissioner's Office provide an ambulance service on Sundays and bank holidays."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: When you have a question of this sort - I am referring to the first question - and you answer "No", as the lawyers would say, you must answer distributively. Are you aware that it is hopelessly inadequate and very unsatisfactory? Are you aware that it is adequate but not hopeless? Merely to say "No" - a comprehensive "No" - to a question of this sort is not good enough. I am asking the hon. member if he does not see that "No, Sir" does not answer Question No. 1?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us how many ambulance drivers are on hand at the Mental Hospital?

4.50 p.m.

bu Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the ambulance service covering the whole island is comprised of ten units. There are three at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, two at the Police Department, two at the City Council, one at the Southern District Council, one at the Northern District Council and one at the Mental Hospital.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thank the hon. member for answering that there is one driver available at the Mental Hospital. Will the Minister tell me .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I did not say there was one driver. I said that there are ten units and I said where the ten units are, and that they are adequately served.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Would the Hon. Minister tell me how many ambulance drivers they are at the Mental Hospital? I think that this is a direct and simple question. How many ambulance drivers are they at the Mental Hospital? If the Minister does not know, he can say "I do not know," and I would be satisfied *pro tem.*

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not know. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. HUSBANDS: Is the Minister aware that on occasions when medical practitioners recommend patients to be taken to the Mental Hospital, very often when an enquiry has been sent out for an ambulance, the reply from the Mental Hospital is that there is no driver available for conveying the patient, or rather, the prospective patient, to the Hospital? Is the Minister aware of that?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thank you. Will the Minister give this House the assurance that that sort of condition will not repeat itself to the inconvenience of the public? *(A PAUSE)* Mr. Speaker, the Minister does not care to answer. May I add another supplementary question? Does the Minister know that Male Nurses have got to be requested to drive the ambulance out from the Mental Hospital to convey patients to the Hospital? Is the Minster aware that Male Nurses on duty on occasions have to act as drivers of the ambulance to convey prospective patients to the Hospital?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid any possible embarassement to the Cabinet and the country, will the Minister see that a driver for the Mental Hospital ambulance is always kept available within easy reach of Culloden Farm? *(ASIDES).*

Mr. HUSBANDS: Will the Minister investigate the case of Male Nurses having to act as ambulance drivers at the Mental Hospital?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will promise the hon. member to investigate it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Having made that promise, might I suggest to the hon. member - he did not make any promise in relation to the other question - that every time that he is in a position not to know, will the Minister ... *(ASIDES)* apart from keeping that lunatic by his side quiet, will the hon. member promise .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member .....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I withdraw that word "lunatic". *(ASIDES)*

MR. SPEAKER: The word has been withdrawn and there will be no more discussion on it. *(ASIDES)* That word was withdrawn with the promptitude with which I expect every other word that is unparliamentary to be withdrawn.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I did not know that it was necessary, that "unparliamentary"; applied to some people, it is a normal phrase.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, that is finished with. That is completed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What is this lunatic talking about? It is a normal phase.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. member must ask a question; he cannot make a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I need no advice from the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I was about to say that some calamities take place; we are subject to hurricanes sometimes. Did the Minister believe that such a calamity could ever take place, that the member for St. Thomas would ever be in that Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir. This is what I am putting to the Hon. Minister. Having answered the last question in the way in which he rightly should answer it, might I suggest to him, or is he willing to do so at all times? That is to say, "I do not know, I have not got the information, but I will seek it out." He did not do that in respect of previous questions.

Mr. HINDS: Do I understand that the Minister did not have the replies to questions 5 and 6?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The questions did not arise.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister telling this House that there are no cases where suffering members of the public requiring an ambulance, find that all ambulances have been garaged-serviced on that particular

date? Is the Minister saying that such an occasion never arose? I can give him chapter and verse and make him look like an idiot.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Minister is saying that he is not aware of this.

Mr. HINDS: That is entirely a different thing. His reply at first was that it did not arise; he is now saying that he is not aware of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed to the next supplementary question, if there is any.

Mr. HINDS: At question No. 1 the Minister's reply was "No, Sir." Is the Minister saying that the ambulance services throughout the Island are adequate?

5.00 p.m.

HON. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply was given to that question already. The hon. member is only asking the same question in a different manner.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Was it drawn to the Minister's notice that about a week ago I happened to enquire on behalf of some people in St. Joseph for the use of an ambulance, that I was told to try the Minister's department, and after having tried the St. Joseph's Ambulance, and having been told that the ambulance was in the garage being serviced, and having got hold of Mr. Mottley, the hon. member for the City, and having rung up the Police - that I had to do all those things before I could get an ambulance to bring the person down to town? Was it reported to the Minister's office?

HON. A.DaC. EDWARDS: Had it been reported something would have been on the file dealing with the matter. There is no record of this on the file.

PACKAGE TAX CHARGES

MR. SPEAKER: Question No. 91 standing in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister of Trade:

1. What representation has the Minister received from business operating in Barbados in respect of the incidence of increased Package Tax charges on goods imported into Barbados intended for re-export?

2. Will the Minister agree that there are many items forming a part of Barbados export trade especially to other Caribbean Islands on which increased Package Tax charges are absorbing a great proportion of present operating margins?

3. Is the Minister aware that unless a refund of part or all of the new Package Tax charges is made on re-exported items the export trade in these items will cease altogether in the very near future?

4. Will the Minister treat this as a matter of the greatest possible urgency and make immediate representations for the purpose of obtaining refunds of Package Tax on items bona fide imported for re-export?

HON. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

1. "Representations have been made by two companies operating in Barbados in respect of the incidence of increased Package Tax charges on goods which are imported into Barbados and then re-exported to the other islands of the Eastern Caribbean.

2. The increased rate of package tax will affect the very heavy items which cannot be warehoused and which are subsequently exported to the Leeward and Windward Islands. It is impossible to state what proportion (if any) of operating margins of companies are absorbed by the increased Package Tax charges.

3. & 4. The representations made were closely examined to discover if there was a genuine case of hardship consequent on the change in the manner of computing Package Tax charges. As a result of this investigation the Minister of Finance issued the Package Tax (Drawback of Tax) Notice, 1968, on 16th January, 1968. This Notice declares that a drawback of Package Tax paid on the importation of cylinders containing oxygen and other locally manufactured gases and iron and iron-work (including galvanised sheets) shall be allowed on the exportation of any of these articles from Barbados. Provision has been made for the retroactive payment of the drawback on cylinders with effect from 11th June, 1963, and on iron and iron-work with effect from 30th August, 1967 and the Package Tax (Drawback of Tax) Notice, 1963, has been cancelled . This Notice has been drafted in such a manner that drawback in respect of any additional articles may hereafter be made by merely amending the Schedule."

Mr. J.M.G.M.. ADAMS: I think I understand the answer. The only complaint that I would make is that this question having been asked in August, and the Order in response to the question having come down in January, it is extraordinary that it has taken until May to come before the House. I think that members on this side would wish to see the answer. I take it that the Minister is saying that although the question is well founded the necessary legislative action has already been taken to correct the abuse therein shown.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now where is the supplementary question?

HON. J. C. TUDOR: May I add something because obviously it could not have been put in the answer. I have just been told by my colleague that the chief reason for the delay was that several Ministries and departments had to work on this matter, and that is the reason why there has been this extraordinary delay in answering this particular question.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: I know that this question is addressed to the "Appropriate Minister of Trade." I understand that the junior member for St. Michael is the Minister of Trade. From now on, when I want to ask a question affecting trade must I ask the Minister of Trade, or the appropriate Minister of Trade who is apparently the Leader of the House, or some other Ministry to go into the question before I can get an answer?

HON. J. C. TUDOR: I think that the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas would appreciate that it was quite properly regarded as a fiscal matter, and while it was routed to the Ministry of Trade it had to be dealt with in the Ministry of Finance because it deals with taxation.

MR. SPEAKER: I will say this, if I may, that I would never have allowed the question to be put in this way "to enquire of the appropriate Minister of Trade." Sometimes questions are addressed to the appropriate Minister and at other times to the Minister proper. Unfortunately Mr. Clerk is not here - I cannot understand why - and I cannot have this matter checked on.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am asking whether there is more than one Minister of Trade.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no reason to believe that there is.

Mr. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: I would ask the Minister to observe that this question was really meant to be directed to the Minister of Trade. The word "appropriate" was an interpolation of the Officers of the House because I ask the Minister of Trade in paragraph 4 to make representations as Minister. Would he say that I am wrong if I take it that his Ministry is interested in promoting trade but there he has to make representation to the Ministry of Finance to allow trade to be carried on?

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: I hope that members on this side of the House or on the other side will drop the word "appropriate." They should know what Minister they are asking the question of. I am asking both the Hon. Leader of the House and my colleagues whether they do not think that it is appropriate to drop the word "appropriate."

HON. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, there is question No. 80.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph in whose name the question stands was not in his place earlier, and therefore I have not called that question yet. The hon. member intimated that he had to leave.

5.10 p.m.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No.100

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Now that a responsible authority on Sugar has pointed out the advantage that could accrue to Barbados' Sugar Industry of Barbados seeking associate membership of the European Common Market, will the Government open direct negotiations with the European Economic Community with a view to applying for such associate status?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:

The Government does not consider it appropriate at this stage to open direct negotiations with a view to seeking associate membership of the European Economic Community.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, Will the Minister answer what may be a hypothetical question, but it is this: Should Britain succeed in its application to join the Common Market, has the Ministry taken any steps to reconsider the matter?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the question of sugar is involved with the Sugar Agreement with the United Kingdom Government, and this would be dependent on whether the United Kingdom could enter into the European Economic Community with the Sugar Agreement. If she could do that, there would be no necessity for Barbados to join as a separate nation because she would be entering with the Sugar Agreement. If Britian is not allowed to enter with the Sugar Agreement, then there may be a necessity to approach the European Economic Community.

Mr. J. M. G. M ADAMS: Would the Minister agree that Britain wishes to carry the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement into the European Economic Community because she pays Barbados a smaller price than the European Economic Community sugar price? She pays a smaller price under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. Will the Minister agree with that, first of all?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The entire Commonwealth countries met at a Conference in London some time last year for a decision to be made, and it has been left open pending Britain's entry , or arrangements for her entry into the European Economic Community.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister see the point that the European Economic Community sugar price is a great deal higher than the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement sugar price and, therefore, it is in Barbados' interest to try to have the sugar price increased, not maintained, should Britain enter the Eurpean Economic Community?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I agree that there is a higher price paid to the French countries like Martinique and Gaudeloupe. They will receive higher prices in the European Economic Community than are at present paid by the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. I agree with this point.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Should we not make a new negotiation for an agreement in which we would get a price that approximates a little more closely to the special preferential price - for example, the £80 that Martinique and Gaudeloupe get per ton compared with our £42 per ton. Should we not aim at that, rather than tamely following Britain and giving her cheap sugar that she could not get if she joined the European Common Market?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any necessity, at this stage, to worry about that. We have to know exactly what is the position. We do not think the time is ripe yet. Until we know what is the exact position with the European Economic Community, we will not take further action in the matter.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF CHAIRMAN OF TOURIST BOARD

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 110, page 7 right hand column. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. What is the total cost of travel undertaken at Government expense by the present Chairman of the Tourist Board since 1962 to date?

2. What journeys to Canada were made by the person concerned between August 1st, 1966 and election day, November 3rd 1966, and how long time was spent on each occasion?

Mr. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. The total cost of travel undertaken by the present Chairman of the Tourist Board since 1962 to 7th November, 1967 is $15,561.72 from the Tourist Board's funds and in the interest of the tourist industry.

2. The Chairman made three journeys, two of ten (10) days each and one of two (2) days to Canada during the period 1st August, 1966 and 3rd November, 1966.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state what journeys were made at Government's expense? We do not want the Tourist Board's expense. We want the Expo journeys in, too, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister say whether he knows the answer?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He is looking for the information.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1966, on behalf of Expo 67 - Barbados, Montreal, New York, Barbados; August 19 - Barbados, Toronto, Montreal, New York, Barbados; July 3 - Barbados, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Montreal, New York, Barbados; September 26 - Barbados, Montreal, New York, Barbados; December 7 - Barbados, Montreal, New York, Montreal, Barbados. Those are the voyages for Expo during 1966, Mr. Speaker.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Cost?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On June 12 - $367 (Caribbean currency); on August 9 - $367; on July 3 - $551.40; September 26 - $367; December 7 - $551.40; December 9 - $110.20. That is the Montreal/Barbados trip.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, that is the cost of the tickets for travelling. Will the Minister say how much subsistence he drew on these occasions?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that off hand. If the hon. member would table a question, I would get the information for him.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: What is the meaning of that? The hon. member has tabled a question. What is the total cost of the travelling of this gentleman?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: He asked for the travelling expenses, and I gave him what is here on the file.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell us why it was necessary not to come back by Air Canada, and why it was necessary to go to New York?

