THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th August, 1968

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., *(Speaker)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Health and Cmmunity Development)*; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Leader of e House)*; Mr. J. W. CORBIN, J.P.; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries)*; I. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Mr. L.A. LYNCH, J.P.; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, *(Minister of Communitions and Works)*; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., *(Chair manof ommittees)*; Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L.(Hon, *(Leader of the Opposition)* and Mr. W. C. B. HIDS.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday 30th April, 19, have, I am informed, been circulated, and unless there is any objection, they may be confirmed. *(After a pause)* There being no objection, I declare the Minutes duly to be confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Ministe: External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1968.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to move the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment (No.4) Order, 1968;

Also, A Resolution to place the sum of $6,704 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, 11 - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No.21, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. CRAIG entered the House and took their seats.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 194, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, is ready.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 202, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 203, also asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary question No. 42, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

This House having in mind its many dictatorial acts and its contemptuous treatment of the Opposition has no confidence in the Government.

QUESTION DEFERRED

Mr. SPEAKER: Question standing in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas. *(A pause)* I am afraid that the hon. member is not now in his place.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. 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. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1968-69 No. 20

A Resolution for the sum of $18,448 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a request for additional Staff for the Office of the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom. The request is that urgent approval should be given to the employment of two additional Clerical Officers to be recruited in the United Kingdom and be attached to the Non-Established Staff of the Commission. It appears, Mr. Chairman, that recently there has been an increased volume of work in the Passport Division of the Mission, and this has required re-assigning or assigning two of the people already employed to that section. That has caused, quite naturally, an additional dislocation by assigning people, whose duties ordinarily lie elsewhere, to do this work. The result has been, of course, that a large portion of the time of diplomatic officers is being spent on routine clerical work. It seems to us that the reasons given appear to justify the staff increases as requested, although of course, the volume of work in connection with the issuing of passports should not, we think, normally remain at its high level, but should taper off after the initial demands have been satisfied.

There is also, in connection with Item 45, a request for a sum of money for a Security Officer/Driver for the Consulate-General in New York. This Officer has duties other than driving. He has the responsibility for the general security of the offices of the Consulate-General and of the Permanent Mission to the United Nations, and he is also responsible, as hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, for the protection of Barbadian officials and dignitaries whenever they visit the United States of America. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House whether the Government contemplates the issuing of passports to people who already have passports of another country. In short, does the Government contemplate the creation of dual nationality? Does it have in mind the fact that the work of the Passport Section would increase considerably if persons apply for Barbadian nationality although they may have other nationality, British or otherwise.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have some familiarity with the problems which this Resolution seeks to meet as, two months ago, I was in London and I visited the High Commission. I would like to say at this stage for the record that I was entertained most hospitably by the High Commissioner and by the Assistant High Commissioner, and I know exactly what the situation is with regard to the Passport Division of the Barbados High Commission in London. Indeed, I also have been made aware, I am very glad to say that I was made aware, without any of the personalities involved being communicated to me, that the entire staffing position of the London High Commission is causing distress to existing members of the Staff; so that there are two quite separate problems, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to deal with today. I hope that the Hon. Leader of the House, if he is no familiar with them, will be able to give them his attention.
12.25 p.m.

Now, first of all, the question of passports. The reason why, in my view, there is this pressure on the Passport Department of the West Indies High Commission is that there is hostility in the British Home Office to the idea of registering, although the law in the United Kingdom provides for it, Black Commonwealth immigrants as citizens. I say this quite definitely and advisedly. I have investigated this both with the Barbados High Commission and with members of Parliament in the House of Commons. When immigrants go to the Home Office to apply for British passports, I believe - I can only say this as belief, because I have not seen it - that there is a directive to the Passport Officers in the Home Office to direct all coloured immigrants to the High Commission of the country from which they originally came. They do not draw to the attention of the immigrants the fact that if they had been in Britain for five years they are entitled to be registered as citizens of the United Kingdom itself as Metropolitan citizens, and are entitled to the issue of a British passport.

I do not see why our High Commission should be issuing Barbados passports this rate to all those Barbadians who are in Britain and are entitled to the issue of a British passport. The first suggestion I would make to the Minister that he gives a firm and positive instruction to officers concerned that before any passport is issued to a Barbadian in London, the person be asked if he has been in England for five years, and be referred back to the British Home Office for the issue of a British passport.

My reason for suggesting this is this: if you were born in Barbados, you remain a Barbados citizen whether or not you have a British passport. Dual nationality - I do not want to press on the privileges of the Leader of the House in answering the question of the hon. member who spoke before me - is a great convenience for any citizen to have, and it exists in the constitution of Barbados, I understand it. I remember we were quite definite about that at the Independence Conference in London.

The example of those West Indian territories which forbid dual nationality such as Trinidad has now been proved to be mistaken, because the Trinidadians

themselves are regretting that they insisted on the renunciation of all other citizenship for citizens of Trinidad, and they are now introducing a Bill to alter it.

To return to the Barbados issue, when those Barbadians have renounced the privilege of having a British passport, if they have to come home on holiday, it is my view that since the Commonwealth Immigrants Act refers only to holders of United Kingdom passports - it does not say 'citizens of other countries' and so on. Theoretically, if an Englishman turns up with a Barbados passport in England, theoretically he has to subject himself to the provisions of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act. This is in the Act, and I remember it.

It is not even every holder of a United Kingdom passport who is admitted to England automatically; so those Barbadians who take Barbados passports to come home here on holidays are depriving themselves unnecessarily of some of the privileges of the residence which they may have put in in the United Kingdom. They will be doing that quite unnecessarily, and the Government of Barbados has a duty to its citizens, I maintain, to inform them of their rights and privileges under the laws of the United Kingdom, and at the same time to relieve the Barbados Mission in London from the unnecessary burden of issuing passports unnecessarily.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I just want to ask a question for my own clarification, because I regard it as an important issue. Do I understand that a person, who is entitled to a United Kingdom passport and can get one after five years' residence, need not press for a Barbados passport? Is that the point?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is exactly the point which I am making, Mr. Chairman. A Barbadian with a United Kingdom passport can enter Barbados and walk through the Customs at Seawell. Mr. Chairman, I have held more than one United Kingdom passport, and I have never had the slightest difficulty, nor indeed my wife who still holds one, in walking through the Customs at Seawell. The only trouble I have ever had with my United Kingdom passport is right here in Bridgetown when it was taken to the High Commissioner and confiscated. I do not know for what reason but that is not a quarrel which I have with the Government of Barbados. That is by the way. I now hold a Barbados passport, even though I did recover my United Kingdom passport from the High Commissioner, after making sufficient of a fuss; but that is purely by the way.

Mr. Chairman, there are no disadvantages to a Barbadian born in Barbados of having a British passport. All the advantages are the other way, if he has a United Kingdom passport. It is nonsense that the members of the staff - I have seen them at work; I have seen the pile of passports on the desk and the application forms being processed - should do all of this work when it is unnecessary.

If the United Kingdom's law remains the same, and at the moment there is nothing to change the law, Barbadians should be advised by their High Commission that they live in England, they are qualified as citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies by reason of their residence, and they must go and apply for United Kingdom passports. Do not let us forget, Mr. Chairman, that when a Barbadian gets into trouble in England - Trinidadians have got into trouble in England; the High Commissioners - Sir Learie Constantine had this experience more than once - are told that when Commonwealth immigrants come to this country they cease to be citizens from the country from which they have come, and they cannot be represented in London by their High Commissioners. That was a view which was forced on Sir Learie Constantine during the Bristol Bus dispute; it was a view accepted by Dr. Williams, and it led to a rift between Dr. Williams and Sir Learie Constantine; so I am not talking about anything that is fanciful or may happen.

When it suits the Home Office not to have the Trinidad, or the Jamaica, or the Barbados High Commission represent the interest of a Trinidadian or Jamacian or Barbadian, the Home Office will say that these people are citizens of the United Kingdom. But when there is an anti-colour feeling running at the depth that it is in England at this time, the Home Office will say: "Go and get a Barbados passport: you are a Barbadian." They reject with one hand, and accept with the other.

I very much hope that the Leader of the House - who, it is wellknown is Foreign Minister in all but name, and is carrying the entire burden of the Foreign Ministry; he confirms all of the decisions, perhaps I should say, that the permament officials recommend, and is really - I do not know for what reason - deprived of the title of Minister of External Affairs. It is well known that we have with us today, Mr. Chairman, a person who can put these things right in the Leader of the House himself.

Mr. Chairman, the second part of the burden of my speech really deals with the staff and the High Commission. There are certain questions on the Order Paper which will, perhaps, indicate the nature of the complaints which are being voiced by some members of the staff of the High Commission in London.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, there is a question of employment policy. We have been told that it is necessary to employ additional officers. I will be quite frank and open and say what complaints I have heard. One I have heard is that too many temporary staff are employed. The wives of Barbadian Civil Servants who are doing courses in England are employed in the High Commission for the period of their husbands' courses, and then go home afterwards It is suggested that they have little interest in the work, because they are only expected to be there for a few months.

12.35 p.m.

It is further suggested that they are depriving Barbadians who are resident in the United Kingdom of the opportunity of a permanent job in our Mission in London. I repeat the complaint as I have heard it, Mr. Chairman. I daresay the Minister will examine the merits of the arguments for and against, and will in due course reply to members of the House as to whether he thinks that the number of temporary staff is too great or otherwise.

I am told, Mr. Chairman, that there are 40,000 Barbadians in England. It seems to me a very large number indeed, but that is the figure estimated by the High Commission. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that of those 40,000 there must be qualified typists and qualified secretaries who would be only too glad to assist their country by working in their country's diplomatic Mission. Provision is made in the Estimates for recruitment of persons in the country where the Mission is established, and I take it that if these temporary persons are being recruited, they are being recruited under that section because I hardly imagine they were recruited in Barbados to work for a year in London. It would seem, on the face of it, Mr. Chairman, that this accommodation of the females of visiting Civil Servants, if the complaints are found to be justified, may not be in the best interests of the Mission, and certainly could not be in the best interests of the large Barbadian community in London.

The second complaint which I have heard voiced relates to the employment of non-Barbadians and in particular to a non-Barbadian in a very confidential position in the Registry of the High Commission in London. I must say that when the complaint was first reported to me, it was reported without any indication of the names of the parties who may have been involved, and so really I am entirely without any personal knowledge even of what intricacies there may be relating to this complaint; but again, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if there are 40,000 Barbadians in the United Kingdom, it may very well be against the sense of the employment policy generally pursued by this Government - as, after all, they cannot come to Barbados and work, or so it is said, if they are Barbadians qualified to do the job - to employ non-Barbadians on a permanent basis, especially in most confidential parts of the High Commission in London, because Registry clerks are the persons dealing with security files and so on - I hope there are no security files in London as such - and with the private business of the Embassy. This is another Complaint, Mr. Chairman, which it may well be found there is some basis for, and on the other hand the Minister may investigate it and offer reasons to the House why the state of affairs should continue. I cannot imagine that of the 40,000 Barbadians in England, no one can be found to carry out the duties of Registry clerk or whatever the matter may be.

One point I would make, Mr. Chairman, on the question of the clerical officers at £ 18 a week. It is not for members of the Opposition to say that salaries should be higher or anything like that, but I hope it is borne in mind when filling these positions that £ 18 a week will not in general buy you a good clerical officer in London of the sort referred to. But that is only by the way.