5.20 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say. I have not got anything on the file stating that, and therefore I cannot go guessing at anything. If I have information, I will give correct information, and there is nothing on the file stating why the voyages were from Montreal back through New York or otherwise.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: I appreciate that answer. Will the hon. member tell why he did not ask his Department to answer the questions fully. Any Minister has got to depend on his Department. He should say: "This is a question I have to answer; get all the details for me". Did the hon. member do that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The hon. member asked the cost of travel and I have submitted the cost of

travel. I would have to refer it, when it was for the Tourist Board, to the Tourist Board for the information, and the Development Board for the information, whether it was for the Development Board, and the Ministry for Expo' 1967. That is what I have got in the file. If the hon. member would like more information, I would be glad if he would table a question, but the information according to the tabling of the question would be given to him.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Will the hon. member answer this question? Does he feel that he knows the Queen's English as much as any of his colleagues? He may be too modest to answer that, but what is meant by the word "total"? If the hon. member who asked the question merely meant the cost of a ticket, he would have asked the cost of a ticket. Did the word "total" not convey anything to the hon. member?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the question is as follows:-

1. What is the total cost of travel undertaken at Government expense by the present Chairman of the Tourist Board since 1962 to date?

2. What journeys to Canada were made by the person concerned between August 1st, 1966 and election day, November 3rd 1966, and how long a time was spent on each occasion?

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Did the hon. member not see that as you ask how long a time was spent, the questioner was asking how much money you spent in a week compared with a fortnight or a day? Was the visit to Canada necessitated being there for any particular length of time? Does the hon. member not see that? Does the hon. member not see that any question which brings in the length of time and uses the word "total," is getting at what everybody in the Island is talking about, that is, "Morgan is giving the D.L.P. money and getting it back on his visits to Canada?" Did the hon. member not know that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I can only answer the question as it was asked. I cannot have any implied meaning in the English language. I have answered the direct questions according to how they were asked. As I have already said, if the hon. member would like to have further information, he can table questions and they would be answered.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Minister would be able to help me with this supplementary. When it says: "The total cost of travel undertaken at the Government expense", does this include even paying car fares from the Airport to the hotel? Because that is travelling also. From what we have been given, we assume that it is the cost of the tickets. We want to know if this includes money paid from the Airport to the hotels and from the hotels to Expo' 1967 total cost.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is it not a fact that the Chairman of the Tourist Board has a subsistence allowance out of which supposedly travelling, such as taxi fares, are paid, and if so, would the Minister tell us now what was the subsistence allowance and what it covered?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I have already told the hon. member that that is a separate and distinct question which he is asking. It is a Statutory Board, and I would have to refer to the Board for the necessary information. I do not have the files belonging to the Tourist Board, nor those of the Development Board. What I can tell the hon. member is that the expenses at Expo' 67 were expenses divided between the Guyana Government and the Barbados Government, and I have given the figures for the expenses. It does not say anything about expenses for travelling. It says: "expenses incurred by Mr. P. G. Morgan as Commissioner General for Expo' 67". It is for travelling, but these expenses were divided between the Barbados Government and the Guyana Government for Expo' 67. The amount given here would be Barbados' share of the expenses for travelling, and that is the conjunction with the two Governments at Expo' 67.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Will the hon. member tell us how much Barbados paid and how much Guyana paid? We are only now hearing about the sharing between the two territories.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: It has been shared equally between the Barbados Government and the Guyana Government. The figures which I have called here would obviously be Barbados' share, and equal shares would have been contributed by the Guyana Government.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister state what was the nature of the tourist duration done between August and November to which he has referred in his original answer of the two ten-day visits and the two-day visit? What was the nature of the tourist promotion done two or three months in Canada which necessitated two visits of ten days each and one visit of two days?

5.30 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I have already told the hon. member. I cannot give him any more information than I have on my file. I will be prepared to answer in due course any questions that he passes over. I cannot say something out of my head. This is a Statutory Board and I will have to refer to them. If he has any more questions, submit the questions and I will answer them.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Is that the way that the hon. member answers questions, or his colleagues? Because this may be a statutory Board you do not even go through the file for the things that you ought to anticipate? Do you know anything about parliamentary Government? A Minister has to investigate everything. It is his duty not only to take up a file, but to go through the Civil Servants and anticipate every question that may be asked.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, it will be impossible to anticipate all the supplementary questions that may be asked.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If you are incapable.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The question I am trying to ask the Minister is this: What is the nature of the tourist promotion to which he referred in his original answer? Does he remember saying that three journeys were made, two of ten days and one of two days for the purpose of promoting tourism.

I am now asking what are the particular pieces of tourism promoted between then and election day 1966 that could necessitate two journeys of ten days and one of two days. What was being promoted besides the Democratic Labour Party?

Sir Grantley ADAMS: Can he give us the amount which the Government spent on Mr. Morgan and the amount that Mr. Morgan paid into the Democratic Labour Party funds for the election?

Mr. SPEAKER: That certainly could not arise in a supplementary question.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: That is so; but there is a lot of nastiness that must be exposed. That is the reason for our question. We consider that the Government spent money and did not mind what they spent because they were getting it back. Ask the electorate of Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: A question in the House cannot be directed to the electorate of Christ Church.

Sir Grantley ADAMS: I am asking him to ask the electorate of Christ Church what Mr. Morgan paid out to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sources of information are for the Minister to select for himself. Question No. 126.

Mr. CRAIG: No, Sir,

Mr. SPEAKER: I am proceeding to No. 126.

Mr. CRAIG: I was awaiting a reply. (Aside) Sit down. Oh, keep quiet, boy! Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was awaiting a reply of the Minister to a question which I had asked by way of a supplementary, and then you went on to Question 126.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I went on, and we are now at Question 126.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker -

Mr. SPEAKER: We are at Question 126 which stands in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas, Page 9, left hand column.

Mr. CRAIG: I shall bow to your ruling, but am I to understand that the Minister is not going to reply to my question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister does not have to reply. (Aside: The Speaker is only skylarking.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to let his asides be audible only to those members immediately adjacent to him, if, at all those members are interested in hearing him.

FRANKING OF INLAND LETTERS

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware -

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that I cannot hear the hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware that there is a great need for a 10 cent postage stamp in Barbados both for the purpose of franking registered Inland letters and for airmail letters to the Eastern Caribbean?

2. Will the Minister make arrangements for such a stamp to be issued forthwith?

3. Will the Minister also make arrangements for this much used value to be included in future issues of commemorative series of stamps whenever appropriate?

Mr. Speaker, this question is intended to be directed to the Minister of Communications and Works although it is printed "appropriate Minister."

Mr. SPEAKER: I apologise if it is wrongly printed.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:-

"1. No, Sir. No stamps of any value are used for franking registered or unregistered inland letters.

2. No, Sir. An examination of the effects of devaluation on postage rates is presently being undertaken, and any decision on the introduction of a ten cents stamp will have to await the results of this examination.

3. The possibility of including a ten cents stamp in future commemorative issues will be considered after the results of the examination referred to in paragraph 2 above become available."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister give the House an undertaking not to give frivolous answers in future, especially when he is too ignorant to understand what is meant by franking? Franking is a classical word used for over 300 years for what ever means of pre-or post - payment of postage. If he does not know that, he should tell his Permanent Secretary not to be frivolous in dealing with parliamentary answers.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, what is the supplementary question?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister aware that 10 ¢ postage stamps are needed for posting registered inland letters and Eastern Caribbean air mails?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Before I reply, I have a dictionary in my hand printed by Miriam Webster, the 7th New College dictionary by G. Belle & Sons and C. J. Miriam and Company. It says "frank" - to mark a piece of mail with an official signature or sign indicating the right of the sender to free mailing, to affix to mail the stamp or a marking indicating the payment of postage, to enable to post or go freely or easily.
5.40 p.m.

You do not have to use a stamp for franking. The hon. member is an expert on everything.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Do you hear that fool?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You do not use a stamp for franking, you idiot!

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Understandeth what thou readeth?

Mr. SPEAKER: The two exchanges "fool" and "idiot", I regard as having cancelled out the other, but I want a repetition of neither.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I have been watching in this House for some time, and, whenever I raise a point, Your Honour says that you do not want any directions from me. According to May's Parliamentary Ruling, you can only ask two supplementary questions in the House. I am answering two, and I am finished with answering supplementary questions; but in order to deal with the hon. junior member for St. James' question, as I had promised - -

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Can't you read?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He ought to be the last person to come in here to talk about people being able to read and write. He has done all in his power to stop people from being able to read and write. When he held the portfolio for - -

Mr. SPEAKER: What question is the hon. member for St. Thomas purporting to answer?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The one asked by the Leader of the Opposition. He wants to know if I can understand what I have read. I can understand better than he, because I am much younger and more agile than he is.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I much regret that I have called the junior member for St. Thomas a fool. It is both unnecessary, redundant, and, perhaps, ignorant on my part because I do not think hon. members of the House or the general public need to hear of that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making a personal explanation?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am apologising to you, Sir, for the outbreak of disorder which undoubtedly characterised my annoyance with the Minister. He read out a definition for franking, and then he went on to say that you do not have to put a stamp on mails.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I expect that the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Michael will encourage the hon. junior member for St. Thomas in his misunderstanding. I expect that, and I will give way -- *(Asides.)*

Hon. N. W. BOXILL rose --

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You cannot be on your feet when it is Question Time. *(ASIDES).*

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended, in view of grave disorder, for twenty minutes.
5.50 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, do I take the Minister's answer to mean that he has anticipated that the postal rates will go up in Barbados either in the near, middle or distant future, and if so, how soon does he expect that the recommendations of the responsible Advisory Body will be in his hands?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, before I answer the question, I must first make an apology to the Chair for what took place just now, and I guess that the Chair will accept the unfortunate episode in the best light; but as I have said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I accept it in the spirit in which it is made, which I regard as a gracious spirit.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As I said before, we are running our Parliament on British Parliamentary democracy, whatever that means, and in the House of Commons a member puts a question and he is allowed to ask two supplementary questions. I am quite willing to answer any question pertaining to my Ministry, but I have told hon. members that I am not going to be bombarded with questions as if it is some inquisition. You are only allowed to ask two supplementary questions, and they must pick out which of the two questions suit the particular thing which they want to get at best, or they must come in with a fresh question. I will endeavour to answer the question which the hon. member has just put, but I am giving the assurance that after I have laid a reply, I am answering two questions and that is not being impolite. That happens in the democracy in which we have our parliament being run. They answer two questions and I will answer two.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the hon. member proceeds, let me say that there is a Standing all-Party Committee of this House which is revising the Standing Orders, and amongst other things which we may consider is whether we should limit the number of supplementary questions. At present (a) the number is not limited; (b) a Minister need not answer any supplementary question; and (c) there is no time limit for the answering of any questions.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question which has just been asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, I could not answer that directly by saying "yes". As I said, "the possibility of including a ten cents stamp in future commemorative issues will be considered after the results of the examination referred to in paragraph (2) above become available." We had a gentleman from the British Postal Service down here examining our Postal Services to bring them up to standard in our getting out mail and so on, but I do not see this as any indication that the Postal rates will be going up or anything like that. If the trend is that, because of the cost of living and the devaluation of the pound and so on, the price of stamps has to go up, we cannot avoid it because you must post mails. My Ministry is presently concerned with keeping things down to the minimum as far as postage for the general public is concerned.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, when I rose, I should also have expressed my apologies to the House because I had already made peace, so to speak, with the Minister, and I neglected in the temporary euphoria of the moment, to express my apologies to the Chair for having contributed to the disorder. I join with the Minister in my regret that the atmosphere of the House should have been marred by unseemly conduct.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is also greatly appreciated, but I rather felt that we had returned so refreshed and so exuberant that we had not yet got quite into our normal stride. (Laughter).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can I ask the Minister if it is not anticipated that the postage rates will be changed? Why should there be an objection to issuing ten cents stamps at least in commemorative series? They are in very great demand.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The answer to that is that we do not object to issuing ten cents stamps. As I said before, we are going into it. What has happened is that the hon. member is a philatelist. I would say..

Mr. SPEAKER: A philanthropist or a philatelist?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: A philatelist? He knows something about stamps, but he also knows this; that if we were to crowd the market with too many stamps, we have sometimes found that it has not taken too well, and as the hon. member is well aware, the stamp business is a money-making affair. I intend to make as much money as possible out of stamps for the country, but we do not want to put out a stamp on the market which will eventually turn out to be a flop. I do not know if I have any figures which I can give the hon. member at the moment, but we are examining the possibility of bringing out certain stamps for certain times. We have two issues with which we shall come out; we have a commemorative issue and we have a definitive issue. We have to be more than careful that we do not get one overlaping the other, because we will have stamps printed, and I do not want to find myself in the same position as other Ministers, who held similar portfolios, found themselves, The only bars I like happen to be shirt bars; so I have to be more than careful as to what I do with the finances of the country stampwise; but wherever practicable and possible I will put out a stamp to suit the community. We will have to put out something which we are sure we will make money on. We do not want to print stamps just because somebody feels that we should print stamps. As soon as we have a look at these stamps, we will most likely bring out a ten-cents stamp because all the West Indies Islands most likely will come out with ten-cents stamps.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister agree that a ten-cents stamp is infinitely more useful than a fifteen cents stamp? There is no postage rate, to the best of my knowledge, other than the air letter to England.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I have broken my promise. However, I am saying that I am agreeing with the hon. member, but it does not necessarily mean that I am right or that he is right. We can both be wrong. I do know that the postage on an airmail form to Canada is fifteen cents and quite a number of us have relatives in Canada and some try not to put on a twenty-five cents stamp. They put on a fifteen-cents stamp. The hon. member does not have to worry. I do not know if he has had a little wire about this. I do know how ubiquitous he is. (A MEMBER: He has a dictionary and he can look it up.) The hon. member most likely might have heard that this matter might be examined, or that it is being examined at this moment, and therefore he wants to steal my thunder. I can assure him that he cannot steal it quite so easily.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am not a stamp expert; such stamps as I have ever collected I have turned over to the hon. member for St. Thomas years and years ago. (Mr. SPEAKER: Which hon. member for St. Thomas?) The senior member for St. Thomas. I would have turned over to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas if I thought it would add to his education. *(Laughter).* I thank God that he has got sense enough to laugh at that instead of going off to defend. I would like to ask the hon. member this. Sometimes I have made use of fifteen-cents stamps and others must have done so, and sometimes I have made use of a twenty-five cents stamp. If you have a fifteen-cents stamp, what is wrong in having a ten-cents stamp? Sometimes you have to take three-cents stamps and even cent stamps and push them all around the envelope if you have not got the appropriate

stamp at the time. Does the hon. member know that far from stamps becoming superfluous, people make stamps? Some years ago, I remember it being brought to my notice that St. Vincent was being told by the Colonial Office that they depend on too much of the revenue from stamps. There is nothing to prevent us from making a ten-cents stamp as it is asked for. Your Honour will pardon me for expanding the question so much, but if the public say: "We would like a ten-cents stamp," what principle is involved? You make it. I suggest to the hon. member that this is how the Cabinet should look at it. If people say that they can do with a ten-cents stamp, you make it. You cannot lose. People all over the world when they hear that a stamp is issued, they send to the Post Office for a few thousand of them, ten thousand and so on. Most stamp collectors are lunatics.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member not forget his question at the end.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Well, I repeat: does the hon. member not feel that if people ask for this stamp he should give them?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a bit rhetorical. I have never said that there will not be a ten-cents stamp. Because the hon. member says that people are clamouring for a ten-cents stamp, it does not necessarily mean that we have got to go into it. We may have to examine it; we just do not do things by guess. After all, this is the people's finances that we are spending. Nobody prints stamps for us for nothing. We have to pay the people in England a lot of money for printing stamps. As I said before, when the hon. member was not in the Chamber, I intend to make money out of stamps. I am not printing stamps just for the beauty of printing stamps. We have to make money out of printing stamps. We have two issues of stamps now and we had to postpone the introduction of them. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas knows that we do not bring them at any time because we do not want to conflict with these things. As far as I know, a year has four seasons. We do not bring down a stamp every season. We bring down a stamp for an average of about three months sometimes, and when we put a stamp on the market we want to make money out of it.

6.20 p.m.

Yes, I know we make money; but we have had stamps that we did not make money from. The Hon senior member for St. Thomas can bear that out. We have to examine these things most thoroughly before we can bring out stamps. As I have said we have had stamps that did not make money because they were not as beautiful to the philatelists as we thought they would have been.

I have not told the House that there will be definately no 10¢ stamps. We are examining it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: One last question. Is the Minister aware that there are hundreds of people, not only in this country, who would like two dollar notes? If the question was: "Would you print two dollar notes," would you say that they would not pay? The same thing applies to 10¢ stamps.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I cannot see how the two questions can be analogous. Two dollars is money if it is in Chinese yen. A two dollar bill in now a rarity and everybody would try to get one to keep as a souvenir. Philatelists do not keep stamps as souvenirs. They try to make money out of stamps.

ARRIVAL OF NON-BARBADIANS BY YACHTS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 138 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. How many non-Barbadians arrived in this Island by yacht in each year 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967?

2. How many such persons have remained and taken up residence in the Island after the departure of the yacht by which they came?

3. How many of those remaining have since been granted permanent residence?

4. How many have taken up employment in this Island?

5. What is the occupation of each such person who has taken up employment?

6. Are any of the jobs such persons are engaged in beyond the capacity or ability of Barbadians to perform?

7. Were work permits or any form of permission given by the Ministry of Home Affairs to those who took up employment here?

8. If the answer to No. 6 is in the negative, will the Minister state the circumstances which did influence the issuing of a work permit in each case?

9. How many, among those allowed to work here are employed by Government?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. It is not possible to supply the information in respect of the year 1961 and the first half of the year 1962, as the records are no longer available but information in respect of the latter part of 1962 and the other years is as follows:-

Year	Number of Persons
1962	317
1963	261
1964	309

Year	Number of Persons
1965	656
1966	377
1967	538

2. Thirteen, Sir.

3. None, Sir.

4. Three, Sir.

5. (a) Civil Engineer.
(b) Yacht charterer.
(c) Teacher.

6. No, Sir.

7. Yes, Sir.

8. Work permits are always considered on the basis of need and availability of skills.

9. None, Sir."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I ask whether the absence of records was due to a fire so that they were not available? If I may put it more simply, what caused these records not to be available?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I understand that they usually keep records only for three years back.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker am I to understand from the Minister that of the 13 persons remaining as referred to in No. 2 and three of whom have taken up employment have been granted permanent residence?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing here showing whether they have taken up permanent residence. I would figure that if they are working in the island they would be resident. I do not know to what extent they will be permanent. Work permits are usually issued without any period of time.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Would the Minister say what section of the Act gives the Government or the Police power to issue work permits? What is a work permit in law?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked, in so far as work permits are concerned in the Immigration Act 1962, there is no provision for work permits as such in the Immigration Act. Although it has been said that work permits are issued, it is a misnomer. There are no work permits as such in the Immigration Act of 1952, but it still functions very effectively.
6.30 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If there is no law, I thought the Hon. Minister would have said: "Nobody knows the answer to that question except God, and no human agency knows the answer." In view of what the Hon. Minister has said, what is the principle on which they are issued? "We have enough carpenters in this Island; therefore, we are not giving you a permit to enter and work as a carpenter - Is that the policy? "We do not have enough masons; therefore, we will give you a work permit to enter and work as a mason" - Is that the policy?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very serious about this matter. Whenever you have smoke, there is something with fire behind it. With regard to the question of work permits, there is no such thing in law, as the Minister says, and it is true. Therefore it is the policy of the Government, as I understand it, to issue work permits only to those persons who are doing work that we do not have persons here capable of doing.

On the question of these work permits, is this a matter for the Cabinet, or the Minister alone? It is the policy of the Government, and I think the whole Opposition will agree with the policy, that if people in Barbados can do a job, then it should not be given to anybody else. I agree with that. Is this the function of a Minister - we have been hearing a lot of funny things - or the function of the Cabinet?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: It is the function of the Minister.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state whether the decision in each individual case is made by the Minister personally, or by a Civil Servant: whether the Chief Immigration Officer, or the Permanent Secretary?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: As far as I know, by the Immigration Authorities after reference to the Minister of Home Affairs, and not the Cabinet. Matters are referred by the Immigration Department to the Minister of Home Affairs.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Minister stated that there are no circumstances under which the Immigration Officer could grant a permit to work in Barbados without referring each individual case to the Minister of Home Affairs.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I do not know. Usually the cases are referred to the Minister, but I cannot say whether this has been done on each occasion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state under what section of the law a person who comes here as a visitor, intransit, or seeking medical treatment, or for any other purpose as set out in Section 12, can be prevented from working? What legal sanction is there to stop a visitor to the Island from working?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make my position perfectly clear. It seems to me as though one can so easily be misunderstood. There are no work permits as such. That is what I have said, but it functions under the Immigration Act of 1952. There is legislation, but no work permits as such. The

procedure is that an application is made to the Immigration Department and the Police, and it is processed to the Minister, eventually, with the necessary recommendations, and then the Minister of Home Affairs goes into the matter and makes a decision. It does not usually go before the Cabinet, except in a very extraordinary case. The question asked was.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The question asked was: What is there in the law to stop a visitor from working? What is in the Immigration Act of 1952, for example, to justify the Prime Minister and Minister of Financial Affairs stopping a masseur from working in Barbados?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the question is: What would prevent a visitor from working during such time as he was allowed to remain? The Police would catch up with him eventually.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Minister does not seem to understand the question. I am suggesting that the law does not stop visitors from working. Once you are lawfully in Barbados, as long as your Entry Visa has not been specifically conditioned against work, once you are lawfully here, whether as a guest at the Hilton, whether you came on a yacht, or on two days with a West Indies team as a masseur, you cannot lawfully be stopped from working.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would like to ask the Hon. Minister this: If fellows come up from Trinidad for races, and they said that they like Barbados and decided to remain here and work, would they be committing an offence? Could any policeman arrest them?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, when a visitor enters this country, he is given a specific period, in the first instance. If he fails to conform with the requirements of the law, or breaks any of the Regulations and conditions under which he has been granted permission to remain, he is peremptorily ejected.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us if the Ministry of Home Affairs has been receiving applications directly from the hands of lawyers on behalf of persons who are now employed at West Coast Hotels? I will repeat it; I do not want the Minister to misunderstand me. Has the Minister of Home Affairs been receiving applications directly from the hands of certain lawyers on behalf of persons who are now working at West Coast Hotels in this Island?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Not to my knowledge. I cannot say whether it is so or not.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister be able to say if Mr. Pouchant, the Assistant Manager of Coral Reef Club, applied for a work permit after seeing the job advertised in a Barbados Newspaper? He left Barbados for one week and returned for the job.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, again, I am not in the position to answer the question.

Mr. HINDS: Do these hotel workers have to make their applications to the Immigration Authorities, or do lawyers make them direct to Minister? That is all we want to hear.

6.40 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: As far as I know, it is made through the Immigration Department. (Mr. HINDS: It is not so.) There is a regular form when an application is made to the Immigration Department. To the best of my knowledge, I have not heard of any other procedure. It is made through the Immigration Department and forwarded to the Ministry.

Mr. CRAIG: There is another supplementary. Wil the Minister be able to state if he is aware of the fact that St. Lucians, Vincentians and Dominicans are harassed daily by the Immigration Authorities when they are working here?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: There are a certain number of St. Lucians and Vincentians who, under agreement, come into the Island during the crop period with an understanding to return home at the end of the crop. I do not know if it might be a part of those who have come in legally to work during the crop and they have not left the Island. I cannot say directly. It might be some of them or some others who came in in accordance with the regulations agreed to by the various Governments for coming into Barbados to work during the crop season on arrangements being made with certain estates to be responsible actually for receiving and looking after them while they are in the Island. There might be others who come in, not in these groups, and therefore the Police more than likely, will be catching up with them; but there are a certain number both from St. Vincent and St. Lucia who come to the Island yearly to work in the crop.

IMPORTATION OF RICE FROM ST. VINCENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question to which the reply is ready, is question No. 146, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. That will be found on page twelve of the Order Paper at the bottom left-hand corner.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Trade:-

1. Is the Minister aware that the consignee of a quantity of high quality rice imported from St. Vincent for the purpose of festivities surrounding a Muslim wedding due to have taken place on January 25,1968, has been refused permission by the Ministry of Trade to import it into Barbados, and that the rice (which has been already paid for by the consignee) has for some months been held in an airline warehouse?

2. In the special circumstances of the case, will the Minister give permission for the importation of the said rice?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:

1. Government is aware that 720 lbs of Uncle Ben's Rice, a product of the United States of America, was imported from St. Vincent into the Island without the necessary import licence being first obtained. This was in contravention of the Export and Imports (Restriction) Act, 1939.