There is one last point which I would make, Mr. Chairman. I see here concerning the Students Division that "no clerical officer is available to assist in the Students Division with the large volume of its work." I am going to say this, Mr. Chairman: the Barbados High Commission in London would work a good deal better if it did not have to deal not only with its own Students Division but also with the Students and Nurses Division of the Guyana High Commission. We are told that we are getting a bargain when we get Mr. Luckhoo, but the biggest sign to be found in Kensington High Street over a High Commission is the Students and Nurses Division, Guyana High Commission. I understand that the Students and Nurses Division of the Guyana High Commission rents offices from our Government. I daresay that included in the rent is the use of the telephone and the use of its Switchboard Operator and Receptionist. I am also going to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not had the slightest complaint from the Receptionist, but other persons have taken up cudgels on the Receptionist's behalf to my knowledge, and it is suggested that the Guyana Nurses and Students occupy a disproportionate amount of the telephone, the receptionist's time, and her time on the telephone switchboard, and that perhaps the majority of visitors at certain times to that High Commission are the Guyana Nurses and Students, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if this is considered a desirable thing.

Sir Lionel, I understand, goes to the High Commission once a week. I do not think that he quite goes 40 per cent of the time even though we pay 40 per cent of the salary. He goes once a week, but the Guyana Students and Nurses are there all the time. Sir Lionel goes presumably for the benefit of the High Commission; the Students and Nurses, as I understand it, go principally to be a burden on the Barbados High Commission staff and - the Minister will confirm this - there is no exchange of staff. The Guyana High Commission does nothing at all for us. It is situated at a great distance. If you go there to see Sir Lionel Luckhoo, you would be referred to his visiting day next Friday at the High Commission if you are a Barbadian. The work of the Guyana High Commission, of course, in the last year has been canvassing votes for Mr. Burnham; but again that is by the way. I understand that has taken up a lot of their time. I am very glad at least that they are not canvassing for votes for the Democratic Labour Party in Barbados. We are at least spared that, but they do nothing for the Barbados High Commission. Why should we, especially if we are charging less than an economic rent to them for the use of our premises, be doing anything for them?

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that Part I of the Addendum is at the present moment justified; but before I sit down, I am going to ask the Minister to give the assurance that what he referred to in his speech and also what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the Opposition referred to in

his speech - the fact that the volume of passport work will not continue at the present level - that when that happens, some of the clerical officers will be laid off. Let us hope that will be the case. Parkinson's Law of the natural increase of Civil Servants - Professor Parkinson says, if it has a basis, that at some stage if a particular Department had more work to do and they took on more staff to do the work and the staff entrenched themselves, the people who are over-worked when there is a staff of three in fact continue to be over-worked when there is a staff of five, and people who want more staff when it is five will want more when it is seven. So let us hope a stop can be put to Parkinsonism in this respect, because even if all the Barbadians in England got passports, it will at least be five years before they can all be asking for them again, because the passports run for five years and there is bound to be a diminution in the amount of work.

I call on the Leader of the House to give the assurance that this work will not expand so as to fill the time available for its completion by the increased staff, and I hope the Minister will assure us that if the work is ended by next March, these jobs will not appear in the Estimates for 1969-70. This is one sphere, one field of activity, where the Minister could really try to cut down the growing burden of the administration of this Island. He would be entitled to the gratitude of all Barbadians, because I am not one who believes that you can measure a country's progress by the amount of money the Government is spending. You can measure it by the amount of development the Government is carrying on, not by the amount of salaries it is paying to Civil Servants. Most countries like to aim and have the highest hope of reducing the burden of the Civil Servants, and when the Prime Minister made his speech about the Civil Service being an army of occupation feeding upon our fair land or whatever the metaphor was, I thought for one moment that he was recognising this. But no! Mr. Chairman, two years later in a Budget Speech he has measured Barbados' progress by the fact that due to an increase in Civil Service salaries, the Government's share of the national expenditure has risen to 23 per cent or whatever it is. Let the Minister strike the blow here for reduction of the cost of Government and spend the taxpayers' money in development where it is really needed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended speaking on this security Bill until the Leader of the House answered the first part about dual nationality. I did not know anything about what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said. He has not told me about this experience of his in London, nor does he know what I am going to say. Only yesterday this question of representation by Sir Lionel an admirable official in himself, came up, and it is only fair to him that what the hon. member has just said and what I am going to say now should be brought to his notice. I for one never agreed and could never see Barbados being represented by the same Commissioner as Guyana is being represented by.

12.45 p.m.

There is bound to be a conflict of interests. It is all very well for us to have an Ambassador - we will not ever reach that stage, I hope, but it is possible - or some Consular representative of, say, Chile and Paraguay or anything like that. The number of Barbadians who are likely to be in Chile and Paraguay are going to be so few that it does not matter if you have one man representing half a dozen South American countries; but when it comes to the number of Barbadians and Guyanese whose interests may conflict - one of my informants yesterday was a Security man himself, and I will come to that part of it which the hon. member who has just sat down has mentioned. When it comes to the number of Guyanese and Barbadians, I repeat, whose interests may conflict, it is wrong to have one and the same representative, however admirable, undoubtedly Sir Lionel Luckhoo, both in his profession and as a man, is. One of my informants yesterday was himself a Security man for a time and saw, at any rate, the workings of Security in the old Federation and saw conflicts arising when one Security man was a Guyanese and he had to decide between conflicting interests of a Trinidadian and a Guyanese. I just swallowed what this Security man said because he obviously knew his stuff; he had been himself in Security and he emphasised how keen and how experienced he thought the British were to have British only in any Security. Have Englishmen or Scotmen or even the sometimes laughed-at Welsh in Security rather than have some people who become naturalised, but they retain all their Germanic affinities and prejudices.

I would be glad to be confirmed in what has been, all along, my opinion that you should not put a man in a position where human nature is such that a Guyanese by birth should have to decide between the possible rival claims of a Barbadian and a Guyanese. Not even Solomon with all his wisdom could ever have forgotten that he was Solomon by birth and not a Gentile. I have just risen - as I said, I intended to leave this, and if the hon. member had not raised it, I would not have raised it, this little bit about Sir Lionel Luckhoo; it is only fair to him, I cannot speak for the Government officially now, but I should be inclined to say that our view would be that it is better to spend more money on a separate Barbadian High Commissioner than to continue with the present arrangement. I say that there may be certain things where it does not matter having somebody representing somewhere else, but not Guyanese or Trinidadians or other West Indians. Even in our Federation, the aim of Civil Servants - and I must pay tribute to Civil Servants of the old West Indies Federation, that although some of them did not know each other until they met in Trinidad, as Civil Servants they aimed at being West Indians; but ever so often conflicting interests and therefore conflicting duties would arise.

I have added this bit to what I said before only in support of what the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said; but I do urge - and I must say that, as the hon. member has said, the Hon. Leader of the House having more time, and it may be, more inclination to deal with External Affairs can devote

some of his time to considering with his colleagues the present position there as well as consider with his colleagues the other point which has been raised by the hon. member about British passports and the like. It was not very flattering to me as a Barbadian that the last time I went to Geneva, the Customs Officer who passed me, not that particular one perhaps, but the Customs Officer who passed me over and over again ten or fifteen times on the presentation of a Barbados Passport, just stopped me. He had to try to find out where Barbados was, although the passport was there and although I had an American visa and all the rest of it. It is not very flattering: but if Barbadians living in Great Britain can make use of British passports as well, that is one of the reasons why I would urge the Hon. Leader of the House to consider this question of dual nationality, because you may not be hurting a Barbadian; you may actually be helping him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is not much which I have to say on this Resolution except with respect to the Security Officer who is employed, according to the Addendum to the Resolution at that rate, his total emoluments being therefore $610 U.S. per annum. (A MEMBER: $6,120 per annum). Yes, Sir, $6,120 per annum. The Addendum to the Resolution says that in addition to driving the official car, this officer is responsible for the security of the offices and equipment of the Consulate-General and of the Permanent Mission to the United Nations. He is also responsible for the protection of Barbadian officials and dignitaries during their visits to the United States of America. Now, Sir, I do not want to say that I have vast experience in Security work, but I have been engaged in Security work in this island, and one must wonder, looking at this Addendum, and try to find out exactly what are the functions, in truth and in fact, of this particular officer.

No mention is made that this Security Officer / Driver, bodyguard, caretaker, whatever you may wish to call him - no mention is made that he has any staff, any assistance of anything of the kind. You must ask, Mr. Chairman, this one question and it is this. If two or more Barbadian officials or dignitaries turn up to the United States of America at the same time and they are travelling, they have appointments taking one to the North and one to the South, how is this Security Officer going to divide his services? And while you might have these Barbadian officials, you might also have some dignitaries. What I am suggesting is this: that this Addendum is a farce, and that this could not be true at all. The officer must either be doing Security duties or he must not be driving this car and be responsible for the equipment at the Consulate-General and the Permanent Mission to the United Nations and what not.
12.55 p.m.

I have a suspicion that this Chauffeur/Security Officer is really and truly employed in the United States, I would say, to go into places like the Bowery, or Greenwich Village, and recruit people from these places to line routes where some of our Barbadian officials are going to pass and to pay them undue compliments on special occasions.

On the other hand, would the Minister tell us whether this Security Officer has been accorded diplomatic immunity by the United States Government? All of these are matters of importance. You must remember that he is a chauffeur and he has to carry out, as the Minister says, general Security duties. It is of some importance to be told what is this Officer's true position in diplomatic circles.

Now, since the Officer is presently receiving $510 (U.S.) per month, and we are now being asked to vote the sum of $6,400 (E.C.), which we can say is another $3,200 (U.S.) to pay this Officer to the end of the financial year - I would much prefer if the Minister would explain this to me. When it is stated, "during the financial year 1968-69" must we take it to mean to the end of the financial year 1968?

Mr. Chairman, we have to be very, very careful when we see notations such as this. We understand from the Minister that this amount of $3,200 (U.S.) is expected to cover the Officer until the end of March next year. One just has to see between now and then what a tidy sum will be paid to this Officer for carrying out these duties. As I have said earlier the duties are such as to make it impossible for any one man to function properly in such a position.

I hope that the Minister will examine the situation as it really is, and that he will attempt to give us some sort of explanation as to how this one officer can be a chauffeur/bodyguard all at the same time, when you have Barbadian officials and other dignitaries plus the staff of the Consulate General as well as the Permanent Mission to the United Nations to look after. I cannot for the life of me, see how one man can function in so many capacities at the same time. It needs some sort of explanation, which I hope the Minister will proffer at this stage.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the Minister says that the New York Police will be available, does this Government pay the New York City for additional police protection? We know how generous they can be in New York to visiting dignitaries with police protection.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is,, undoubtedly, one of the most interesting to come before this Committee, and certainly not least because it has evoked important issues and questions which need careful study and attention. All the points raised on the other side desire considerable significance and attention. Although, quite rightly, I think I may not be able to answer all of them in the detail required, I shall certainly try my best. But even with those about which I shall be very loth to give what I think the hon. junior member for St. Peter would understand if I say that I am loth to give an *al fresco* opinion to some of them, I think they really deserve careful attention. I would be prepared to take up those

matters with the appropriate authorities, and return to the House next week with enlightenment on them.