2. No, Sir."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, would the Minister agree that the rice was not imported for commerical purposes, and would the Minister agree that the rice was imported in ignorance of the fact that rice is now a generally prohibited commodity? Let the hon. Minister answer those two questions.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas should well know that ignorance of the law is no excuse, and to tell one in this country that 720 lbs of Uncle Ben's Rice at a cost landed in Barbados exceeding 53 cents a pound - when in countries like Guyana with a larger percentage of the Muslim population must use this rice - as Minister of Trade, would anybody in Barbados believe that I would sit down and accept that? I definitely would not.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: I take it that the Minister is saying that he knew they were doing wrong. Will the Minister accept that this particular case was the first time that I was aware of this? I am a lawyer and I read every piece of legislation and of subsidiary legislation; perhaps I am even more familiar with both the Act and with the Regulations which he has sited than he is. Will he accept that this was the first time that I knew that Uncle Ben's rice was now the subject of a stop Order? It has not been the subject of a stop Order for a very long time, and in view of the special, compassionate circumstances that their were a thousand guests who wanted a slightly better quality rice, Uncle' Ben's rice, and it has already been paid for and was being paid for in the Airlines warehouse - What I am suggesting to the Minister is that, as a compassionate gesture, not as a gesture that it is right to defy the laws of Barbados, the rice should be allowed to come into Barbados. The man actually paid for it for his wedding.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I have already told the hon. member that as Minister of Trade, I say "No," and I mean "No. I am not allowing hotels to import Uncle Ben's rice in Barbados. We have a Rice Agreement with Guyana and I stick very closely to my agreements. I am satisfied that they are producing a quality rice today to cope with any rice which is imported from any place, and in accordance with my agreement, I refuse to accept any person bringing in any other kind because it is a violation.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I ask the Hon. Minister whether the agreement with Guyana is for the purpose of maintaining Guyana's trade with Barbados? If I were coming into this Island and I had a gift of ten pounds of rice, let us say, would I be stopped from bringing it in?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Trade I would not have any objection to a gift or something like that coming in, of ten pounds of rice, but it is imported from a hard currency area just around the same time as devaluation, when a lot of merchants in Barbados have been making approaches to the Ministry for the purpose of importing Uncle Ben's rice in the Island, and I have been refusing them. The agent for Uncle Ben's rice in this area actually sat in my Ministry and told me that he would get it in otherwise. In other words, if St. Vincent which is a country which is under the Agreement, allows Uncle Ben's rice to come in, and they are going to use St. Vincent to tranship rice in here, they are not going to do it with me as Minister of Trade.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I will phrase my question differently. If the Ministry of Trade is convinced that rice is being imported, not for commercial purposes, if people choose to have a ton of rice to throw on wedding guests, would that be stopped? (ASIDES). The whole object of the Agreement with Guyana is for commercial purposes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: All of these Agreements would have to be for commercial purposes, and if in the same Agreement for commercial purposes, Guyana is supplying us with rice and this is under consideration at nearly every annual meeting as to the price, one of the conditions in the trade was that they would produce rice suitable and comparable with any from the United States of America. As to that particular rice, I checked on it, and the price ran into about 54 cents a pound. It is from a hard currency area and it is in violation of the Agreement which I have got with Guyana. I am not satisfied that 720 lbs of rice even for a wedding - as a matter of fact I would say that the first thing that I asked the owner of the rice was what was he doing in Barbados, and his profession, and he told me that he was a Commission Agent.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: The Minister has quoted this price of 54 cents a pound. Would the Minister agree that the price worked out at 54 cents a pound because the people went to the trouble of having the rice flown here? It was flown here specially to be used at the wedding.

6.50 p.m.

HON. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the owners of the rice must have made approaches here in Barbados first of all to supermarkets and other places in the island and must have been told that Uncle Ben rice is not allowed in the island. I refused to let them bring it into the island. I am not giving it to them. It was just using what I would call a "long head" over us.

MR. CRAIG: This is a supplementary. Would the Hon. Minister put a control on the importation of American sugar such as is imported by the Hilton Hotel from Puerto Rico due to the fact that Barbados is a sugar producing place?

HON. G.G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, we have no sugar refineries in Barbados. We have nothing to compete with the refined sugar imported into this country for the tourist industry that is an essential revenue earner in this country, and as long as it is something for the country to benefit from, I will be prepared to issue licences for it.

If we were producing sugar of that quality, or it was available from any British source or in the CARIFTA area, I would stop that from coming in too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister answered before I had time to tell him that I did not regard that question as a supplementary. This is apropos of rice. If you are going to bring in sugar, why not bring in salt and peppers? This has to do with rice.

MR. J. M. G. ADAMS: Does the Minister think that Tate & Lyle sugar made from sugar produced in the West Indies is of a worse quality than Puerto Rican sugar?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not regard that as supplementary - not a supplementary on rice.

MR. J. M. G. ADAMS: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The Minister said that the rice compares in quality with Guyana rice. Why are the super markets and wholesalers crying out to be allowed to import rice if Guyana rice is just as good? Will the Minister say if it is a fact that a license to import Uncle Ben rice was given at the start when the order came into force?

HON. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I attended a conference in December 1966 in Guyana and they were prepared to carry out experiments to produce rice comparable to Uncle Ben rice. Under that agreement I guaranteed that if they produced a quality of rice comparable with or equivalent to Uncle Ben's rice, I would grant no licence for the importation of Uncle Ben's rice. That was one of the conditions. We were in the position of getting a far better price, and in consideration of that we would give them all the importation of rice into Barbados, provided that could cope with the quality required.

During that period a few hotels were complaining about it and they were allowed to bring in a little other rice; but after the last Rice Conference no licenses at all have been given, not even to hotels. Most people were satisfied that they were getting good enough results from Guyana rice. No licences at all have been granted for the importation of U. S. rice - Uncle Ben or any other rices.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Has the Minister ever enquired of the learned Attorney General how far he can go in making Agreements in restraint of trade? How far legally can he go? I mean that as a serious question. A lot of illegal things are happening for the sake of peace. The lawyers on this side have been keeping quiet so far, but they will not always keep quiet. I am trying to get an answer from the Minister.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not like Agreements. Anything that involves any legal matters is referred to the Crown Law Officers and the Attorney General. I am not a lawyer. Therefore anything like an Agreement is vetted by them and not by me.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Therefore it comes to this: the Minister has done his part and passed on the Agreement to the Attorney General. Has he been told by the Attorney General that there are certain Agreements in restraint of trade which you cannot make? Has he ever been told that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I agree with that - Agreements in respect of GATT, for example.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say that the Hon. Minister is so quick at replies that he does not wait for me to say if I deem a question not to be supplementary. Anyhow the Minister has answered. Question No. 141 standing in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas, Page 11, left hand column.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Trade:

Now that Barbados is Independent, does the Minister consider that there is any justification in continuing to forbid the importation of any goods from the list of countries set out in the first Schedule to the Exports and Imports (Open Import Licences) Order, 1962?

If the Minister considers that such a restriction still to be necessary, will he state what is the justification for including Japan in a list of Communist Countries and excluding Cuba, Yugoslavia and North Vietnam?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

1. There has never been any prohibition against the importation of goods from the countries set out in the First Schedule to the Exports and Imports (Open Import Licence) Order, 1962. Goods from these countries have been imported on special licence. The only countries from which the importation of goods is prohibited are Rhodesia and South Africa.

2. Does not arise.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That will not do. Will the Minister agree that there is a prohibition of the importation of goods without licences? If he wants the words "without licences" I will ask him a supplementary on that. There are places from which you cannot import goods - places like Albania, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the U.S.S.R. Japan is on this list. What justification is there for putting Japan on this list, which is a standard list circulated to Colonial terri-

tories forbidding imports from Communist countries. What is the basis of including Japan in the Communist stop list?

You can only import goods from those Communist countries with the Minister's licence. I appeal to the Minister to reconsider his answer that Paragraph 2 does not arise.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to know why Japan is under licence. If we are in a developing area, and if the prices from Japan or any other country were such as to stop development within this country, the Government would have every right to put them under control, to put restriction on them.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There are hundreds of countries in Japan's position. Will the Minister agree that imports into Barbados are controlled in two ways? Firstly, you control the import by reference to its nature. For example, you cannot import rice from anywhere except Guyana without a licence. Secondly you control the Import according to its country of origin. This is a Communist stop list which also includes Japan plus Rhodesia and South Africa.

You control imports in two ways. One is economic and the second is political. Will the Minister agree that the answer that he has just given is appropriate to the economic control relating to certain types of goods? If he agreed with this, will he accept that this question is about political control?
7.00 p.m.

Why is Japan on the Communist stop-list? It is an insult to the Japanese Ambassador; it is an insult to Japan with whom we have just opened diplomatic relations. Will he agree that the First Schedule to the Export and Imports (General Open Import Licence) Order is a political stop-list instituted by the Colonial Office before we were Independent?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, all exports from Communist countries are controlled by State trade organisations, and the prices of the exports are often determined by considerations other than production cost, with the result that goods are dumped on the imported market at cheap prices aimed at disrupting the economics of non-Communist countries.

After all competitive goods have been ousted, the prices are increased substantially thereby causing an abrupt reduction in essential imports from a wide range of non-essential imports which could well weaken a country's position, especially underdeveloped countries, to resist other pressures from the Communist bloc particularly if at the same time it has become dependent on the price of the market for its exports.

This, fortunately, was not the case with Barbados. As far as Japan is concerned, liberalisation of trade with Japan would encourage greater imports from that country, especially in footwear and cotton piece goods. The restricting of trade from Japan is considered necessary to protect the local footwear and cotton industries, and to prevent any adverse effects on our Foreign Exchange resources because of the lack of reciprocal trade from certain countries.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister: How does the use of a Communist stop-list square with the answer given earlier by the Leader of the House that the position of this country since Independence is to be independent of either the East or the West? How can you have a Communist stop-list when you are not taking sides?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Hon. Minister read that out, my respect for Mr. McConney goes down a bit. I certainly appreciate the first part of his answer. That has been a political argument which has been circulated to innumerable Permanent Secretaries by the Colonial Office in days to prevent imports from Communist Countries.

The second part of his answer relating to Japan is not in harmony with the first. Japan has no State trading organisation. Will the Minister agree with that? Cotton piece goods can be restricted by licence directed to cotton piece goods. The position as it is at present, Mr. Speaker, is that you cannot import cotton piece goods from Cuba anyhow, because Cuba is subject to quantitive restrictions in its own right. The situation now is that you can import sugar from Cuba, if you want to. Cuba is not on the Communist stop-list. Cuba has the State trading organisation, and you can import freely from Cuba. But why should Japan be on this stop-list? China, Mr. Speaker, is not on the stop-list. Does the Hon. Minister know that?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: While the hon. senior member for St. Thomas approached Japan as a non-Communist country, we included it in this. China is included, and this obviously must have been overlooked by us. Japan is included in it by error. You have Albania, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Hungary, Japan, North Korea, Poland, The Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. Japan should not have been included.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It is one of those simple oversights; it is a hangover from the Colonial days, and we have not yet got around to eliminating it. That is the simple position.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is nonsensical, and we shall have to change it.

CREATION OF SILENT ZONE NEAR QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 137 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George. It is on page 10, left hand column.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

!. Is the Minister aware of the inconvenience and difficulty caused to recuperating patients and to Nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (especially when the said nurses are receiving telephone calls in connection with their duties) due to the noise of vehicular traffic on the highways adjacent to this institution?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have the portion of the highway known as Martindale's Road from the entrance of St. Michael's Girl School to the junction of River Road and Wellington Street declared a Silent Zone?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Ministry has under consideration the designation and marking of appropriate area in the vicinity of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as "Hospital" or "Silent" Zones. Legislation has already been drafted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, arising out of that, until such legislation is drafted and passed, will the Minister agree that special constables should be posted within the area? There is a lot in what the hon. member has said. I have received those complaints, too. Even diagnosing cases in the Casualty Department is difficult for doctors.
7.10 p.m.
I asked if the Minister would appreciate the fact that legislation is being drafted between now and Christmas. *(ASIDES)*. It is a teaching hospital and the doctors complain that you cannot diagnose the case of an accident within the Casualty.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister caught it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not enough because I cannot rule whether it is in order or not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that you know it is in order. As long as that Minister stands on his feet it is in order, otherwise he would call me to order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no doubt that he was appealing to the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The question is a very simple one. The Minister says that legislation is being drafted to the effect. I know that legislation is being drafted for the salaries of the Clergymen for ten years.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I think I did say that legislation has already been drafted. The hon. member's point is well taken and we realise the necessity for having that area made a Silent Zone. I think it is regarded as a silent zone by a lot of people already, but we are bringing down legislation to ensure that it is enforced and regarded as a silent zone. Until such time that the necessary suggestion will be adopted, I will recommend that to the Minister of Communications & Works.

COMPOUNDING OF PRESCRIPTIONS AT QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question to which the reply has been laid is question No.134, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James, to be found on page 9, in the right hand column.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I heard that called long ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, the hon. member should be ready now.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that members of the general public have to wait for long hours - sometimes more than a day - before prescriptions are compounded for them at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

2. Will the Minister agree that the circumstance above referred to is due to the shortage of dispensing staff?

3. Will the Minister look into this matter and have this state of affairs remedied as soon as possible?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:

1. Yes, Sir. Only in very rare instances, however, such as the non-availability of specific drugs, are patients unable to obtain medicines in one day.

2. Yes, Sir. The damand for dispensing services has increased considerably both in the number of prescriptions and in the complexity thereof.

3. My Ministry is at present reviewing the organisation and methods of the various departments of the Hospital with a view to coping efficiently with the demands which are made on their services. Plans are presently being formulated for the development of the Out- patient's Clinics and Dispensaries in the rural areas, which are designed to relieve the pressure on similar services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital".

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Minister's reference to the non-availability of specific drugs, is that term to be taken to mean cheap drugs?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It does not necessarily carry that inference. There are doctors and doctors

each having his own pet theories, and you find them prescribing various drugs which serves a similar purpose. There are some doctors who will order a specific drug whereas another one which is available can serve the same purpose. Each doctor has his own pet theory and that will build up the cost of running that Department.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Has the Minister or the Department got the doctors in Cabinet and after hearing their views, decide on what drugs they should get in knowing that "A" will want "B's" drugs and "B" will want "C's" drugs and so on? The way in which the hon. member has put it, it is as if vaguely a doctor might come along and say "I do not want this, I want that." Can't they get all the doctors together and let them say? One likes Aspirin, somebody else likes Dispirin and so on - and then we will agree as to how much Aspirin and how much Dispirin to have?

Mr. HINDS: Will the Minister deny that a circular has gone out from his Ministry directing the doctors against prescribing certain drugs for patients because of the high cost of those drugs?

Hon. C . E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think that the Minister would be aware of that. Is the Minister aware that there is a pharmaceutical book used at the Hospital from which doctors are asked to use drugs as closely as possible? What I want to get straight is this; human beings differ in their make-up and the like. With the high percentage of hypertension, blood pressure and so on, a potency of five percent milligrammes out might be very much greater than the five percent otherwise, and one doctor prefers to use that. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that I have always fought that question, and the Minister himself, I believe, helped me to fight that question in here at one time. I do not believe in pinning down a doctor to using a particular drug house if he feels that certain drugs react better or that people react better to certain drugs. Is it not a fact that this book is being used at the Hospital and that the doctors are told to use a particular drug? I can call the names of a tremendous lot of them. I am not surprised that they want it because they tried to shut down the whole of the Bridgetown City Council from giving drugs there, and therefore they have three thousand people more. Nothing is being done and three thousand more have to go up there. That is the whole trouble.
7.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 133 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James Page 9 right hand column.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware that there is growing dissatisfaction among the staff at the dispensary at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as to (a) their conditions of employment; (b) their salaries; and (c) the shortage of dispensing staff?

2. Will the Minister investigate these circumstances and take such steps as are necessary to alleviate their grievances?

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

"1. No, Sir. Three members of the dispensary staff last year requested salary adjustments to give recognition to previous service with qualifications.

2. The staff structure and salaries of the dispensing services will be examined in the context of a comprehensive review of technical services."

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary. Is the Minister aware then that Orderlies at the Hospital assist dispensers in the compounding of drugs?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would hardly expect an Orderly to assist a dispenser. The Director has reported that there is no evidence of dissatisfaction among the dispensing staff except as in regard to salaries. The junior staff are usually concerned with the failure of their requests for incremental credit for years of qualified service. This is aggravated because incremental credit has been given to dispensers working a non-pensionable basis.

In so far as shortage of staff is concerned, the comment of the Director is that the dispensing staff, as well as most of the Hospital staff, are aware that the Ministry is investigating the numbers and categories of staff of various sections of the hospital.

Mr. CRAIG: Perhaps I can help the Minister in this. Is the Minister aware that when they are about to revise the salaries of the dispensers, they have been telephoning drug houses in Bridgetown asking what are the salaries of the druggists in the City drug stores and basing their salaries on those of druggists in the City without taking into account the fact that many druggists in the City are people who are not qualified, but people who are drug sellers. Therefore dissension is coming into the Hospital because of the low salaries paid. Can the Minister say anything on that?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Minister, unlike the hon. member who has just sat down, has no control as far as the fixing of salaries is concerned. I will have it investigated and let him know what the procedure is. I definitely do not agree with fixing salaries of qualified dispensers on the basis of those who are not qualified. I will look into the matter and let him know as soon as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 151 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, Page 11 right hand column.

STANDPIPE AT ROCK DUNDO

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Will Government seek to have installed a Standpipe at First Gap, Rock Dundo, St. Peter for use by residents in the area?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

There is at present a standpipe in First Gap near its junction with Rock Dundo Road. Consideration will however be given to the installation of an additional standpipe at the other end of First Gap when the Additional Mains and Standposts Programme for 1968-69 is being prepared.

Mr. HINDS: I thank the Hon. Minister, but it seems that we are at variance about this gap.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will he say that "the gap I mean is so-and-so?"

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister aware that I meant the gap next to Mr. Bovell's garage, which is the first gap after you pass Highway 2?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Apparently the syntax of the question got lost some where between "First Gap" and the first gap. Which gap? If the hon. member for St. Peter will tell me exactly where the gap is - before I sit down I would like to impress on the hon. member and on all members of this Chamber - because I was castigated about some person wasting water in St. Peter - that there is a dire water shortage in the entire world.

It is not in Barbados alone; it is even in Guyana with all its rivers. I am asking all the representatives to ask all the people not to waste water not because it belongs to the Democratic Labour Party; it belongs to all of us.

7.30 p.m.

PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AT PALMETTO SQUARE

Mr. SPEAKER: This will be the last question before the Sitting is suspended for other reasons. Question No. 155 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James, page 13, right hand column.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that the public convenience adjacent to the Trafalgar Hotel in Palmetto Square is in a most insanitary state?

2. Will Government take steps to remedy this state of affairs immediately?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the replies are as follows:

"1. No, Sir.

2. Does not arise."

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

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

7.35 p.m.

On resumption--

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, will you kindly ask that the bell be rung, the time being 8.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly shall; let the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the suspension of the sitting, questions were being dealt with. All of the questions have been dealt with to which answers have been laid and in respect of which hon. members who instituted the queries happened to be in their places.

The questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. James, who were unavoidably out of their places at the time, will be held 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 proceeded with.

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

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

APPROVAL OF THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: The first item under Government Business is in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution has to do with the provision made for filling the post of the Aide-de-Camp to the Governor-General. There is an assigned scale, of course, already existing for this post and it is $3,600 to $3,960 per annum. Of course, the holder of the post is normally expected

to live in Government House and to enjoy full board and lodging.

It sometimes, happens, however, that recruitment is made of a person otherwise suitable but who, for domestic reasons, cannot live in - obviously if he is a family man he would not be expected to live in and, therefore, other provision has to be made to accommodate this type of person. It is felt that if a person, being a family man, cannot be expected to live in and therefore enjoy board and lodging in addition to his salary, he should not be in a worse off financial position than any officer who would live in.

It is proposed to provide for the payment of a duty allowance which is intended to compensate for the loss of benefits accruing from living in Government House. This compensate allowance is valued at $150 a month, and it is proposed that this should be the allowance which should attach to this post in addition to the salary. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am now asking leave to proceed with the Resolution of which notice was given today and copies of which were previously circulated to members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with a Resolution of which copies were instructed to be circulated yesterday afternoon. Personally, I did not have the privilege of receiving such a copy, but if other hon. members received their copies --

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does it matter if this is not got through by the end of April? Some hon. members on this side are complaining that they received this Resolution late.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have been told that arrangements have been made to have a meeting of the Other Place on Thursday which, of course, will be after the 30th April, because tomorrow is a Bank Holiday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked for leave to proceed with it now and, unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted.

8.20 p.m

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the remainder of this sitting.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as an amendment, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the remainder of this sitting. He will add dignity to the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that. I am sure that, on this occasion, the hon. member would not have forgotten his glasses at home.

Mr. SPEAKER: Really, that is unfair to Mr. Clerk who alleges that he could not find his glasses today and we were without his services.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Messrs HINDS, CRAIG, CORBIN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 4.

Noes: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs LOWE, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 7.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been reported to me that four hon. members voted "Aye", and seven hon. members voted "No", *(ASIDES)*. That is the report to me from the Clerk at the Table who has actually arrived. The Clerk has informed me that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew voted "Aye". I declare that the "Noes" have it.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for the remainder of today's sitting, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR. C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, N. W. BOXILL; Messrs LOWE CORBIN, WEEKES and HOPPIN - 8.

Noes: Messrs HINDS; CRAIG and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 3.

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 while in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for $84,229 of which notice was given earlier today.

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. HOPPIN in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1968-69 No. 1

PERSONAL EMOLUMENTS FOR CLERGYMEN

A Resolution for the sum of $84,299 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when the Estimates came before the House in Committee of Supply last month, in response to a question put to me, I think by the hon. senior member for the City, I pointed out that the provision which appears in the first column of Head 39 as Statutory Expenditure of $248,000 represented the sum which it is proposed that the Anglican Church should be given in the first year of settlement by way of a block grant.
8.30 p.m.

It did not, however, appear to hon. members myself included, then, that put in the Estimates in this form it would not have guaranteed the stipends of the clergymen, in as much as the statutory provision under which this sum would have to be disbursed had not yet been established.

In other words, the enabling Bill separating the Church from the State which would itself include the financial provisions had not yet been brought before the Legislature. However, it would appear that when the Estimates were being prepared, the Ministry of Education did genuinely hope that by the time the Estimates got through the House the enabling legislation would have been passed providing for the settlement of which the financial provisions would, of course, have been a part.

This hope has not materialised and accordingly the provision of $248,000 which the House has already made cannot be spent although it has been already voted because provision under which it would be expendable has not yet been made.

Therefore, in order that the Clergy - I should say at this point that an agreement has been substantially reached, on the approach to the issues of the settlement, and the delay of the legislation is due to the fact that there were one or two points of detail which my colleagues, the Minister of Education and the Attorney General, did not see. These points are still being clarified between the two sides, but the broad, general agreement has been reached and therefore in the interim period betweeen the beginning of the financial year and whenever the settlement is made, effective provision has got to be made for the emoluments of the Clergy to be paid as the current law now requires.

As hon. members will realise, up to this present moment - and this will be so until the settlement is complete and the appropriate legislation enacted - the Clergy are on the Civil Establishment under the terms of the Anglican Church Act or the Partial Suspension Act.

Therefore, the $49,000 which represents the emoluments of those Clergymen who did not come under Partial Suspension is already provided for by law; so what we are asked to provide is a sum o $84,000 which represents part of the emoluments o the Bishop, part of the emoluments of the Rector o St. Michael, part of the emoluments of other Rectors and part of the emoluments of Vicars.

This sum of $84,229 together with the sum of $49,320 would of course represent the total amount of $133,000 which is the sum required to meet the emoluments both of those appointed before Partial Suspension and those appointed after.

For this reason we are asking for the supplementary provision of $84,229. Now, as I said just now, or I should have said it, it is proposed that the settlement should take effect as from the 1st April 1969. What is proposed is that in some time within this financial year, legislation is to be brought to the House for the House's approval.

However, Sir, until that time comes, I think that I should give the House some idea of the broad general agreement which has been reached between the Government and the Anglican Synod. They are that the Anglican Church Act of 1911 should be repealed and replaced with an enabling Act embodying the settlement, and that over a number of years beginning with whenever the settlement comes into effect there should be a certain quantum of financial disbursements made to the Church beginning in the first place with $248,000 tapering down to the sum of $35,000 and after the tenth year the Government should pay to the Anglican Synod a subsidy which should compare with the total amount paid to the other denominations in the same proportion as the membership of the Anglican Church compares with the total membership of those other denominations, providing that such sum is not less than $10,000 per annum; that the liabilities of the Government should be honoured in the case of persons to whom the Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act of 1965 does not apply and that provision will be made for clergymen still serving under the Partial Suspension Act at the date of the repeal of the Act by the payment of one month's salary at the present rate in respect of each completed year of service provided that service of six months or more was completed year before the 1st April, 1969. The 1st April, 1969, will be regarded for the purpose of the computation as one year's service.

This means, in effect that all the people appointed since the Partial Suspension will receive their gratuities computed on a certain basis. The next is that pensions along with compensation for the payment of fees should be paid immediately on disestablishment. The next is that the contributions of the clergy to the Widows and Children's Pensions Schemes should be treated in the same way as the contributions of Civil Servants who leave the Service.

The next is that service in Church and State should not be reciprocal. One point I should add is that on the repeal of the Anglican Church Act no clergyman would qualify for the payment from the Trea-

sury of leave passages to which he would not have been entitled if the Act had not been repealed unless such leave had been taken before the date of the repeal.

The next is that the franking privileges at present enjoyed by the Church should cease on the repeal of the Act, that Bishop's Court should be revested in the Church which should henceforth be responsible for its maintenance and upkeep.
8.40 p.m.

Next, that the present understanding between Church and State regarding school buildings should continue. That understanding, briefly, is that in respect of their schools which we are occupying, whenever we are giving them up, we give an understanding to return them to the Church in good repair. That has been done, as far as I remember, in the case of Holy Innocents' Infant School and one or two other schools. *(Asides.)* We will have to build a new school at St. Christopher; so we will have to give the Chapel to them in good order. *(Asides.)*

This is the understanding, anyhow. Also that the State should not concern itself in the appointment of Bishops, and that the Church should not retain a special association with the State, and that all legislation making mandatory provision for the appointment of Chaplains from the Anglican Church to Government institutions should be repealed. This, generally speaking, is what they have accepted.

There are, however, two or three points which both the Minister of Education and the Attorney-General felt, and I dare say the Bishop himself also felt, needed further clarification. I will mention one that springs to my mind immediately. This point dealt with the extent to which the Clergy, after disestablishment, may be called upon and may be required to perform certain services to the population some of whom may not be Anglicans. Let me put it this way. Questions as to whether anybody may still then be buried within the precincts of a Church's grave-yard; whether certain ceremonies customarily performed for nothing, should we say, should be continued and so on. These are some of the points that will have to be clarified. Not that there is any dispute about them, but it is as well before you embark on legislation which is meant to have considerable finality that nothing should be left to chance, or to individual interpretation.

I want to emphasise that the largest part of the settlement has already been arrived at. The Synod has informed the Government that the provisions are generally acceptable. The Attorney-General has gone a considerable distance in drafting the required legislation; this Draft Bill has been before the Church Authorities and, as I have said, except for one or two points, one of which I have mentioned, which are now being clarified, it is acceptable to the Church Authorities and to the Government.