Meanwhile, let me deal with the majority of them. First, as to the question of dual nationality. I appreciated everything the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas has said. It struck me, giving a purely layman's opinion, which is not only challengable but may even be wrong - it strikes me that the Constitution does seem to envisage the possibility of dual citizenship. It says here in section 8: "Every person who under this Constitution, or any Act of Parliament is a citizen of Barbados, or under any enactment for the time being in force, in any country to which this section applies is a citizen of that country shall, by virtue of that citizenship, have the status of a Commonwealth citizen."

Of course, I do not know whether it also implies the converse, but I would think, speaking purely as a layman, that this is envisaged and that you will probably need special legislation to bring it into force. However, this is one of the points on which I would like to seek further enlightenment not only for myself, but for the benefit of the House as to the intrinsic importance of the question, and give a definite answer to the House on the next occasion.

In connection with this, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas also pointed out that the reason for the large increase in applications for Barbadian passports lies not so much in the desire to have Barbadian passports, but from pressures and inconveniences, possibly, experienced by Barbadians in the United Kingdom and a certain amount of intransigence and even skullduggery on the part of the British Home Office authorities in dealing with Commonwealth Nationals.
1.05 p.m.

I think that this is true, but I should also like to point out another aspect of the matter. I think it is true that their difficulties in their dealing with the British Home Office drives them to apply for Barbadian passports when they need not have them, but it could also be, I think, that they regard a Barbadian passport as something which they ought not to be without in case they need final protection, support and all those things in the United Kingdom. It may not only be because they are under pressure; they might genuinely think that if they have this, this is the sort of last and final insurance they can have. This will have to be investigated. It could also be, I think, that they may feel that the possession of a Barbadian passport enables them to escape the rigours of going into the British Army and doing National Service. There may be mixed motives, but I am at one with the hon. member that it seems absurd that an office or a department in a High Commission should be inundated with these requests which need not come to it and which, if the people knew their rights, would not be made. It seems a pity that this should be happening to increase unnecessary expenditure, and perhaps to disorganise the work of a whole office or part of an office for something that need not be, and I readily give the assurance that this will be immediately investigated.

We have been told, of course, that between now and March this flood of requests for passports should taper off, but I shall certainly have it drawn to the attention of the appropriate authorities that this need not happen at all, and that far from tapering it off by the end of March, if we can get it tapered off by the end of the calendar year, in the next three or four months, we should try to do this. I think this is a very important point, and the sooner we get to work on it, the better.

I also take his point that our own people ought to be instructed to inform our nationals that they are entitled after five years' residence to United Kingdom passports. Very often people do not always know their rights in this respect and it would do no harm to make them aware. As I said, that is a point which I readily take, because if that were done, that also would cause a reduction in the number of applications for Barbadian passports.

With respect to the employment policy, the hon. member sought an assurance from me that Parkinson's law would not apply in these administrative arrangements in our High Commission, and indeed I believe he meant generally speaking in our overseas Missions and offices abroad. I could not obviously give the assurance that Parkinson's law would not apply. I think the hon. and learned member is perhaps even more aware than I am of this tendency within the public service of any country to multiply *ad infinitum*. You have no sooner perhaps re-organised one office, rationalised its work, giving it a working force which it said it required, than within six months you are told that a horrible miscalculation was made, and they need more staff to pull together what the rationalisation was designed to pull together. It seems to me that in every country in all aspects of the public service, the pressure for more and more hands and brains to do the same amount or even less work is the same, and this is probably because in any public service they tend to make work for each other. So I could not give the assurance that Parkinson's law would not apply.

I can, however, give the assurance that instructions would go out that first of all they should hasten the issue of these outstanding passports; they should at the same time inform applicants of their entitlement to United Kingdom passports, and so cut off the flow of applications, and that as soon as all this is done, those who are not required should either be put to other work, or, if their services are not needed be dispensed with. This is the most I can give an assurance about, but I cannot say that the situation would not become worse, because these things have a habit of snow-balling on you.

The hon. member also raised the point about the tendency which has been evident in the recent past to give employment to the wives of Civil Servants on leave for the duration of their husbands'

leaves. This is a case where the hon. and learned member is better informed than I am. I myself was not aware of this, but I am perfectly willing to take his word for it, because I could scarcely imagine him to visit the High Commission, be lavishly entertained by the number one and number two and not be told everything that he wished to know; so that if he tells me this, I am perfectly willing to accept it and to have it investigated. It would seem to me to be something wrong. I do not say this in criticism of individuals, but I would think, Mr. Chairman, that it should be obvious without having to be spoken; but if it needs to be spoken, the appropriate directions would be given. I would think, however, it would be obvious to the people responsible for taking on temporary staff in our overseas Missions and offices abroad that a certain amount of fair-mindedness ought to apply, and that if you have Barbadian nationals in the United Kingdom who live there and who are qualified for the kind of work you have to give, it would seem to me to be a fair-minded thing to offer them the temporary employment, provided they are otherwise suitable, rather than take up people who are just up on holiday or only for short periods and give them employment. As I say, this should be a policy without its being directed to be; but if a directive is needed in this respect, I am perfectly prepared to give it, because it is a fair and decent thing to do. If qualified Barbadians live in the United Kingdom and have made their homes there, they are as much entitled to employment in Barbadian offices and Missions abroad as anybody who is sent from here, and provided they are suitably qualified, it would be my feeling that they should have every opportunity to work in our Missions and offices abroad and not be shunted aside for people who are only going up there at most for six months or, in most cases, even for a lesser time than this.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter as well as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition both raised questions about the second part of the Resolution which deals with the supplementary provision to augment the salary of the Security Officer/Driver at the Consulate General.
1.15 p.m.

I wish to give the hon. junior member for St. Peter the assurance that the facts are as sent down here. Briefly, the position is this. This Officer himself is principally attached to the Consulate-General as driver, but perhaps on the same principle which has been enunciated here earlier, it has been possible to combine that with other duties of a different nature. The hon. member's point is well taken, because, from an experience which I myself had, the opportunity which I had to observe the kind of work which has to be done by this officer, it may well be that in a year's time or so, we may have to consider splitting these duties entirely because the officer, it would seem to me, has no regular sleeping or off-duty hours. The nature of his work is such that when the Consulate-General is called out, for instance, to New York at any time, he naturally has to go with him. He accompanies him occasionally on Government business to Canada or wherever our nationals have to be attended to, or other parts of the United States of America, and at the same time, he is charged, when present, because he could not do this other kind of work when absent, with the responsibility for Security within the offices while he is there. It is not true - I know that the hon. junior member for St. Peter likes to be a little fanciful at times, but I think this is a bit too fanciful to suppose that this officer is sent down to the Bowery to pick up a stack of enthusiasts to line the streets when Caesar passes by. I do not think he would find that kind of person in the Bowery unless he was interested in, perhaps, gathering together as many Hippies and Psychadelic enthusiasts as he could muster, and even so, I do not think they would like Fifth Avenue unless it was for a love-in. The duties are as set out here; but I can see that there will be increasing problems. Because of the nature of the work and for the number of times he has a span of duty of 18 hours, 20 hours or 24 hours a day sometimes - well, not 24 hours a day but, say, 18 hours a day two or three times a week, the increased allowance is well justified.

As I said, and I wish to repeat, I myself would think that the time is soon coming when the whole position will have to be revised, and the Consulate-General may well have to employ a driver as driver, and allow the Permanent Mission and his office to use the services of a Security person full time. It is going to be increasingly difficult to maintain within a single person the responsibility for both jobs; up to the moment, it is being well done, yet I can see that the strain may well sometime in the future become impossible.

If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will again refresh my memory on the point which he raised about the Security Officer, I will do my best to answer it. I did not really make a note of his point, but he did raise the point.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is obviously manifestly impossible for one man to be a driver and see after Security, anyhow, of a single person. In my experience, at any rate, they were very generous in New York City. Dr. Cummins and I stayed in a hotel for two weeks and had two private detectives in an adjoining bedroom day and night and wherever we went. I mentioned to one of them once that I would like to go to Macy's to buy a few ties or something like that, and I say that we could not have been treated more generously than we were treated. Does this Government have to pay some of that? We were very generously treated in New York; it could not have been more generous. We could not have been seen after and safeguarded more than we were. Does this Government now have to pay some of that? (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No.)

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, it is after hearing the Hon. Minister that I have got to ask if this Security Officer has had any special training in Security work. My reason for asking that question is this; we have our local Security staff here, and when one looks at the salary which is being paid to this

Security Officer/Driver in the United States, one might well ask: would it not have been better if you had offered promotion to one of our local men here to serve in the United States where he would feel that his service and training here are now worth him something, to be stationed abroad and be attached to a Mission or something of the sort, rather than to go about, as I understand it, just like a "gauling" in the United States and put your hands on some strong arm man who has, from my information, no special aptitude or anything for this Security Officer's job. It is well worth the Minister telling us, if he does not feel that the time is ripe, when he should make an investigation so as to find out whether or not the salary is sufficiently attractive that one of our local men here could be offered the opportunity to work for $500 or $600 U.S., a month in the United States of America. I feel that that would be some encouragement at least to the other people to serve.

One other point is this. Can the Minister tell us if this Security Officer is regarded as a Security Officer by the United States authorities, or is it a case where he drives the Consulate-General say, to a conference, or wherever he has to go, and he has to remain outside sitting in the car and cannot trespass on the portals of the building or what? This is a Security Officer and we want to know. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He has the opportunity.) If the Minister is telling us that this Officer is entitled to have that opportunity, I sincerely hope that that is the case, and that he is regarded by us in this Assembly as a Security Officer and not just as some knock-out in the United States of America.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's point is well taken. As a matter of fact, this is what I was hinting, although I did not put it in quite that way, when I said that, in my view, the matter would have to be reviewed certainly within a year. I could not give the assurance that it would be reviewed now because, obviously, what arrangements are in force would have to be in force until the end of this financial year. I said that it seemed to me from what little opportunity I have had to observe it, that the work load would become increasingly heavier on both sides, and that a bifurcation or splitting up of the duties sometime in the future would have to be contemplated.

There is one other point I would like to make before I sit down. I just want to say this: I know that members on the other side have expressed some anxiety about the arrangement which we have which enabled us to share a High Commission with the Government of Guyana. I should like to say that this has not been a problem with us and no difficulties have arisen. As we have said during the Estimates, we are quite satisfied - and this has been attested to by people outside of Government and who were not speaking on behalf of the Government - with the high level of achievement which Sir Lionel Luckhoo has demonstrated in his job. I want to say that the arrangement could easily have been in the other way. It could easily have happened if, for instance, in point of time, we had come to Independence before Guyana, I believe that the Government of Guyana would have asked us, having been there first, to share with them this particular service, so that this is purely a historical accident - (Mr. HINDS: Why did you not ask Trinidad?) We cannot ask everybody - that this arrangement is as it is.
1.25 p.m.

I want to make it perfectly clear that we are satisfied with the performance of Sir Lionel Luckhoo, and any anxieties or inconveniences which our own nationals experience from time to time arise not from the arrangement as such, and certainly not from anything which happens or does not happen at the top of the High Commission, but from certain administrative and other difficulties which we are at the moment resolving. I do not want hon. members to go away with the thinking that because our High Commissioner is a national of another country; therefore the complaints of our own Nurses and Students that they cannot use certain facilities are necessarily consequent on that. We would have these complaints anyhow so long as imaginative treatment, or imaginative attitudes are not brought to bear on a particular job.