I would expect that in another two or three weeks, perhaps, we may be able to introduce legislation and to pass the Bill in due course. The Cabinet has already, of course, decided that, for the sake of tidiness, since this financial year has already started, the settlement should come into force on the 1st April, 1969, so that there will be ample opportunity between now and the 31st March to tie up any loose strings. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to this Resolution is not at all clear to us on this side, and particularly paragraph 4 of the second page. It seems to us that on the first page in the head and item of the Schedule "Statutory Expenditure", there should be a note that what is contained in paragraph 4 should be inserted there.

As I understand the position in Barbados, under the provisions of the Constitution at the present moment, the Statutory Expenditure is that which by some Act or legislation is either charged on the Consolidated Fund, or should be paid out of the revenue of the Island; so that the fact that no provision had been made in the Estimates under Head 39, Ecclesiastical, does not mean that the Accountant General can refuse to pay those emoluments to the Clergy who are under the Civil Establishment Act, because the Civil Establishment Act is the authority for the payment.

All that is required to be voted now is the provision of Other Expenditure which is contained in paragraph 3 of the Addendum. Perhaps the Minister, who introduced this piece of legislation, can explain whether the meaning of "statutory provision" under personal emoluments is still effective with the following details. If he looks at the Estimates, Head 39, surely; at this stage now, since there is no legislation which has amended the Civil Establishment Act, or the Anglican Church Act which deals with the position of the Bishop of Barbados' emoluments and the emoluments which are charged, and those clergymen who were appointed before the Anglican Church passed the Suspension Act, when we are dealing with the Supplementary Estimates it ought to be made clear that there is now in existence Statutory Expenditure. There is bound to be Statutory Expenditure now.

Although one sees under Head 39, Ecclesiastical, "No Statutory Expenditure", that is not accurate at the present moment. That is the only point I wish to make.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, while I must support this Resolution so that the Clergy will have their monies in their pockets like other Civil Servants, so to speak, I must say that it is unfortunate to see that this Government is another classic example of Government starting before they are ready.

I think the Leader of the House, Mr. Chairman, will agree with me, and I think he is honest and big enough to do so, that he has been charged in certain

quarters by certain people, by all parties and all sections of the community, with the mishandling of affairs in the Ministry of Education under which Head 39 falls. I have heard that he was fired from that Ministry, but I do not believe it, and elevated to the Ministry of Caribbean and Latin American Affairs. I think I have the correct Ministry in which he and I had a little and will have a little "do together" in the Press shortly.

No one can safely say that if this Assembly had found itself in the very unfortunate position as the Federal Assembly did with a floating vote, and that floating vote had opposed the Clergy, I do not know what the Clergy would do between now and the time that they are prepared, according to the Minister, to get these ends tied up.
8.50 p.m.

How long will it take? That is the important question. When my Party was in power, it advocated the disestablishment of the Anglican Church and I agree with that. Since this Government came into power, they set about to do likewise, but it is seven years or almost seven years in which they have been struggling with the disestablishment of the Church. Now tonight we are being asked by the Hon. Leader of the House to vote this money to assist the Clergy. The whole question of the Church in Barbados has always been a bit of a problem. I must confess, however, that the Anglican Church or any denomination in Barbados has played an important role in this country, but there is one thing which I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House, that is, that as soon as they disestablished the Anglican Church, there is another clean-up which they have to do, and that is to clean up a lot of these highway robbers, I call them, who come to Barbados as State Leaders and carry away thousands of dollars, like Billy Graham, a hypocrite, who has never condemned racialism throughout the entire world, from Australia to Madras; neither have they condemned the people from Miami in Florida to Iceland for segregation, neither in his country nor abroad, but he came to Barbados some years ago and carried away thousands of dollars from some of the most unfortunate people in the community.

Not only should we put the Anglican Church on their feet and allow them to take care of themselves, but the time will come and it has to come, when we have to deal with these half-baked crooks who come to Barbados sometimes on yachts. I have had the experience of sitting down on platforms with them since I have been in public life, and when I am greeted by them and they are told that I am a member of Parliament, they tell me one thing and they tell the congregation something else. I can bring a classic example of one who told me that his daughter was ten years old and she was playing the guitar at two, and when he came to preach, he said that his daughter was ten years and she was playing the guitar for four years. I am making these points. I am sure that the Hon. Leader of the House was a preacher himself at one time, or he still is, but there is a lot of truth in this. There is also a lot of truth in the ridiculous sermon that the Bishop of Barbados preached at the Memorial Service for the late Dr. King. He should be ashamed to have adorned the sacred pulpit of St. Michael's Cathedral and say absolutely nothing. Now we are asked to vote money for him to cool out. I must say that it is unfortunate that we have such a Head of the Clergy. I believe that from the time that the Anglican Church came into this country, not one single coloured Bishop has ever adorned Bishop's Court House. I hope that when the Church is disestablished, the Government will not have any say in it, because I heard that on one occasion the Government wanted to appoint a Bishop - I do not know how true that is - that they wanted to have some say in the affairs of the Church. I hope that that is not so. I heard this when the Hon. Leader of the House - I am not accusing the Hon. Leader of the House because I like to give the Leader of the House what is due to him, for the sight which is so vigorous, youthful and dynamic, a TV viewer or cartoonist, to my mind, he is. However, you look at TV you can see the Minister of Education. On every page of nearly every paper you can see that they are pushing the Minister of Education, I am told, for St. James and that is another part of the story. We do not have to worry about that part; but if the Minister of Education, I am confident, is responsible for the mishandling of the ecclesiastical affairs, it is his duty to know that they anticipated they would have got through with this matter by the beginning of the financial year; but tonight the Clergy are in a very unfortunate position in that when every Civil Servant has been paid, I believe, on the 25th and the 26th of this month, they are hoping tonight that they will be paid theirs. I know that the Government has the numbers, and we are going to support this Resolution, but I just want to express these sentiments not only on the Anglican Church but, as I said earlier, on many of these highway robbers like the Reverend at the Baptist Church in Constitution Road. When I telephoned him and asked him if he was going to have a Memorial Service for Dr. King, he said that he could not because he had Communist views. Those are the people in respect of whom I hope the Government will look into, that type of person who is prepared to divide and rule. Nobody really could condemn a man's religion. I believe that is democracy, freedom of speech, freedom of choice of your political Party and freedom to choose your religion. If Reverend Harold Tudor chooses to be a "Dem" and to be even a member of the Democratic Labour Party and to canvass the teachers and the congregation, that is Reverend Harold Tudor's business. We might have a Reverend too, who knows? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We have ten.) The Hon. Leader of the House seems to know a little more than I know, and I wonder if it is that the Minister of Education is holding up the coppers.

Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to hold up the House unduly, but I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House will take into consideration these few remarks and when they disestablish the Church and free the Church from the State, let them do their own business and let the Government keep out of their affairs and make sure that they keep a very

close watch on some of these highway robbers who come in sheep's clothing and carry away money from Barbados at times, I believe, tax free. That is one of the very salient points which I wanted to make in my speech. You can rest assured that there is nothing that we can do with this Resolution but to support it because we are well aware of the fact that without this Resolution being passed, the Clergy would be in a bit of trouble. After all, they have spent their days studying when they could have devoted their time to some other profession, and if this is their chosen profession, then they must be paid for it. I also wish to say that this may be the last time when I might have an opportunity to say anything on these affairs and I wish to say that I am one who believes that the Church did something for this community years ago, and I sincerely hope that they will continue to do something to elevate the social standing in particular of this community in the years to come.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wish I could, at this stage, cause this Resolution to become controversial, because we would all be heading for home in a matter of minutes. Nevertheless, it is indeed unfortunate that we have to be here tonight to consider the terms of this Resolution. Why I say so, is this; on pay-day all Civil Servants and members of the Civil Establishment or whatever you call them, had received their pay cheques, all with the exception of the members of the Anglican Clergy.
9.00 p.m.

There are times, Sir, when there can be genuine mistakes; but I regret to have to say that we are seeing too many mistakes in the affairs of the Ministry of Education which is responsible for Ecclesiastical Affairs.

For instance, one would imagine that the Government knew quite well when the Estimates were being passed that the necessary enabling Act which would effect the disestablishment of the Anglican Church was not ready. It was known before pay-day that pay-day had to come and that the Clergy without their pay cheques would be put to considerable inconvenience.

What happened in that respect? It was not until the day before pay-day that the Bishop received a communication from the Ministry of Education informing the Bishop that no pay would be available the day following and expressing regrets for any inconvenience.

That was the day before pay-day; but other members of the Clergy were not even treated that way. They found themselves - and each and every member knows that we have never had a wealthy body of Clergymen - many of them who had made arrangements for their pay cheques to go to the banks turned up at the banks, and some of them were so sure that their pay cheques would have been deposited with their respective banks that they went about and must have issued cheques, feeling that their accounts at the banks would have justified it.

Some of them had cause to turn up at the banks themselves, and when searches were made up and down the banks they learned for the first time that there was no pay for them that day. I feel within myself that it was beastly unfair to the members of the Anglican Clergy, and it so happened that some of them the day after pay-day then received letters expressing regret for any inconvenience caused. That is after pay-day had gone by. Nobody could suggest that it was reasonable or fair or just to those people.

It so happened, Sir, that it was not every member of the Clergy who was content to go and find that his cheque was not deposited. Some of them went to the Ministry of Education. Do you believe, Sir, that a member of the Clergy went to the Ministry of Education and a member of the staff of the Ministry had the brass to look at a member of the Clergy and tell him: "Oh, you cannot say anything about it because after all it is not due until the 30th." That is what was done by a Civil Servant. They are not particularly concerned with the inconvenience that this really caused.

They look at a member of the Clergy and tell him that he cannot do anything because it does not become due until the 30th. We feel that it is not fair that the Clergy should be treated in that way at all; but Mr. Chairman, we have got to look at the Ministry of Education and see if the time is not come when you will have to demonstrate in some form or fashion the people's dissatisfaction and disappointment with all that is going on there.

We have seen, Mr. Chairman, as I have seen, that because there is not that amount of delegation of responsibility amongst various members of the Ministry - the Permanent Secretary, the Chief Education Officer and people placed in that category - you will find that this country of ours now stands to lose the respect, and more the benefit of having out nationals being taught the Spanish language free of cost in this nation. All who wanted to learn Spanish could have come and be taught the Spanish language just for the asking.

That, Mr. Chairman, is one of those serious things that we cannot sit idly by and allow to continue to happen. It looks very bad, however one might try to brush it over, however one might try to make it sound not so bad.

It is definitely a bad case and the one reason for it is this Mr. Chairman, I have had occasion in this Hon. House to speak with regard to the Royal Barbados Police Force, and to say that two Police Superintendents were not on speaking terms with each other.

Now, I know what dangers such a situation can create in an organisation, and I am prepared to say tonight that the present Minister of Education cannot expect the co-operation of the members of his Department. The Minister seems to be a "know all",

and his approach is such that if the most valued member of his Department had any information, any suggestion to make to him, he would be tempted to sit back, and time flows by and there is hardly any communication whatsoever between the Minister of Education and certain members of his Ministry. That is responsible for the state of affairs existing today.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that, in this very matter pertaining to the Clergy, there is evidence that something has got to be wrong between the Permanent Secretary, the Chief Education Officer and the Minister of Education. Something has got to be wrong between the three of them.
9.10 p.m.
Things cannot be working smoothly. If, on the other hand, they are so overworked that they have to leave some of the most important business undone, would it not be better tonight, Mr. Chairman, if we were asked to vote a sum of money to provide staff for the Ministry of Education to cope with its business?

You must bear in mind, Sir, that when matters of this nature occur in a Ministry or a Department such as the Ministry of Education, it can do untold harm to the community at large. Just picture things for yourself, Sir. This happens to be the case of about sixty Clergymen. One might be tempted to say that they will soon get over it, or something of the sort, but it is not right.

If it was seen that Government had attempted to bring about a settlement between the Anglican Church and the State by way of disestablishment; if they had seen and known that it was not possible to have had the necessary legislation passed by the House of Assembly by the time these gentlemen were entitled to receive their salaries in respect of the month of April, I have to say that it was the bounden duty of the Ministry of Education - the Minister and his Permanent Secretary - at as early a date as possible, to have got in touch with the Bishop, the Synod and the Clergy instead of taking these members of the Anglican Clergy and treating them badly.

In other words, here is a case where we must come to the conclusion that the Government feels it does not want their services any longer and it begins to treat them in this manner. It is not fair it is not right; and we on this side of the House cannot encourage the Government to treat the Clergy or any other body of people in this manner.

We are asked, Mr. Chairman, to vote the sum of $84,229 by way of a Supplementary Resolution, but I have to ask, Mr. Chairman, since we have already voted the sum of $248,000 under this Head, can we now go - whether by way of a Supplementary Resolution or otherwise - and vote the sum of $84,229 under the same Head?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, we can, because the original sum voted of $248,000 will lapse and it cannot be used.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the $248,000 will not be used and that it will lapse, but does the statute make provision, at this stage, for us to have $84,229 and $248,000 under this Head at one and the same time? That is all I am concerned with. Are we within our rights tonight? If we even seek to accommodate the Minister and the Leader of the House, and if we are moved in our desire to see the members of the Clergy get their salaries as soon as possible, are we doing what is right? That is one question we would like to have considered in every aspect.