I wish to make it quite clear that while I think that this arrangement could not last forever, a time certainly may come when a Government of Barbados whether this one or a succeeding one, will decide to change this arrangement. When that time comes, and that arrangement is changed, the Government of Guyana or some other Caribbean Government may still be proposing to us to share representation, if not in London, in some other part of the globe.

Arrangements and agreements for the sharing of external representation are things which countries do and have with one another from time to time. If they do not work smoothly somewhere down the line, this is not because of the decision to share representation, but it can easily be because subordinates and others do not always apply fair-mindedness and imagination to their tasks and create friction where none should exist.

I will bear in mind the comments made by the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas, because any difficulties which our nationals experience in an office that we contribute money to, have to be remedied immediately. It certainly could never be an excuse for not remedying them that we are afraid to offend the Guyanese Government. This could not arise at all. Instructions will go out that a full and thorough investigation will be made into any grievance complained of, and the appropriate remedies set in hand. I just want to give hon. members that assurance.

The question that the Resolution for $18,448 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour 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, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read the first time.

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution be now agreed to.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Police Act, 1961.
1.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, recently the Hon. and Learned Attorney General drew to the attention of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Government generally that in a recent examination of the Police Act of 1961, there had been discovered two matters which were in need of urgent rectification. The first one has to do with Section 29(2). It appears that Section 29(2) of that Act purports to continue to vest in the Commissioner of Police power to suspend Officers of the Force of and below the rank of Inspector. This is seriously in conflict with Section 96 of the Country's Constitution which vests all disciplinary control over such officers in the Governor-General, and which therefore supercedes the provision of Section 29(2) of the Act of 1961.

An attempt was made in Legal Notice 168 of 1967 to bring this into conformity, but by a typographical error, intended reference to section 29(2) of the Police Act, 1961 appeared as a reference to section 29(1).

The second thing which appeared to be in need of rectification, Mr. Speaker, was this: it appears that in section 60 of the Act of 1961, there is an omission which, it is felt, can cause serious inconvenience to the Police Force in the disposition of property which comes into the possession of the Police in connection with a criminal charge where there are conflicting claims to such property even after the charge has been disposed of. As it now reads, the section applies only to property which comes into the possession of the Force in connection with "any criminal charge under section 31 of the Pawnbrokers Act of 1885". It appears that it was originally intended that that section should apply to any property coming into the possession of the Police Force in connection with any criminal charge, or under section 31 of the Pawnbrokers Act, 1885; so that this Bill has accordingly been prepared in order to bring the provisions first of section 29(2) of the Police Act into conformity with section 96 of the Constitution, making it clear that disciplinary powers are vested not in the Commissioner of Police but in the Governor-General, and secondly for the sake of tidiness, opportunity has also been taken to amend section 60 by the insertion of the word "or" which had been omitted due to the oversight which I just outlined.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if it is all the same to the hon. members opposite and if the hon. and learned member opposite does not mind, I would suggest that we could take the luncheon suspension now.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the Government side, since there is no more Government Business, to come back in, because on the last occasion when the sitting was suspended the Ministers kept straight home or went somewhere else; but they did not come back.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member misunderstood me. I never said I had come to the end of Government Business for today's sitting. I merely said it did not seem to

me worthwhile starting a new item within ten minutes of the suspension; so that if the other side did not mind, I would move the suspension now - which I have done.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is very kind of the hon. member, but I prefer him to carry on until time expires. I was thinking that he had finished Government Business, and we could take the break and then come back; but if the Hon. Minister has more Government Business, he should do it until the hour for suspension.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

1.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I have been informed that the Reply has been laid to Question No. 194, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. That is on page 13, left-hand column.

BEDSTEADS AND MATTRESSES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ROYAL BARBADOS POLICE FORCE

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

Is it the intention of the Government to furnish bedsteads and mattresses to members of the Royal Police Force to be used in place of the wooden-framed and canvas cots?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, when does Government intend to implement the plan?

3. Is Government aware that the knowledge that members of the Fire Services have been furnished with bedsteads is giving cause for uneasiness amongst some members of the Royal Barbados Police Force?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the hon. member. I did state that the Reply to Question No. 194 was ready, and so it is written here, but the Replies have no relevance at all, as far as I can see, to the Question. The Replies which I have here have to do with the appointment to the post of Education Officer. There must be a mistake somewhere. If the hon. member can find that Question, notice of it was given on the 14th May, 1968. The Question should have been No. 174.

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY re APPOINTMENT TO POST OF EDUCATION OFFICER

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 174, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. That is to be found on page 9, left hand column.

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

What is Government's policy with respect to making appointments to the Post of Education Officer in the Ministry of Education?

2. What is the Government's policy with respect to seconding officers or teachers to such posts in the Ministry of Education?

3. Was a Mr. L. S. Wellington of the Staff of Harrison College due for secondment to the Ministry of Education to serve as an Education Officer?

4. Has the post of Education Officer ever been advertised as vacant or has there been an advertisement or advertisements calling for applicants to fill the post?

5. When was such an advertisement published and where?

6. How many applications were received as a result of such advertisements?

7. Were applications received from suitably qualified teachers with experience?

8. Was Mr. L. S. Wellington one of the applicants for the post?

9. If the answer to No. 3 above is in the affirmative, was the secondment a recommendation of the Public Service Commission?

10. If the answer to No. 9 is in the negative, will the Minister state who made the recommendation for secondment?

11. Were the powers of the Public service Commission in anyway usurped in the matter of seconding Mr. Wellington to this post?

12. If the answer to No. 11 above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state who is guilty of such conduct?

13. Has Mr. L. S. Wellington taken up the post?

14. If not, why not?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. The policy respecting the making of appointments to the post of Education Officer in the Ministry of Education is that Education Officers concerned with Secondary Schools must hold a University degree while those concerned with Primary Schools may be non-graduates. In every case, professional training and teaching experience are essential pre-requisites.

The procedure is that the Ministry may either recommend to the Public Service Commission

that the vacancy be advertised, or submit a nomination for the appointment, with supporting reasons.

2. With regard to the seconding of officers or teachers to the posts of Education Officer, the same policy outlined at (1) above is observed. The normal procedure is that the Ministry submits nominations for confirmation by the Public Service Commission.

3. The Ministry of Education nominated Mr. Wellington for secondment to act as Education Officer until a permanent appointment would be made.

4. The post had not been advertised at the time.

5. Does not arise.

6. Does not arise.

7. Does not arise.

8. Does not arise.

9. No, Sir.

10. The recommendation was made in accordance with the procedure stated in paragraph 2 above.

11. No, Sir.

12. Does not arise.

13. No, Sir.

14. When the appropriate form was submitted to the Public Service Commission, they did not approve the proposal to appoint Mr. L. S. Wellington on secondment from Harrison College.

2.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the Minister if seconding an officer, as was the case of Mr. Wellington, before the post was advertised was in keeping with Government's policy?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Will the hon. member repeat the question?

Mr. HINDS: I ask if the Minister would tell us if, in seconding Mr. Wellington for the post of Education Officer before the post was advertised, it was in keeping with Government's policy?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would say that this is what has been done before, and can be done according to the exigencies of the Service within a particular Ministry. The point is not whether the secondment can be done or is done before the advertisement. The point is to get the secondment approved by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister feel that the Public Service Commission ought to be familiar with the exigencies in the Service to which the Minister just referred?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, as a general but not necessarily an absolute rule, because emergencies may occur in a Ministry over the week-end, and P.S.C. would only know about them when so informed. Generally speaking, they are entitled to be kept informed of these matters, but they cannot know everything until told.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister agree that in seconding Mr. Wellington to this post before it was advertised was prejudicing the chances of applicants after the post was advertised when the time came for the post to be filled?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is not necessarily so, Mr. Speaker. I can well think of a case in which you can second an officer to the post, and then you advertise the post and he takes his chance with everybody else and can lose that chance. This is the luck of the draw.

Mr. HINDS: I think the Minister, Sir, in reply to No. 8, said that it does not arise. Has the post been advertised since the tabling of the questions?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I must have notice of that question, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing here to indicate that that is either so or not so.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, has the post been filled since the tabling of these questions?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid I must return the same sort of answer, although I believe that the post of Education Officer has recently been filled and that Mr. Best has been appointed; but, whether that post is this one, I am unable to say.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the Minister prepare the answers for himself, or is it something handed to him? Imagine him saying what he has just said!

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the questions have been somewhat lengthy. At No. 13, Sir, I have the Minister's reply, regarding Mr. Wellington taking up the post, as "No". Is the Minister telling me now that Mr. Wellington did not go in the Ministry and carry out the duties as Education Officer for a period before these Questions were tabled?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am not telling the hon. member that, nor am I telling the hon. member that he did. I just do not know.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister feel it is fair to us on this side of the House to have him to speak for education? He does not know this, and he is not familiar with this. That is what I am saying. Does he think it is fair to us to have him answering matters regarding education?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this would depend upon the Questions asked. If the hon. member can be astute enough to ask me Questions the answers to which I know, I will answer

them. But if he asks me Questions the answers to which I do not know, I cannot answer them.

Mr. HINDS: Will the Minister tell us who will be in a better position to know, than he is?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would think, from the way this is going, the hon. member himself. *(Laughter)*

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister still saying that Mr. Wellington was not seconded?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, I am saying he was not seconded, because I have already said - if I have not said it before, I say it now - that, when the particular form conveying the request was submitted to the Public Service Commission for approval, they did not approve the proposal. Therefore not having approved the proposal, I cannot say that Mr. Wellington was seconded.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister say what date that form was submitted to the Public Service Commission for approval?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid I cannot answer that, because I see nothing on the file to guide me in that respect.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS rose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. junior member for St. Peter given way?

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The Hon. Leader of the House, I presume, can speak only for himself, but are we to understand that is the way Questions are answered? A file is handed to a Minister; he reads certain parts of it, and then he says: "I cannot tell you; it is not here "!

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will have to make very strong representation to Your Honour as to whether answers are in order when the Minister gets up to answer and merely says: "From what I have before me, so-and-so I can tell you." Is this his habit? Is this the rule? We cannot ask him to speak for his colleagues, because they see what the questions are and see the answers for themselves and get the information. Anybody can get up and just look at the file and hope to read something, if that is the way Questions are going to be answered. I would ask the Hon. Leader of the House to answer whether he gives us answers merely from reading from a file handed to him?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to that was obvious. I have to take the answers from the file; that is how Government operates.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Can anything be more preposterous than that? They take a year sometimes to answer Questions, and they can only answer by having the files put in their hands. It is absolutely contemptuous of the Opposition. That is the whole essence of Parliamentary procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not make a speech now. He may continue.

2.50 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is not the hon. member aware that the whole essence of having Questions and answers is that the Opposition may be able to dig out of the Government information as regards things that have to come to their knowledge, but of which they have no full or official notice? Does the hon. member say that when a Question is put specifically to him, because sometimes the Opposition just says "the appropriate Minister" but you know to whom you put the Question, he does not then see for himself, examine the files for himself, get answers prepared and then read out the answers? I am waiting for an answer. This sitting down silently despising the Opposition and not caring whether they answer or not is absolutely below any dignity in a democratic Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to make any speech at that stage. He may make his point in another way, as he very well knows.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I suggest that Your Honour should ask the Minister whether he is disposed to answer?

Mr. SPEAKER: A Question is put which according to our Standing Orders, as yet unamended, the Minister may answer or may not.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He may give a reason for not answering. After all, this is not the only Assembly that hon. members know of and have seen the working of parliamentary procedure. You give a reason for not answering.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I do not detect a supplementary question there.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think I noted correctly that the Minister said in reply to Question 3 that the Ministry nominated Mr. Wellington or words to that effect. The Ministry nominated Mr. Wellington to do what?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the additional portion of the reply to question 3 was "nominated Mr. Wellington for secondment to act as Education Officer until a permanent appointment would be made".

Mr. HINDS: Sir, did he act?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well the answer to that is "no". The proposal was not approved by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. HINDS: How much time elapsed between his nomination and the forwarding of the form to the Public Service Commission?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: What did Mr. Wellington do between the time he was nominated by the Ministry and until word was received that the Public Service Commission did not approve of this recommendation?

Mr. SPEAKER: As to the question "what did Mr. Wellington do", I am afraid that is too wide. Would the hon. member make it more specific?

Mr. HINDS: I mean with respect to his being nominated to act.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This I do not know.

Mr. HINDS: Has the Ministry of Education paid Mr. Wellington any sum at all in respect of services performed for the Ministry of Education up to the date of the tabling of this question?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am unable to say, Mr. Speaker. If they had not employed him, I cannot see how they could pay him.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that Mr. L. S. Wellington is a Master attached to the staff of Harrison College, and he was so at the time of the tabling of this question?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes. This is in reply to the Question itself. I am aware of this. This being the case, he could only have been paid by the Governing Body of Harrison College who was then at the material time employing him.

Mr. HINDS: Could the Minister tell us if Mr. Wellington's nomination for secondment was communicated by the Ministry of Education to the Governing Body of Harrison College at any time?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am unable to say.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us at all how Mr. Wellington got inside the Ministry of Education?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am afraid not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Who in the Ministry of Education nominated Mr. Wellington for secondment?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would think that this kind of nomination would be done by the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Would he be acting on instructions received from the Minister if he carried out such action?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No. The Minister has no jurisdiction in personnel matters.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, I understand the Minister to say that the Minister has no jurisdiction in personnel matters. Does the Minister know that Mr. Wellington is a personal friend of the Minister?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member wishes to tell me that, I have no objection to hearing it.

Mr. HINDS: Does the Minister think it was fair to Mr. Wellington to have nominated him under such circumstances?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member would have to say the circumstances in which he deems it unfair. The question is too wide. I really could not answer that one.

Mr. HINDS: Well, Sir, the Minister has asked me to state the circumstances. I am only permitted to ask a supplementary, but in reply to the Minister, leading up to a supplementary and with your permission, I am willing to state that from the Minister's reply.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member may put it this way: "Is the Minister not aware.....?"

Mr. HINDS: I am grateful to Your Honour. Is the Minister not aware that Mr. Wellington was given a sort of fare-well at Harrison College immediately before the tabling of this Question?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No. Sir.

Mr. HINDS: Are you saying he did not have the party or you are not aware of it?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The question was whether I was aware, and I said "no".

Mr. HINDS: Not aware of what? Of the holding of the party?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, no. I was not aware of what was asked.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Minister in possession of any knowledge at all that Mr. Wellington served within the compound of the Ministry of Education for a period nearing two weeks on secondment?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No, Sir. I was not aware of that.

Mr. HINDS: Did it happen?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not know, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: As a result of the tabling of this Question, did the Minister not try to find out any of these things, and was none of these things brought to light for the Minister?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The answer to that would be "yes". If things had not been brought to light, I would not have been able to answer the hon. member's questions. It is the supplementaries which he finds difficulty in getting answered, but this is be-

cause he is asking these things of which I personally am not aware.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, is the Minister speaking for himself or for the Ministry of Education?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if you ask me whether I know that a farewell party was held, you are not asking me anything about the Ministry of Education; you are asking me about myself. If I tell you I am not aware of it, you have to take it that I am not aware of it. If you ask me things that I know about, I say that I know, I agree with you or I disagree with you. It is pretty simple.

3.00 p.m.

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY re OPERATION OF SCOTLAND FACTORY

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 202, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James. That is on page 14 left-hand column.

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

Will the Minister state Government's policy with respect to the operation of the Scotland Factory, St. Andrew?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

As a result of an insufficient supply of canes during this year's reaping season, the Scotland Factory which was being operated uneconomically was forced to close down. Since it is unlikely that the situation will improve in future years, the Agricultural Development Corporation has been authorised to dispose of the machinery.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Scotland Factory the only concern of Government that has been operating uneconomically during the past year?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I do not regard that as a reasonable supplementary.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is there any Government institution which has been operating economically within the last year?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I do not regard that Question as being any different from the former in-so-far as coming somewhat outside the scope of this Question.

Mr. CRAIG: Will the Minister be able to tell us if this factory was closed down during the harvesting of the peasants' canes during the middle of the harvesting season or when all of the canes were harvested by the peasants in St. Andrew and its surrounding areas?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: It was closed during the reaping season and the factory had made a certain amount of sugar, or molasses or syrup, and then due to the lack of peasants sending their canes; I think it required 4,000 tons of canes per day to operate economically, and the maximum amount which it was receiving was within the vicinity of 2,400 tons rather than 4,000 tons. It was uneconomical to run it, as the peasants were sending their canes to other factories over the hills. Due to that, it was more than uneconomical. In other words, the financial position of it became worse than it was previously, due to its not receiving sufficient canes. That was the reason for the closing down.

Mr. CRAIG: Will the Minister tell us what is responsible for the peasants sending their canes to other factories, and not to the Scotland District factory which is Government-owned?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: In the Scotland area the peasants have always received a lower price for canes at the Scotland factory than they received over the hills due to the recovery rate. The price that they can receive, say, at Andrews or at any of the other factories has always been more than they have been receiving at the Scotland factory. I suppose that that is one of the reasons why they have transferred their canes to other factories, although the transportation per ton would run into the vicinity of $1 to $1.50 per ton more.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker is it not a fact that the Government made available to the peasants the trucks paid for by the Agricultural Development Corporation, so as to deprive Scotland Factory of the canes in order to give them an excuse for shutting it down for the same transportation of which the Hon. Minister has just spoken?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member repeat the Question? I have not heard the hon. member's Question; my attention was deflected for a bit. Will the hon. member please state his Question again?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member be good enough to repeat his Question?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is it not a fact that the Government made available to peasants in the Scotland area trucks owned by the Agricultural Development Corporation for the purpose of carrying their canes away from Haggatts so as to give them an excuse for shutting down Haggatts?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I could not say that. I have heard absolutely nothing about that. There is no report as to that on the file, but it would be rather peculiar that the Agricultural Development Corporation, whose interest it is to operate Scotland Factory, would have provided transportation to take canes away from the factory.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is the Minister saying that the trucks from the Agricultural Development Corporation did not carry away canes from the Scotland area to Vaucluse and indeed, I believe,

that on one occasion they carried them to St. Philip as well? Is the Minister saying that the A.D.C.'s trucks did not carry away peasants' canes from the Scotland area?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I did not say that trucks did not carry away canes from the Scotland area; I said that it would be very peculiar to me that the Agricultural Development Corporation should furnish trucks to take away canes from a business which they were operating when they needed the very canes. I cannot say whether that is true or not, but there might have been canes carried away from the area due to a few peasants still having canes at the closing down of the factory. That might have been a matter of finance, but even this I cannot say.

Mr. CRAIG: In view of the fact that Scotland factory is Government-owned, does the Government think it desirable to pay a lower wage at Scotland factory than what private enterprise would pay?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, Scotland factory has not always been Government-owned. The price which has always been paid in the Scotland area for canes by factories, due to production - the machinery might not have been up to the standard of, say, modern factories, and the production rate has been lower and they pay practically on that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, did it not occur to the Government that if the factory which they themselves were running was not getting canes because somebody other than their factory was paying more money, it was the duty of the Government to pay more and keep these canes and keep the factory alive?

I put it again to the hon. member. Here is a Government factory, and the Government presumably wanted to let the people know that they are doing something for them. Knowing that a rival next door was paying more, did it not occur to the Government that they should pay at least what its rival was paying in order to keep the peasants, to whom they are looking for votes, from sending their canes to Haggatts, so that Haggatts would still be open for work? Did that not occur to the Government or did not the Government deliberately seize a method of shutting down Haggatts because they had pressure from certain quarters? I hope that the Hon. Minister understands the two questions.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the acquisition of Haggatts factory back down in 1963 or whenever it was acquired, was merely an expedient in the first instance. It was then well known to the Government that Haggatts factory was uneconomical to run, dilapidated and needed new machinery and equipment. It took the peasants in the area about three crop seasons to realise that they would have been more beneficially served if they had accepted the offer which was made by the Government then, to assist them in the transportation of their canes to factories which produce more efficiently, which had the modern machinery and which could afford to pay the best possible price for canes.

3.10 p.m.

It took them about three years to learn that we still have to do that. They are now doing that on their own. The Government are not doing that any more. The Government tried to serve them, knowing fully well that the factory would have to be closed sooner or later. It was an old dilapidated factory. I would not worry to call it "old iron", as it was referred to some years ago. I would not worry to call it scrap iron, but it has turned out to be more or less that. The position is that it took about three years for the peasants themselves and the farmers in the area to be convinced and to realise what was told to them in 1963 at the time when I happened to be Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Sir, I speak with intimate knowledge of these matters, and I had to persuade my colleagues, when we were more or less trapped in Belleplaine, to at least amend, waive, or vary to some extent, a decision that was taken not to purchase, and we had to purchase to get back home safely.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that Question Time has expired, it now being 3.15 o'clock.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If this is Private Members' Time and we say: "let us go on....."

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is agreeable to both sides not now to proceed with Private Members' Business, it is entirely agreeable to me. May I have an indication of the feeling of the House?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I formally beg to move that we continue the discussion on Question Time.

Mr. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the Motion. The hon. member did not state an extension for how long. If we are going to do this every Tuesday, then next June or July will find two Budget Speeches here to be replied to.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my view Standing Order 14 would have had to be suspended. May I just ask for the general feeling of the House whether it is in favour of suspending Standing Order 14 for the purpose mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition?

Hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Question 42 on the Order Paper. I believe notice was given of it in April. If the answer to this Question is ready, I should like the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, Minister of Communications and Works, to give it. I should say, as senior representative for St. Thomas, I get a great number of requests from persons who

live in Porey's Spring, Barker's Corner, Content Tenantry and so on as to what is happening to their petition relating to street lights. The Question was asked more than a year ago, and I would like the Minister to answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point, but I am afraid that, as this proposal has been made after 3.15 p.m., automatically, we must now decide ..... *(ASIDES)* I gather that there is no question being agreed upon.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, you are there to see that there is no infringement of the rights of the Opposition. How can it affect the Government if we say that we wish to go on, except because of a spirit of nasty controversy?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is also the duty of the Speaker to see that there is no infringement of Standing Orders, and it is my Ruling that, in respect of this present time, we resume Private Members' Business.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: In that case, I beg to move that Standing Order 14 be now suspended.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is the only way to bring home to the feeling of the Leader of the House - if he has any - that we have to play the game, and that the Opposition are entitled to treat their own time in their own way.