We learn from the Leader of the House, a former Minister of Education - I do not know why it is that he had had the misfortune to be back in this thing again, because he quite well remembers that, in the battle of words which went on between himself and the Bishop, for the first time in the career of the Leader of the House he seems to have run out of words. That is quite unlike him. It is rather unfortunate that he now finds himself back in the saddle, so to speak, in this matter of the disestablishment of the Anglican Church.

We have learnt from him that even now there remains certain matters to be settled between Synod and the State. Mr. Chairman, is not that in itself sufficient evidence to prove that either the Ministry of Education is not sufficiently concerned, or has lost interest, or the Minister is not prepared to accept his responsibilities where the Anglican Church and disestablishment are concerned?

From the time it was known that certain matters remained to be settled, by negotiation, discussion or otherwise, that in itself was enough to have caused the Minister to realise that legislation could not be enacted in time to bring about this disestablishment, to bring about the break between Church and State, and the one and only just thing to do would have been to bring this Resolution before the House at a very early date so that the Clergy could feel like honourable men who have laboured and are entitled to receive at the end of the day like any other member of the Civil Establishment. That is how we feel about it.

The Minister, for instance, took us along the path, as he says, that leadeth unto disestablishment. We might thank him at this stage, but it is not necessary for him to carry us along that road tonight because exactly how far he had to go is, to our mind, not germaine to the issue. What we are concerned with is whether or not this money should be voted, and whether or not in voting this money we will be doing what is right.
9.20 p.m.

I heard the Minister say that it may be on the question of their performing certain functions, whether they will be there in the future or to what extent they will be called upon or what not. Already it has been drawn to my attention that Priests at Churches have had occasions to be asked by the

members of their congregation to bring the Register of births or baptisms into the Registrar's office. In one particular case I know that the Priest promptly said that he would have to be paid for carrying in the Register. He wanted car hire and said that he should be paid a day's pay. On receiving the report, I tried to get in touch with him and he promptly asked me what I expected him to do, if I expected him to leave his district and, incidentally, this was in St. Michael, not far away in St. Lucy or St. Peter or St. Philip. Mr. Chairman, this will be one of the minor details which would have to be worked out with the Bishop, Synod and Church Committees or whatever it is, as they go along from time to time. We are particularly distressed over the fact that, despite the shortcomings of many members of the Clergy, the Ministry of Education in its stride to promote a good image of its Minister - and while we do not wish to speak about good - looking men, I have to say that regardless of what ever image the present Minister of Education may project over a number of years. I do not see it looking as anything being worthwhile to look at in its truest sense. He is not a good-looking man, but, as I say, we do not wish to speak of good-looking men. That belongs to the fairer sex. You look at some of our schools, or the method which is being employed by the Government in bringing about this disestablishment of the Anglican Church; the method of approach is bad; it is very, very bad indeed. It is coming about, to my mind, with too much friction between the Church and the State. It is something which should be processed in a smooth and orderly manner, as all things pertaining to the Church should be orderly.

Mr. Chairman it seems to me that even now the Hon. Leader of the House may be turning away from his upbringing with the Churches, his association with them, and he might become tainted with some others who have absolutely no use for a Church door at all. We do not, for a single moment, associate the hon. junior member for St. Andrew with turning away from his Church. Oh, No, Sir. He is one man who, if you call upon him in the middle of the night, he can quote you some scriptures which might never exist. *(Laughter).* And hon. members laugh. Mr. Chairman, we are expected to vote for this Resolution. Undoubtedly we will do so, but I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House would be able to inform us at this stage if it is not correct to say that, even now, Synod is awaiting the final draft of the enabling Bill from the Government.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, this must be true because I said that there were one or two outstanding points which were still to be clarified, and if they have been clarified, they have to be incorporated in draft which will then be sent to the Synod.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is true that tonight we are not, in the truest sense, discussing all aspects of this enabling Bill because it is not before us, but the Hon. Leader of the House tried to point out to us some of the terms which will be brought into force, which will be obtaining when the enabling Bill comes into force. I am wondering if, even at this stage, the Minister could tell us in the best way he can, if it has occurred to the Government at any stage to see that in disestablishing the Church, ample provision is made for the protection of the rights of Church Officers. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.) The Hon Leader of the House has replied in the affirmative.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon member will give way, I can tell him why I can boldly say "Yes". The Church Officers, as you know, were employed by the Local Government Authorities. We have taken over all the obligations of the Councils; the Councils took over all the obligations of the Vestries and, likewise, the Central Government has taken over all the obligations of the Councils. Therefore, pensions, gratuities and severance pay or whatever it is, which accrues to these people, will be fully met by the Government.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, believe me, I am glad to hear the Hon. Leader of the House say that the Central Government has taken over from what was formerly Local Government, and will be responsible for pensions, gratuities, severance payment and whatever is due to these Church Officers.
9.30 p.m.

But, Sir, there must be many years before the pension stage is reached. There would have to be also a number of years before the question of severance pay could also arise; but it is these intervening years that I would like to address my mind to at this particular moment. I am sure that the Leader of the House knows that there are many of these Church Officers who worked with Local Government Councils, and they never received salary increases over a period of years. Some of them have not had a salary increase for ten years; but now we have reached the stage where these same Church Officers find themselves being considered - for what? Pension rights, gratuities or severance pay.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Government, Central Government, would only be doing what is just and right if, even if it is brought to their attention at this late hour, to correct in all fairness the anomalous position of those people and see whether they had not been denied of what was their due. It would help them when it comes to the computing of their pensions or gratuities or severance pay or whatever else is due to them.

We are not, Mr. Chairman, opposing this Resolution, and our main reason for not opposing it is this: We want the members of the Anglican Clergy to bear in mind that we on this side of the House are with them in this, one of their trials, so to speak, because do not let us fool ourselves, a parson or priest, or whatever you may choose to call him, is just another human being like you or me.

He has his responsibilities. He has his commitments; and when the hour of pay arises and he finds that he is without it, he must turn around and face embarrassment like anybody else. He has got to

make excuses to somebody. Tell me, if a Minister of the Anglican Church left his district and came into Bridgetown for his salary to be told that no salary was there, is it not grossly unfair. He might be one who might have had garage bills or gasoline bills. They have got to eat and wear clothes like anybody else.

Are you to tell me that it is an easy thing for them to return home and say that they have been told no pay today, and further that some Civil Servant who is getting very well besides himself, should tell a member of the Clergy that he cannot say anything because it does not become due until the 30th of the month? We do not like these things, and we are throwing out a warning to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Chairman, everything seems to be wrong with the Minister of Education. They are spending large sums of money, a fair size of the nation's budget, and there seems to be no proper accounting even to the extent that the Auditor General cannot get reports and carry out a proper audit. All of these things are wrong.

It is true that sooner or later, while we might try to be at peace,from what we have seen going on in the Ministry of Education we have got to be upon our toes. Mr. Chairman, do you realise what is in very great measure responsible for the behaviour of the present Minister of Education? He is not answerable in this House to the electorate. He does not have to come and stand up here and be bombarded with questions as to his conducct.

That, Mr. Chairman, is something that, while the Constitution makes provision for him to be hidden away in the Other Place, I may say that the day will come very soon when we hope that the present Leader of the House will say that he can stand no more of this embarrassment for the Minister of Education; let him come and answer himself.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister seems to be charting a course for wrecking the ship of Government. Why do I say so? Not many days ago there was a post of Education Officer in the Ministry to be filled. What did we find? Quite a number of qualified teachers who have worked hard and richly deserve promotion made applications for the post. They wanted promotion. No. Sir. No promotion for them, no matter how hard working and no matter how concientious.

What we find is this, that a member of the staff of Harrison College was invited to come over into Macedonia, without the knowledge, without the sanction of that body so nobly elected to examine those who had applied for the post. All this was done when the Minister thinks nothing about the Public Service Commission. He can do as he likes. He will have whom he will and he will appoint whom he will.

Then what do we find? We find that people in the Service who have been giving of their best for many years must of necessity become frustrated people. If you find actions such as this from the Minister, it should demonstrate his indifference to the assurance that a hard working officer at the end of his day will not be going home to his family receiving in the evening of his days the mere pittance which he began to get 18, 20 or possibly 30 years before.

It is not fair, and we are calling on the Minister of Education- we are asking the Leader of the House to pass on to the Minister of Education what we have said tonight. Let the Minister understand that from this night forward we are going to excerise vigilance, we are going to be watchful, we are going to observe and take notes of all that he has done and is doing to wreck the educational system of this country.

I say that, Sir, because if the Minister has the best designed plans and the best ideas, he cannot expect to meet success if he alone is to be Captain First Mate, Second Mate, First Cook and Boatswain and everything on the ship. You, Mr. Chairman, must see and must know what I am talking about.

Tonight members of the Anglican clergy cannot feel themselves as having been treated like men. And, Mr. Chairman, they are not at fault. They have not contributed anything whatsovever to create the situation that has prevented itself to the Legislature. We do not want to dictate to the Minister. We do not want to give the appearence that we do not approve of this Resolution; but we need to make it known that when we see something that is bad we will tell from the house tops.
9.40 p.m.

We are going to tell it from the housetops. We are willing to have this $84,229 voted tonight. Is it sufficent for us to tell ourselves that because we want to see the Anglican Clergy get their salaries that we should just sit and allow the matter to go through the House without saying anything or doing anything about the matter? It is one of these opportunities, Mr. Chairman, that I am very, very, sorry it was not possible for this Resolution to have been introduced at a very early hour.

I know that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has a long way to go; he has Scripture enough to quote tonight; he plans that he is not going to rush the brush, because he does not want to waste the paint. I am going to give this Resolution my wholehearted support, but we are warning the Leader of the House that it seems to us that when his Government sets out even to do a good thing, it employs bad tactics; its approach is so bad that when we would be glad to take note of that jot or tittle of good, the wrongs that it does far outweigh and obscures the good. That is no fault of ours.

We promised that we will support this Resolution, and we hope that when the Government finds it possible to have the necessary enabling legislation brought before this House, we will not be having a

Police outrider coming to our house the night before with a "hot and sweaty" Bill, and we turn up here the next day to hear some honourable members say that they have not received the Bill. For instance, His Honour the Speaker says he has not received a copy of this Resolution. But weeks have rolled over and quite a number of things could have been done.

The Leader of the House cannot deny that it is a lack of responsibility on the part of the Ministry of Education and, perhaps, to a lesser extent, on the Crown Law Office, for these members of the Anglican Clergy finding themselves receiving the treatment that was meted out to them on pay-day. Mr. Chairman, it is with those few remarks that I think I can say that I will lend this Resolution my support.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In view of the hour, Mr. Chairman,and the many points the hon. member who has just sat down has made, I do not propose to say what I had intended to say. That is why I stayed in for this debate, but there are two points I must make. It seems to me, especially after hearing the hon. member, that two things have happened. It is gross carelessness when an item like this - I could not have thought of this until I heard the Hon. Leader of the House speak. How could you possibly put this $248,000 in the Estimates when you not only knew that the Bill had not yet been completed, but even if it were partly completed in draft it could not have been completed? You not only knew that, but you knew that the Government and the Church had not yet agreed, even if it were on a simple matter. In short, you could not possibly tell whether the Agreement would be long drawn out.

Look how easy it would have been to let the Estimates stay as they were last year. Of course, if the Act has been passed last month, let us say, then you would, when the Estimates were being dealt with here, say that you propose to withdraw that because the Act has been passed and you insert instead the $248,000.

9.50 p.m.

I am told - I do not know how true it is - that what happened with the past Government varied to some extent, but I am told that the whole Cabinet goes through the Estimates, and the responsible Ministers explain to the Cabinet Head after Head. Certainly that used to be done in the old Executive Committee days before we had the Ministerial system. Whether it was always done with the Ministerial system is a different matter; but if this Government has revised the system which existed in the old Executive Committee days, how is it that no member of the Cabinet spotted this or asked: "What about the Bill?" The hon. member made it even worse by saying April, 1969. How do you know that you will get this Bill before March 1969? How do you know that you have a whole year within which you can play? How could it escape? It could not have escaped, but I was going to ask how could it have escaped any ordinary draughtsman. It could not have escaped because the $248,000 was not there. This was a specific change from what the normal Estimate would have been, to put in something for which you had not yet got and apparently, you could not say when you would get, agreement on.