When I gave notice this morning of my Resolution about having no confidence in the Government, the hon. member proceeded again to show his contempt for the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member cannot even give a purview of his address on the Motion censuring the Government at this stage. It has not yet even been printed or circulated.

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. LYNCH - 10.

NOES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG and Mr. SMITH - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare the Standing Orders duly suspended as from now.
3.20 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken until 4.30 p.m.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. SPEAKER: This is now the time when Private Members' Business shall be taken, and the first item therein stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution condemning the Government's financial proposals for the fiscal year 1968-69 as contained in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made on 2nd July, by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and when the debate on this matter was adjourned on 6th August, 1968, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair. He may resume if he cares now.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, after all something will have to be done as far as the replies to the Budgetary Proposals are concerned. You will remember, Sir, that debate on last year's Budgetary Proposals has not yet been concluded, and this year's is going on in the same way. Now Budgetary Proposals are very important. They are responsible for running the country and also for pulling money out of people's pocket by way of taxation. After the Prime Minister delivers his Budgetary Proposals, I feel that immediately after the replies should be made rather than having something crop up every meeting day and having this matter pushed further and further back. It does not help the people and things become stale. Now I have to reply and I am going to do so.

I feel that we in the Opposition should fight hard for a day to be set aside, even if it is the day after the Prime Minister delivers his speech, for replies to be made rather than having the matter debated for ten minutes, half an hour and sometimes not at all at subsequent sittings. It is not good enough if we are serious about the people's business, and just as I had to fight for a little time on the air, I will have to fight for a day to be set aside for the replies.

Sir, one man can get up on the floor of this House according to the Constitution, and tax me and you as he thinks fit, and that is the end of it. The Opposition does not have a chance soon after to let the people know if the proposals are fair or not. The people do not want to hear anything now; in fact, they cannot hear it because it is not being broadcast any more and the *Advocate* newspaper is finished with that, although it is the only paper in this country through which people should be able to know something.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out that there are other newspapers.

Mr. SMITH: There are other newspapers, Sir, but..... We in the Opposition are not taking this seriously and we have to fight to get things our way. I have nearly forgotten what I have to say, and if I stand up here for another five minutes, I may become dumb because there is the possibility that, having to fiddle with this all the time, I will forget what I want to say. I have a note here on the same *Advocate* drawing to the public's attention how important Budget Day is, and there is an article under the caption "The enquiring reporter asks what are your impressions of the 1968-69 Budget."

Mr. SPEAKER: May I take it that the hon. member proposes to read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument?

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I do not understand it. Put it to me more clearly. That is a little bit too tall and maybe you may throw me down before you finish.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may refer to notes.

Mr. SMITH: I am referring to my notes; but when I say the *Advocate* I am so much out for them for not letting the people know what is happening that I will continue to answer them. These are some of the views of people in this country relative to the Budgetary Proposals, and I am entitled to let this House know these views. Now when you are budgeting, Mr. Speaker, you are budgeting not for dead people, but for living human beings, and they are entitled to their views; so these form part of my notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may read from his notes, but may not of course read extracts from newspapers.

Mr. SMITH: These are my documents, and following are the views of one of the taxpayers of this country. I will not call his name yet, but he is President of the Barbados Chamber of Commerce and a Company Director. These are his views: "Generally I think that everyone realises that the Government requires additional revenue to cover the cost of expanded service. The Budget that is presented is probably the least painful way of providing the additional revenue which is required."
3.30 p.m.

Sir, I underline those words. "The Budget that is presented is probably the least painful." It is no pain for him. "However, nobody likes to pay additional taxation. I hope that the new income tax which is promised would provide some relief by increasing the allowance and having the personal rates less steeply graduated. I am pleased to see that there is no increase of personal income tax at this stage. The method used to increase taxation in what is considered as luxury items and by increasing certain licences and fees....."

Now, Sir, this gentleman says that it is not painful and its intention is to tax luxury items. In the Budgetary Proposals here, you will note that in relation to Falernum - Sir, I began to make my speech on the Budget, but I did not have any time, as you know; but this gentleman says that the tax is on luxury goods. You should not, or you would never classify Falernum as a luxury. Falernum is a little sugar boiled up and flavoured to suit, with some water, and yet this Company Director, Mr. John Stanley Goddard, is telling us that the Government taxed luxury items. He knows more about Falernum than I do, I am sure about that, and still he pleased to say that the taxes are on luxury items. I have the honour to go all over these big hotels, not merely to look, but also to partake, and sometimes I make full use of that, and I do not see one drop of Falernum being served. Sir, even if I were to come to your home and you offered me Falernum, I would leave immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very grateful for that information; I will not offer it. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SMITH: That is the drink for the very poorest people and do you know what they call a local champagne? - Falernum and soda. That is the only drink that the working-class people of this country - I do not mean the ones who "fire" alcohol; I mean the other people. In other words, when they are going "soft", they have Falernum and soda, and yet it is being taxed so highly by the Prime Minister of this country. I suppose that because it is drunk so freely and so much of it is being consumed, that he takes it upon himself to tax it and put it along in the company of the luxury items. It is the drink for the very poorest people of this country; yet this gentleman is saying that the Government has only taxed luxury items. He is happy and very glad to see that hands are being taken off the personal income tax. This Budget will suit him; this Budget is in his favour; therefore he must compliment it and he must give it his blessing because, taking it from what he has said, nothing has been done to his income, but to the poor man's Falernum, a local product which you see on the screen, which you see all over. They are asking us to 'buy local', and now that you are making an effort to make the local product a success, down comes the hammer from the Prime Minister. That is only because he may have found out, or it might have been recommended to him, that he will get a nice slice by hitting Falernum, forgetting completely that it is made from our local sugar cane, and forgetting that it is being manufactured in this island. But it is put alongside the imported high-class drinks! The only way in which some of the people of this island can get something out of these high class bottles, is after they have been emptied by the big shots and they go to the standpipe and put a little water in the empty bottles and partake of what was in the bottles with the label on them. They would not know what are high-class wines, high-class whisky and high-class brandy.

Sir, you may think that I am making jokes. At one Christmas I offered one of my supporters some

of my drinks. He said: "Skipper, I have never tasted this, what is it?" I said: "It is something which will do you good." You must know how some people would be able to buy a little whisky or a little brandy or a little champagne. Well, you can tax them; but as to this man, if I had offered him Falernum, he would not have asked what it is.

We come back to the local gin. This gin which is being classed as white rum with a little gin essence, is not "Gordon" or "Gilbeys" or anything like that; it is the same rum that you are drinking. The brewers or stillers or whatever you care to call them, just buy a little essence and put in the white rum and it is called gin, and we drink it as gin. But, in truth and in fact, comparatively speaking, it is not gin.

3.40 p.m.

Yet an increase of $5 and over per gallon? Do you know, Sir, that the tax on those two items - I see the hon. senior member for St. George shaking his head. I do not know what he means by shaking his head; I suppose he may put something else in white rum other than essence.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. With all due respect to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, as a shopkeeper, I cannot allow him to say things which are detrimental to the community. Neither local gin nor Falernum has gone up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a point, but I must say that I am doubtful whether it is a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: I wanted him to get up, Sir. This is the first time I was able to get him up since I have been in this House. I want the hon. member to understand that when I was a shopkeeper he was not one. He may think that local gin is not made with gin essence. He may be out to believe everything that is being told to him. I would not doubt that if they told him it was Gordon's Gin, he would believe it is. He is speaking from his experience, and I am speaking from mine. He is saying that local gin is not made up of white rum.

Mr. LOWE: On a point of order. I never said that.

Mr. SMITH: I raised the point in here and the Prime Minister did not deny it. Now the hon. member says that gin has not gone up. If it has not gone up, then he took it off. The hon. member should be honest enough to get up here and say that it has not gone up because the Prime Minister had been interviewed by merchants in Bridgetown; they recommended it, and he took it off. That is what he should have done instead of standing here and saying it has not gone up. I have my facts here.

A lot of us can read things upside down. On one occasion an old lady told her husband: "your head is too big to have sense." I am looking for the page, Sir, because I did not mark it off. It is here: "Wine, Whisky, Brandy, Gin not exceeding strength of proof." Gin is $4 per gallon, Sir; gin not exceeding strength of proof is $4 per gallon; gin exceeding strength of proof is $4 per proof gallon. Now this is gin here, Sir, and the hon. senior member for St. George is telling this hon. Chamber that gin has not gone up. (Mr. LOWE: Gin Essence has not gone up.)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member in order when he makes remarks like that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I have been hearing remarks from both sides when I want only to hear the hon. senior member for St. Joseph at the present time.

Mr. SMITH: I was making a point. The hon. member does not know what has gone up from what has gone down, because he is in the air where the wind is blowing cool in his wheel chair, and he does not know what is going on in a little shop. I am challenging him now that the increase on gin is $4 per gallon. I can only go by what is in front of me. We have to go by what the Prime Minister puts here on this sheet. So far as Falernum is concerned, I challenge the hon. member to get up here and say that the dealers in Bridgetown did not have to approach the authorities concerned because they had made a mess of gin and Falernum. I would be glad if you would get up here now and deny that. Trying to be smart, or to make me look foolish, he says that gin has not gone up. He talks about Gin Essence, but I have not seen gin essence here. I see the words "Local gin:" white rum with essence put into it. I did not say that gin essence has gone up, because essence is only a little thing - you put a few drops into the rum and it smells like gin, but it is not gin.

Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister thought it was gin, too, and it caused him to put up the price. This particular gentleman is saying that only luxuries were increased. He says that we must have money to run the Government. But when you tax the people of this country, you must spend the money wisely. Sir, I made my notes because I had expected to make a 2-year matter of these Budget Speeches. I took time off to make these notes, and as soon as anybody slips or tries to fool my people - when I say my people, Sir, you know whom I mean: the poorest class of people in this country. I come from among them; I do not care where I am today, I will never forget the conditions down there where I came from; I will do everything that is possible to bring them up here. Some of us up here are doing the opposite. Some of us are out, and some of us do not care who are in.

I will never forget those people, Sir, and before I should die and go to Heaven, I am going to write a book on the poor people of this country. I am going to write it in such a way that everybody can understand what is in it. Some people write books that even themselves cannot understand what is written in them. One tried and failed completely.

3.50 p.m.

Now, Sir, I will refer to my notes again for another chap. He said: "I think that the 1968-69 Budget is very fair indeed." Now this is what this type of person calls "fair". When I am saying "unfair" they are saying "fair". "Naturally the Government needs money to run the affairs of the country and this is one of the means by which they can raise money for this purpose. However, I am very glad to see that itinerant vendors were taxed. I endorse the Prime Minister's statement that they constitute unfair competition to the established business houses which have large staff and high overhead to meet." He is now talking about "unfair": so you can see where the wind is blowing. The Tax is fair only because these itinerant traders are being taxed and because they mete out unfair competition to those big firms in Bridgetown which have their staff to pay.