In short, if these matters - it is noticeable too - I hope that those who are taking down my words will forgive me for breaking off in the middle of a question and saying something else, but the Hon. Leader of the House was as unnatural in his speech as he could be; at least he gave me that impression. It did not come about easily, it did not flow out smoothly and it almost looked as if the hon. member was thinking of what to say. I am not throwing anything at him, but he must, from his previous experience in the Department, have sufficient knowledge not to have to feel for words when explaining a matter under this Head. Surely, apart from that, he must see, no matter what Head it would be, that if you are seeing something in the Estimates which is going in for the first time, you must have legislative authority for it. Even if the Bill was passed early this month, that would not have justified your putting in this $248,000. I repeat for the last time: How could it be justified that it goes in when the Agreement is not there yet, and when the Agreement may not be there for another eleven months? How do you know, even in the ordinary things - you can call them ordinary things if you like - how do you know that you are going to agree on things which are still outstanding? In short, there is no justification for this thing taking place. If the Hon. Leader of the House does not say anything else, I would like him to tell us what explanation was given when the Estimates were being prepared, for inserting something when you knew that you did not have any legal reason to say: "This thing is going to be inserted, but we might not have to make use of it. The Bill is ready and it will be passed about the same time." Sometimes you will bring the two things together.

I think that the Government is lucky that the Opposition is not in their places because I entirely agree with the strictures - that is the information which we have had on this side, and the strictures which the hon. member has laid on the Minister himself. I think we all agree that it is lamentable to think that the Minister is not a member of this House, but a member of the Other Place; but from all that is being said, the Minister is not even getting on with the Department. Anyway, I warn the Hon. Leader of the House before hand to be prepared to get all the information he can from the Minister's Department because we intend as soon as the appropriate occasion arises in this House, to attack that Minister on the running of his Department. I am straying a bit, but I will not be for more than a minute. The things which the Minister tells the public in fact that are going to be done have never been brought to this House. The nonsense about a Sixth Form College (Hon. N.W. BOXILL: That is not before the House.) The hon. member ought to have manners occasionally and leave it to the Chairman to have the necessary discipline in Committee, and not sit in his seat and make these grunting stupid noises. Let him keep his bad manners

for outside. That is the advice I would give the hon. member. Let him try to have good manners when he comes into the House. I suggest I should tell him - in any event, I am preparing the Hon. Leader of the House because he will have to do the defence. We do not intend, on this side of the House, to do things haphazardly; I will let him know now before hand when he comes with anything affecting education, he must be prepared for shocks all round this side of the Table.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House could tell us if the draft Bill is ready. I have my reason for asking that question (Hon. J.C. TUDOR: It is all but ready.) It is all but ready. I understand the Minister to say that the draft Bill is all but ready, but is it not a case where, to bring the enabling Bill before the House and have it passed, would have put the Government in the embarrassing position of having to meet a commitment of $248,000 which they do not have in the Treasury? Is that the case? (Hon. N.W. BOXILL: What foolishness is the hon. member talking?) I know I will hear that this is foolishness. I am just enquiring of the Minister, and I have very good reasons for asking the Minister what I am asking him. I know that the hon. member is tired and would like to go home, but I am going to do my parliamentary duties because I am here and I will do them. We have a faint suspicion that the more we state this - Mr. Chairman, the Minister cannot deny that money has already been voted under Heads, and despite what I heard the Prime Minister say about money not being paid out unless it is being properly vouched for and that sort of thing, I do not believe one word of that at all. We are wondering if this is not a case where, even the $248,000 which has been voted by this House, is not to be found in the Treasury.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am really astonished that what I had thought was a quite simple Resolution in its essentials should have produced so much political mileage.
10.00 p.m.

It would seem to me that there is nothing before the House that you cannot bring up for the purpose of attacking the Government, whether the attack is justifiable or not. It seems to me, not only from this debate, but from previous debates, hon. members opposite do not like the Hon. Minister of Education. That is how it seems and they are not prepared perhaps to be as fair-minded in assessing him and his work as they ought to be.

Some of these things that I hear are going on in Government I often hear for the first time. I do not know if the Minister is at variance with his staff. I have no reason to believe that that is so, and I do not see why hon. members should think that because - and we admit that this is an unfortunate matter - that because this is before the House in this way, there is some disagreement between the Minister and his officers in the Ministry.

I believe that it would be well to remember that when the Estimates are drawn up it is usually in the month of August or September. When they go to the Cabinet on their way to the House they are already printed, and it is true that quite frequently before they reach the House in their final form they are altered to suit changes of policy which may have developed, say, between the time that they were first begun and when they reached the House in the final form. They certainly come to the Cabinet in this form, and it is in this form that they are approved and laid in the House.

Now, Sir, the proposals for settlement with the Anglican Church were indicated by me to the Lord Bishop early in August. I thought it proper to do this myself because I did not think it fair to my successor, who , I knew was coming in at the middle of August, or before the end of August, to give him the trouble of communicating the Cabinet's decision to the Bishop, when he was not a member of the Cabinet in the preceeding months. So I indicated the proposals.

The Estimates were prepared, I believe, in August or early September on the basis of the agreement which had been reached, and the figure put in here was $248,000. With respect to that there is no dispute. That was put in because it was evidently hoped that say between the end of August and the 31st March of the following year the enabling legislation either would have been completely on the Statute Book or would have been brought before the House, if not brought before, at least simultaneously with, the Estimates. I think that that was a legitimate expectation.

There are, Mr. Chairman, two Departments most concerned with the matter. They are the Ministries of Education and Finance. Between themselves they decided that it was proper to insert the figure of Statutory Expenditure in the Estimates because both the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education and the Financial Secretary had every reason to believe that bewteen the end of August and the 31st March the settlement would have been enacted.

One does not normally disclose Cabinet transactions, but I think I can safely say that when the Cabinet came to approve the Estimates it was known that there was no outstanding matter to be settled at that time between the Government and the Church.

The Attorney General, when the Estimates were laid, had prepared a draft Bill which was with the Synod. It was after we had approved the Estimates and laid them that it was indicated that there were one or two points or, may be three points in the draft Bill which needed further clarification: and the Minister of Education and the Attorney General met the Bishop and his advisers on these points and it was decided that further study would have to be given.

Even then the Cabinet for its part wanted further clarifications on one other point which we thought it better to spell out in detail lest there should be some confusion. In other words while during the Estimates I did make - or rather I did ask the Attorney

General whether he thought that we could proceed. with the Estimates in this form, because I pointed out to him that since the figure of $248,000 was put under Statutory Expenditure, I did not think that the House in Committee of Supply would delete that figure, but that adjustment both legal and administrative, would have to be made in other ways.

However, the Committee appropriated the amount. At that time, when the Estimates were concluded, we had one more matter - a very troublesome matter. As the hon. member for St. Peter will recall, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was not in the Island when we were dealing with the C.B.C. matter. It was my intention in the week in which we did the Resolution for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to see whether this matter could not be straightened out then.

Unfortunately, and I confess this to the House without feeling in any way abashed, though I regret it, the involvement of myself in the two Resolutions dealing with C. B. C. knocked this matter clean out of my head and I, therefore, did not have time to have the consultations which would have been necessary in order to straighten this matter out one month before now.

Then, in the following week I fell ill and went into Hospital. I have been away from my work until only Wednesday last week when, again, I went off to Antigua; so that, to all intents and purposes, I have been away from House business although the House itself was in recess. I dare say if I had been active with my duties I would have sought Mr. Speaker's permission to have a special meeting of the House last week to deal with it and, therefore avoid the inconvenience which a few weeks' delay would have brought on the Clergymen concerned.

These are the facts of the matter, and this is why I say that it is unfair really to place the blame on the Minister of Education. If you do not care for a person, you do not care for him, but I would think that, out of fairness to him, hon. members on the other side ought to give the Minister a chance to do his work. After all, in my mind, I would have thought that, in the view of hon. members opposite, he would meet every possible criteria that you could possibly want for a Minister of Government. He is a Barbados Scholar; he has the right colour; the right family background; the personal achievement; he is in the right Party. All of these things he has to his credit and I think he ought to be allowed to do his work without this nagging criticism. He does not need my defence, but I say this for him because I happen to know him as a colleague. He is not the kind of person which he is portrayed to be in this House. He is neither arrogant, vainglorious, nor in any way interfering, as we hear from the other side, and those of his colleagues who work with him and see his approach to his work have an entirely different view of him from the view which is portrayed here.

Naturally, the Minister knows that since he is a politician, though not an elected one, he must meet both his fair and unfair share of public criticism. In my view, he is perfectly aware of this and is not particularly worried by the amount of unfair criticism which is thrown at him.

I just want to interject a personal note because I do not want to detain the House. Hon. Members cannot have it both ways. When his appointment was first announced in the House, it was gloried in; it was thought to be something done at my expense. The other side welcomed it. Senator Barrow, who is a loyal member of the Barbados Labour Party, I believe, for the first two or three months, certainly in the first month after the Minister was appointed, said what a welcome relief it was from my regime that at long last the Minister of Education had a chance to live.

Well, if hon. members, or their colleagues, were so glad that I was moved in order that my colleagues may take over, at least give my colleague time enough to do his work, and see and appreciate the kind of work he is doing. Be fair-minded; that is all I am asking.

The personal note I was striking is this - one has to get this on the record. As soon as the last General Election was over, I wrote to the Prime Minister, even before he had resigned in order to be reappointed, saying that I was ready to leave the Ministry of Education because, so far as I personally was concerned, I had done my share and my part. He asked me to wait until a more convenient moment when he could turn his attention to the question of my successor, and he asked me whom I would recommend. I made a recommendation, and some eight months after the appointment was made. These are the facts. I therefore, first of all, would not and could not join in any denigration of my colleague, not merely because he is a Ministerial colleague and I owe him that much loyalty, but I would not join in it because I would not have drawn the Prime Minister's attention to what I thought and still think are his obviously excellent qualities if I did not think him the kind of person who would be a Minister of Education of the calibre we need in this juncture. This is how I feel.

Furthermore, I would not demean myself either by remaining silent when criticism is made of him, or by half-hearted replies to criticisms, making it appear that I am in agreement with those criticisms. I think he is doing an excellent job of work. It is a hard, backbreaking and wholly unthankful task to be a Minister of Education because you cannot please everybody, and you succeed in displeasing everybody, as I know from personal experience. The hon. Member himself has had some experience of it, but at the same time, unpleasant though one's task may be, policy has to be devised and executed. All I ask, in fairness to him, is not that he be spared criticism, but that such criticism of him should be fair-minded and free from personal denigration.

Mr. Chairman, I say that I sincerely regret this inconvenience, but it was not an inconvenience which sprung from any bad motivation, but from a series of unfortunate mishaps and omissions which I very much regret.

One last point. The hon. member for St. Peter said that he hopes he will not hear that the $248,000 is no longer in the Treasury. I do not think he will ever hear that. The sum has been appropriated, but it will have to lapse because the proper authority for the expenditure of it is not yet forthcoming. When that authority is forthcoming, the amount voted now will be deducted from that other amount and the difference will be used from the appropriation already made. *(ASIDES)*.

I sometimes think, Mr. Chairman, that the way to deceive hon. members is to tell them the plain unvarnished facts of a particular case, because they will not believe it and will be searching for motivation where no motivation exists.
10.20 p.m.

If I were as clever as some hon. members opposite, I would really devise, and I believe I could succeed in doing it, a means of deceiving them, but I really am not so clever and therefore I have to give them the facts of the case. I say this finally: when I give them the facts of a particular case, they must not think that I am trying to deceive them because they will be flattering me above and beyond my deserts. But these are the facts as I have given them, and we regret them and it cannot happen again because the situation will be vastly different.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am going to ask the hon. member one question. I am going to ask him to ask the Attorney General whether the $248,000 having been put in the Statutory column of the Estimates has any effect whatever. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: None.) Exactly, and therefore you do not have to say that will lapse. It is as if it was never voted. It is not there, because you cannot say that it is in a Statute and then when you look to see what the Statute is, you see a blank.

The question that this Resolution do now pass 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 one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Resolution concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, looking at today's Notice Paper, it occurs to me that we have only got three Resolutions for next week of no particular urgency, it seems, and certainly no money Resolutions, and I suggest that we could meet in two weeks' time. That would give us time to clear up all the other questions which are outstanding on the Order Paper. Therefore, instead of moving the adjournment of the House for one week, I will move it for two weeks.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that we move the adjournment for one week and move it for an earlier hour. Nobody wants normally to sit down in here until half-past ten. I would also like to appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House again to go back to the old practice of fixing the Order Paper now and not have to send us during the week, additional things. In short, when we come to the House we come prepared to say: "We are going as far as down as this and we are doing so-and-so", and only in the most exceptional and unavoidable cases you send around a policeman with additional things to be considered.

Mr. SPEAKER: If hon. members would just premit me to mention this in respect of today week and the earlier hour, the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition and myself are engaged in a matter which has to be concluded that day in the Supreme Court because the Learned Judge is going on long leave. I only mention that to hon. members. If I have a duty to perform, I can only guarantee that I, personally, will not be here.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was that that I had in mind.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: To oblige His Honour the Speaker, of course, why not make it next Wednesday then?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, let us adjourn for two weeks. I think the hon. member opposite will see the wisdom of this. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 14th May, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon).

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member must see that Private Members' Business is hanging fire for too long. That West Indies Hospital Sweepstake debate is holding up everything. Unless we will agree to alter the hours for Questions and Private Members' Business generally, or unless so much time will not be taken up with the preliminary giving of notices encroaching on Private Members' time, where will we ever get?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 14th May, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon), was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.30 p.m.