Sir, you would not know, and I am going to tell you that these itinerant traders take a risk, because they credit everybody with two eyes and rely on sheer luck to get it back. These people take years to collect $20. Just imagine one of them crediting a suit for $30 or $40, and every Monday morning or every day in the week he collects 25 cents, and some weeks he collects nothing at all. Why don't these big business places do the same thing? They would not have to run all over the country, but they could give the same facilities for owning a decent suit or buying clothes for one's children at a payment of 25 cents a week. Not one would ever do that. They would pull up their stakes, close their doors, and do everything before they did that; but this person calls it unfair competition, although these people are buying the cloth from the same big firms for cash and crediting it in the country. They are so much out to kill the itinerant trader that I believe they might have asked the Prime Minister to do it in that way.

Mr. Speaker, you could always believe me. There was a particular lady living on my land. I do not know if it is her nature, her blood or what, but something is very sweet about her and she had so many children, sometimes two at birth, that she could not send them to school. She had them running all around the place. The husband, poor fellow, got weak. He was bound to get weak because the job he was doing was too much. Along came these people and credited her with two suits of clothes for each child, and they were able to go to school and be educated. Now, Sir, both the lady and her husband have stopped working, the children are in England and sending back money for their parents, and they are as happy as I am. If these people had not done that, these children would have come up without any education or clothes, and I daresay, the old man would have passed on and the children would be knocking about the streets. That is the meaning of these itinerant traders.

Again, you have a big Company Director, one Mr. George Challenor, telling this public that he is pleased with everything the Prime Minister did, and as far as the taxes are concerned, they are fair, though it is unfair for the unfair competition. Do you think poor little Fix-it-Right Garage could compete against the big garages in the City? It is impossible. They would only have to sell their goods at cost for one month and poor Fix-it-Right would go through the eddoes. These people go into the rural areas with their goods and are doing this country a service. I am only replying to this because any person reading it will feel that all is well, but all could not be well.

Now, Sir, we come to the professionals. This is what one said: "I think this is a fair budget. It was well thought out and well presented. The Registration fee for professional people, this applies in many other countries as an additional source of revenue, and I think that the amount suggested here is quite acceptable." This is from Dr. Douglas Carter. I am saying here and now that the Prime Minister has insulted these professionals by imposing such a small fee, and this is where I have to disagree with the Prime Minister and Dr. Carter. Sir, I will not call any name now, but I heard that the home of some doctor was broken some time ago, and I never expected that one man would have so much money in his purse to be carried away. I believe it was only a day's takings, because the previous day's money would have been sent to the bank already. He is an intelligent doctor and he would never keep so much money in his place in such a way that an ordinary thief could steal it. He should never have disclosed how much it was.

4.00 p.m.

This is a doctor, and another doctor is saying that he is pleased with that and that it is fair. That is an insult. They would never say: "Increase the fees by that little thing" because how could they increase it? The biggest mathematician could never say how much per person is an increase for this little "nay nay" thing that the Prime Minister has put on professionals. He is a professional too and he may be making way for when the table turns so that he did not hit them. If I were an adviser in his Cabinet, if I were one of his Ministers, I would say "Oh, no; if you are going to hit the itinerant $500, multiply these boys by $100 because they are making it." I do not like, and you have heard me say it many times Sir, to interfere with my doctor and my cook; but sometimes too far East is West. If I should allow or make my cook feel that I am afraid of her, I may have to be putting on what she is to put on, and she will be putting on what I am to put on. I would still have to let her know where she is wrong.

As to the professionals, you are one, Sir, and I am sure that you would not have any grouse. You would never say that it is too small or that it is too high; whatever the Prime Minister puts on, you would 'take it easy'. I know that you are of that temperament. You do not want it for yourself and you must be saying: "I am very glad that he has not gone any higher; but if he went higher, I can still go higher yet". And what is it? A little "nay-nay" something like $120 a year or something like that. It is nothing at all when the takings can be so much for somebody else. I think the Good Book says, I forget it now, but some people put their things where thieves can come in and carry them away. I cannot refer to it but the

Deputy Prime Minister can do that, because he knows the particular chapter and verse where you would get that. I would not call upon him to refresh my memory. There is some part in the Holy Book which says - I remember it now - "Lay not up treasures on earth where thieves break in and steal." This particular doctor did not read that passage; well, he did not have time to read his Bible, but he laid up and the thieves broke in and carried it away. Yet, the Prime Minister held on to my Falernum and my little gin with a little gin essence in it and hit it by four dollars a gallon more. The doctors just look at you and charge you five dollars; I understand that it is $8 now and it is a big insult. I think that some lawyers said that they have no right to hit the lawyers and I wonder why not? They are not going into the Court until they draw; they must draw their berry: otherwise the case will be put off until never-ever morning. They are not appearing until the berry comes out, and now you are going to hit my Falernum and my white rum and allowing them to get away! This is too slight; he has insulted them.

Mr. Speaker, I am coming home with this now: A Barrister-at-law..... "Behind the facade of taxing luxury goods, the budget is actually biting deeper into the living standards of the working-class people". He is my brother this time. *(ASIDES)* I have never seen a black star yet. *(Laughter)* As soon as I see a black star, I am going to make right with my Almighty and say: "Father, take me into thy hands." It goes on: "the Budget is actually biting into the living standards of the working-class people. Without price control such increases in taxation as the Government has placed on those who can pay, will be passed on to the working-class consumer by even higher prices. Down there at the bottom of society those who can least afford are being made to pay for CARIFTA, top-heavy administration, $450,000 for two houses and the failure adequately to tax foreign business interests operating here. Since this Budget I am even more concerned as to how the man and woman who get $13.44 per week or less will exist."

There you are, Sir, I will try to compare it: You have three big shots and I would not say what I call them, but you know what I call them - ends. You get an "end" bringing up the rear now still remembering his people. Since that, the Prime Minister has to scrape the bottom of the bucket to look for money to run this country; I daresay that he could not wait until everything goes down the hill and then to look around for it; but you can clearly see that as much as he has not made any effort to tax the small man definitely, indefinitely, he is doing it. Apart from the professionals - although I heard a professional man say that he would have to stop it; I do not believe that, he was a little bit blue at the time. I do not think you would get a real professional just because he has to pay out a little "nay-nay" yearly, saying that he would pass it on to his people, but as to these other people, the gin and Falernum and other things, the itinerant would have to pass it on; and when they pass it on, the people are supposed to get what I would call a blow that they did not expect. Since we are on this word CARIFTA, as it is mentioned here, CARIFTA sounds very nice on paper.

4.10 p.m.

It sounds very nice on paper; it is a very nice way of making an effort to bring us together, financially but I feel that the wrong end of the wedge is being inserted first, because when are you going to get goods here in this country duty free? Now I read some time ago that refrigerators were landed in this country and they will be sold or can be sold at $100 cheaper. That is due to the fact that the refrigerators are practically tax free. Suppose the duty on one of those refrigerators is $100, you do not pay it on the down-payment on the refrigerator, but it is the consumption tax that will be following you up.

In my opinion - I do not know everything like some people; I am a small businessman, but I do not know all of the business. But if that refrigerator is being sold for $100 less, then there is a possibility that with the consumption tax you may have to pay $110. Therefore you have done nothing. You talk about CARIFTA; you preach it; you run all around, and you are trying to bring it here; but things must rise yonder, because you still want that money to run your country. If by signing this CARIFTA Agreement the refrigerator would be $100 cheaper and the Government are still getting their duty on it, well then, I would say that the Prime Minister went about the matter in a fair and square way.

That is why I believe, in my opinion, that Jamaica was a little bit hard to come in. You are obliged to do that, and it may cost more. If it is going to hit the other smaller countries, if these countries feel that they are losing by CARIFTA when it is stated in the CARIFTA Agreement that you can pull out, Sir, do you think that these small boys, if they stand to lose through CARIFTA, would not pull out? Instead of pulling out, Sir, somebody would have to drive them out.

I am not going to fool myself; I am not going to let anybody fool me that the CARIFTA Agreement is such a nice thing. It sounds good, but the Government must have money. If they should lose a few thousand dollars yearly by CARIFTA, then they will have to find ways and means to get it back. Sir, you will find that this nice thing we are in today - a new nation with Independence and so on - I am saying now that Independence is responsible for this additional taxation and these high prices. We had to look for a certain amount of money yearly from the time that we gained our Independence. We have to look for more money now than when we were not independent. We will have to find it. What do we have to benefit from it? I heard about an O.A.S., and I said on the floor of this House that the only one I knew was in the alley down there where we could go and "fire one". We have also joined the O.A.S.; we have to pay out a lot of money. The Hon. Leader of this House went up to America not long ago. I thought that he would have been able to go and demand his amount

to spend on capital works here, and merely say: "I have come for my share; my people are suffering; let me get the money quickly, so that I can go and relieve them." I listened to his nice speech, and I came to the conclusion that he was also begging. He had to beg.

Sir, imagine I am independent and still have to beg you. If I were an independent man I would not even beg the Chief Justice if I were in front of him charged for murder; but if I am not independent I would take off my blouse, pants and everything and kneel down and beg. If I am independent, I am inpendent. I do not know how they spell this word "independent" yet. I cannot see what we are going to benefit from it yet.

Sir, I know that every little shot has become a big shot, and when he was working for $1 he was living in a 10 X 10 house, and he is now living in a palace. Imagine spending $450,000 on two houses! I believe that the men who are going to live in these houses are gold men; they cannot be Barbadians who have left ordinary houses here. But if you are an Ambassador, you are a big shot, and you cannot live where even your own people can live. Where is this money to come from? Government do not make money; Government do not dig money out of the earth; Government have to dig money out of you and me, Sir.

When the Income Tax people rushed me a few mornings ago and they had given me a chance I would have run away, but the way they rushed me I could not run away. I had to make wrong things right; I was not in their good books. They said that they wanted the money, and I had to pay the money. That is why I am hurt now, Sir. The blow has struck me now. I nearly had to ring you up, Sir, but you have not got off yet. If things do not work out well, I will have to ring you.

What is causing all of this trouble? This thing that we call Independence is nothing yet. It is taking the money from our pockets, and we cannot see anything for it yet. What is forthcoming from the Hon. Minister who has just been abroad? He has to go and beg, and we want money. We have just committed ourselves - I did not commit myself, Sir, because I can remember that I nearly lost my life in talking to people in this country and showing them the mistake that was being made. During the night the police had to escort me to my car. The people did not know what was being held over them. They felt that the word "Independence" meant that they would not work, and there would be no more taxation.
4.20 p.m.

Now can this small country bear all these overhead expenses? It cannot. I am saying that if we try and get the others to come along with us, we can share because that would be eight more territories, and that $450,000 would have to be divided between nine territories. I am not saying that we are not to come together; we have to come together sooner or later. We cannot stay away from each other much longer; so what is the good of playing that you are a big shot and not trying to encourage the others to come with you? What is the use of saying that we are going to diversify and try to get in as many industries as we possibly can? It is all right to bring in industries; but if the people do not have any money to buy what is being produced, what is going to happen with the industries? If you stop planting canes completely, what are you going to do with so many thousands of workers? Can industrialisation absorb them in a minute? This diversification is a hundred year project. We have to face facts and not talk because we have mouths. The argument that the little space which a particular industry takes up would employ more than if the area was planted in cane is a good argument for a fool, but not for a person like me. We depend on rain; but if we do not get rain, what would happen? We have to pray that storms keep away from us.

Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspaper that the Ambassador would have been arriving here for private talks with the Prime Minister, and I thought we were going to get somewhere, but we found out the following Tuesday that the Ambassador wanted us to buy a home for him at $450,000. This is a lot of money to go out of the Treasury. I feel that if he were drawing up in a trash house, he would have to continue to do so until I could get the other islands to share the cost. The Constitution says that we must have a Prime Minister, and it is no use fighting; but Constitution or no Constitution I do not think it is fair that one man can dictate to 250,000 people, and at least 200,000 cannot dictate to him. I cannot call that democracy, because after all we are human beings and we will make mistakes; but I am telling you that more than half the people in this country is not satisfied with the way things are going, but they would have to take five clear years to correct the Government's mistake if it made one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member will have to resume if he wishes at the next sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Item under Government Business, No. 3, stands in the name of the hon.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, we are not now proceeding with that Item.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member propose to deal with some other item?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Item No.4.

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1968

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Is the hon. member seeking to take charge of it in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave to take charge of the Order standing in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Employees Pensions Act, 1961.
4.30 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this amending Bill is very short. It arises out of the necessity to regularise certain procedures in this Act. Section 10 of the Public Employees Pensions Act 1961-47 lays down that a gratuity shall not be assignable or transferable except for the purpose of satisfying a debt due to the Crown and for other purposes therein specified, and outside of those purposes shall not be levied upon, attached or sequestered in respect of any debt or claim whatever, unless this debt or claim is due and owing to the Crown. The purpose of this Bill therefore is to change Section 10 of the Act to extend those purposes so that a gratuity payable to a public employee may be chargeable to and may include a discharge of any outstanding balance of account owed by a public employee on his retirement or at his death for a Housing Loan. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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 Bill was read a third time and passed.

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Order in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted. *(A PAUSE)* There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed to take charge of this Order which is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

I understand that there is a shortage in my amplifying equipment. I apologise to hon. members for that.

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

MEDICAL REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Community Development:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill set out, this Bill seeks to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911 (1911-6) in order to provide for temporary special registration without fee for Medical Practitioners, whether or not they are entitled to be registered under the provisions of the Act, who satisfy the Medical Assessors (a) that they are qualified to practise in any country; and (b) that they are engaged in Barbados (1) in doing special work in Public Health or research which is sponsored by the University of the West Indies, the World Health Organization, the Rockefeller Foundation or any such other organization approved by the Minister after consultation with the Medical Assessors; or (2) in full-time employment by the Peace Corps to render Medical services exclusively and without fee to members of that Organization; or (3) under full-time employment with the Crown, in work under the supervision of a Medical Practitioner under Section 4 of the Act.

This matter comes as a result of an appeal by the Peace Corps which is rendering very useful work not only here but throughout the Caribbean, and it has made an appeal to the Ministry of Health and the Government in order to facilitate one of their doctors who is qualified to practise in the State of California, but not in New York, New Brunswick or England.
4.40 p.m.

At present the present doctor who is here and who is due to leave shortly has served for two years; he is duly qualified and he complied with the requirements of our Medical Act. The new one who is coming is qualified to practise in the State of California but not in New York, New Brunswick or England, and the Chief Medical Officer could not entertain his application.

As hon. members are fully aware, the requirements for registration of Medical Practitioners are set out in section 4 of the Medical Registration Act, 1911 (6) as follows:

> "(a) Every person who holds a degree, diploma or licence which would render him eligible for registration as a medical practitioner in the United Kingdom, or
>
> (b) Every person who possesses satisfactory evidence of being entitled to practise medicine, surgery and midwifery in the State of New York, U.S.A., after a course of study of not less than five years at any University or College whose curriculum requires five years' study precedent to graduation, each year's course of study at such University or College being not less than eight months, and registration is subject to the production of a certificate granted by the Board of Medical Assessors appointed under the Act."

This is being done primarily at the request of the Peace Corps in order to facilitate their new doctor, and at the same time opportunity is being taken to extend it in certain respects.

As I have said already, Sir, as the Act now stands, the Medical Assessors cannot waive or relax the requirements, and it should be pointed out also that these requirements are intended not merely to protect local practitioners and local physicians, but to ensure the maintenance of satisfactory standards of medical skill in a country which lacks the resources to evaluate the various medical qualifications obtained abroad.

At present the Ministry is not satisfied with the present form of this statement of the requirements for a number of reasons, and the whole matter is being gone into with the Medical Faculty of the University of the West Indies who provides assistance in this field to the Government of Jamaica. This matter of temporary registration is being gone into very carefully; but in order to facilitate the Peace Corps' application, we have brought this here to amend the Medical Registration Act in certain respects, and he will be entitled to practise, or any such person will be entitled to practise for three years in the first instance.

I think I have explained it briefly, and, if there are any other questions which hon. members would like to ask, I will be willing to try and answer them. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Medical Registration Act was passed in 1911 when Barbados was still a Colony, and when the great trade union of the medical profession was sufficiently powerful to exclude from practise in Barbados persons who had received degrees at American Universities other than those who were qualified to pass the examination at the New York State Board.

Mr. Speaker, many persons in and out of the medical field may feel that the limitation to Commonwealth and New York Doctors is one which is no longer appropriate to the circumstances of Barbados. I am not aware that the medical universities of New York have any higher status than those, for example, of California to which the Minister has adverted in his opening speech. There are countries other than English-speaking countries where doctors qualify. The medical profession I do not believe, at this stage, has the outmoded attitudes that New York alone in the whole of the United States can provide suitably qualified doctors, nor do I believe that the medical profession in Barbados, bearing in mind that among the number is one who originally qualified, I believe at Frankfurt - I do not think the doctors in Barbados really believe that German medicine, French medicine and Russian medicine are necessarily inferior to New York medicine, Canadian medicine, or indeed Indian medicine.

Let us not forget that you can qualify at an Indian University in - I cannot pronounce the word, Mr. Speaker, particularly well, but it is, I gather - ancient Aryan medicine which involves, among other specific, cowdung. You can qualify in an Indian University in that, and it would be an outrage to commonsense

if a graduate of the University of California were to be told that his degree was not good enough to practise in Barbados while graduates from another University in India could practise in Barbados upon producing the necessary Medical Registration Certificate from whatever Indian State granted it.
4.50 p.m.

I think that the Minister should have a look at the entire question of Medical Registration in Barbados. I recommended to the Bar Association some time ago to reconsider whether it really thought that barristers qualified in Scotland should from that reason and no other be qualified to practise in Barbados while barristers from the forty-seven or forty-eight common law jurisdictions in the United States who were taught the same sort of law as English barristers should be excluded from practising in Barbados, if the situation were the same, I mention this example, Mr. Speaker, because I am a barrister as you are, and it is our profession which would be threatened if it were open unlimitedly to barristers from all common law jurisdictions. But the same principle applies in my view to barristers as to doctors. If we allow New York doctors to practise here, we should not have to have a temporary Bill to allow a California doctor to practise here. That is what the medical faculty should be looking into - whether this restricted practice unworthy of the great professions which they are supposed to control should any longer be allowed to continue.

Our Medical Registration Act is supposed to be a very tough one. In England, for example, a struck-off doctor can practise. He must not hold himself out as a registered medical practitioner, but struck-off doctors do practise. One of the doctors with the highest income is a plastic surgeon on Harley Street who was struck off some years ago and he still maintains a flourishing L50,000-a-year surgery alone although struck-off. In Barbados he could not do it. It is said - I have argued this myself on one occasion in the Courts - that herbalists are entitled to practise their calling in Barbados by virtue of the Herbalist Act of 1540, and if that view of the law is correct, herbalists are the only exceptions who are not caught by this Act; but again, that, Mr. Speaker, shows the anomalies which the 1911 Act has. Osteopaths are well recognised as practising a type of treatment which is of value. Indeed chiropractors are similarly well recognised, but it may well be that construing the terms of the Medical Registration Act strictly, many of these persons would find themselves practising in Barbados what the Courts might say was medicine, and therefore be caught by the Act and find themselves subjected to the penalties of the Act.

The Act, in other words, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting, is becoming outmoded; and rather than chip at it piecemeal, I would recommend to the Minister that the Government place this on the list of Acts to be subjected to the purview of whatever Law Reform Committees or persons responsible for examining out-moded Acts to see if they can be brought up to date. I do not think it should be necessary, Mr. Speaker, for example, for us to have to pass a Bill saying "Medical practitioners employed on a full time basis by the Crown and working under the supervision of a medical practitioner registered under section." I do not think it is necessary for us in 1966 to have to come to pass a Bill like that. Let a comprehensive amendment to this Bill be drawn so that doctors will know exactly where they are *vis-a-vis* the laws of Barbados. If we have a tough Act, untoughen it a little bit, acknowledge modern advances in medicine and get right off that belief in 1911 that there was some great virtue in an English or Canadian University, by virtue of its having been founded by an Englishman, that American Universities did not have.

As regards Nobel Prize winners, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the last time I can remember a Nobel Prize winner in medicine from the Commonwealth Universities. They come from the United States, France, Germany and Russia, and they are the very countries whose doctors cannot practise in Barbados today. Mr. Speaker, I should say that we will support the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I just want to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the Ministry is at present discussing this matter with the medical faculty of the University of the West Indies and other bodies that are capable of assisting us in this matter; so the matter is under active review and consideration.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the Minister would be so kind as to give way for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member has risen on a point of explanation.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member had related, and in my speech I tried to explain this, what he has just said to temporary registration. What I was talking about was permanent registration.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am afraid the hon. member did not allow me to complete what I was about to say. The Ministry also wishes to seek the views of other Governments at the next meeting of administrators of Health Services in the Caribbean on this particular matter; so we are actively considering it, and I thank the hon. member for his assistance and co-operation. We do intend amending the Act in an up-to-date way and bringing it more in line with the Medical Registration Acts in other developed countries.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr, YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

QUESTION

Mr. SPEAKER: I promised the hon. and learned senior member for St. Thomas who was not here at the opportune moment today, that unless there was any objection, I would allow him to put, at this stage, a question which was not put earlier. The Hon. member may now give notice of his question.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to Your Honour and to all hon. members. The question is this:

To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Are the activities of rats regarded as a problem to agriculturalists in Barbados?

2. Is the Minister aware that Professor James Bond, the eminent ornithologist, has suggested that introduction and release in Barbados of a number of Barn Owls from the Windward Islands would be a boon to the Island's agriculture as these birds feed largely on rats?

3. Will the Minister consider this suggestion?

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th August, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon)

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is no objection, but the Hon. Leader of the House should take the Opposition more into his confidence as regards the adjournment of the House especially. It is customary to adjourn for some time in what we would describe as the hurricane season. Does the Government propose to go through the whole of August week after week and adjourn in September or what? He would do us a favour when some of us are expecting the Government - it has been sending down very few things recently - to finish its work and adjourn for three weeks or a month or so. If he would just tell us that, we will be very grateful on this side of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I had in mind, but I think that the hon. member will appreciate that I could not give any intimation of that today because I would have to consult the other Ministries and Departments in order to see whether they have any legislative matters which they want processed within the next week or so. It is for this reason that I have moved the two-week adjournment in order to bring as much as I can up to date so that I will be able definitely to say, when next we meet, when the recess will be. I hope it will be from then.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th August, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon), was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.10 p.m.