

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 16, 1953.

Pursuant to adjournment the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present

His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. M. E. COX, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., F. E. MILLER, J. C. MOTTLEY, C. E. TALMA, E. ST. A. HOLDER, L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B., MRS. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were said.

Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, R. G. MAPP, V. B. VAUGHAN, L. E. SMITH and J. E. T. BRANCKER entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meetings of the 12th, 19th and 26th of May, 1953, which had been printed and circulated were taken as read and were confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I am commanded to lay the following Papers:—

On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—

The Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers) (Amendment) No. 2 Order 1953.

Statement showing amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the Provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended on 31st March, 1953, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Foot and Mouth Disease Prevention and Spread (Amendment) No. 2 Regulations, 1953.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Importation of Animals (Prohibition) (Amendment) Regulations, 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,648 at the disposal of the Gov-

ernor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54 No. 5 which form the Schedule to the resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1953.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to place the sum of \$1,850 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part II, Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953-54 No. 6, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill intituled an Act to make better provisions for Local Government in the Island.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Public Health.

Mr. WALCOTT: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Private Members' Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly desires to draw to Your Excellency's notice the following comments recorded in two Reports submitted to the Government in the years 1947 and 1948 respectively.

These comments are as follows:—

(1) "As indicated previously, a number of the less efficient factories have closed down and it has been estimated that the present factory capacity is insufficient to reap a crop of more than 150,000 tons of sugar without loss of efficiency.

Under present conditions it is considered that, with good weather conditions, the Island could produce a crop of some 180,000 tons of sugar. It is understood that this lack of factory capacity is receiving the attention of a committee appointed by the Sugar Producers Associa-

tion, but your committee wishes to emphasize that a solution to this problem is urgent if the island is not to lose sugar in the event of a favourable year resulting in a large crop."

"This deficiency in factory capacity can only be made good by the erection of new factories but, owing to the general shortage and present high cost of materials, it will be some years before any new factories can be erected. In the meantime your committee considers that all existing factories should be retained as operating units and the capacity of the present factories should be expanded wherever this is economically possible."

(2) "In the present abnormal circumstances and as a temporary measure, it is desirable to retain all the existing factories, for the island does not contain sufficient factory capacity to mill all the cane which can be produced in a favourable season."

The new variety of cane B37161, which has only recently come into almost universal production, yields at a much higher rate than the standard varieties of 1939, and nobilized seedlings now in their trial stage, promise to outyield B37161. If then a season as favourable as 1938—9 is experienced in the near future, the output of sugar would be, not 156,000 tons, but in the region of 200,000 tons. The record crop of 1939 was taken off only by extending the end of the grinding season from May to July.

An early start and the late finish of the crop season entails a loss of sugar, for the sucrose content of cane is normally lower in January and in June and July, than during the period January to May. But the factory capacity of the island has diminished since 1939, and if still more factories are abandoned it is doubtful whether it will be possible to handle an exceptionally good crop even if the grinding season is unduly prolonged. In such a season many cane growers would find no market for a portion of their crop."

It needs then only a favourable season to produce a record crop, but if to this probability we add the possibility of utilising the enormous reserves of sheet water for irrigating cane, then it becomes obvious that the factory capacity of the island is woefully inadequate to meet future requirements.

It therefore appears necessary as a temporary measure to retain all the existing factories despite the fact that some of them are known to be inefficient. Indeed it is advisable to expand the capacity of the present factories wherever economically possible."

No (1) quotation is taken from the par. 13014 "Report of the Committee appointed by His Excellency Governor Blood to study the Question of Seasonal Unemployment and to make recommendations as to the best means of promoting full employment in rural areas throughout the year." This committee was appointed 6th March and reported 3rd September, 1948.

No. (2) quotation is taken from "The Sugar Industry of Barbados.

A method for calculating the price of sugar cane.

Report by Dr. C. Y. Shephard published July, 1947."

The House considers the personnel of the committee appointed by Your Excellency's predecessor of sufficient importance as to accept their recorded opinion as expert.

The House knows that Professor Shephard is recognised throughout the West Indies as a specialist on the economy of the Sugar Industry in the

British Caribbean and consequently regard his opinion as authoritative.

The House further desires to draw Your Excellency's attention to the existence of the "Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund" and the fact that the public of Barbados contributed to this fund as the result of Government's decision to relate the price of locally consumed sugar to the export price of that commodity.

The House is aware that since the existence of this fund, and since the publication of reports referred to in this address, that more Sugar Factories have gone out of production including Broomfield in the parish of St. Lucy and the quite recent dismantling of Poole Factory in the parish of St. John.

The House is apprehensive that such a situation and its continuance constitutes a threat to the economic interests of the island in the immediate future and the House considers the importance of such interests to be distinct from, and above any probable financial interests that may accrue to individual shareholders in the sugar industry resulting from their decision to reduce the sugar factory productive capacity of the island.

In view therefore of the opinions recorded as quoted in the reports of which this address has made mention and in view also of the existence of the "Sugar Industry Rehabilitation Reserve Fund."

The House interprets these facts as substantial justification to demand that Your Excellency take necessary steps to exercise immediate executive action to prohibit the further dismantling and throwing out of production of any more sugar factories in this island until such time as new units of sugar production have been erected.

Mr. MILLER: of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that the people of Barbados are deeply conscious of the contributions made to their progress by certain prominent men in their history; and that the time has come, when it is incumbent upon the Government to perpetuate the memory of these great men, either in bronze or marble or by other public deeds.

The House is further of the opinion that first and foremost of these great men is Samuel Jackman Prescod; and that a bronze or marble statue bearing his effigy, and standing on a granite pedestal, should adorn the little green circle of grass lying in the shadows of the tower of the Public Buildings, or wherever Government thinks best.

The House feels that the names, Sir Robert Bowcher Clarke and Dr. Charles Duncan O'Neale are also worthy of perpetuation, and that bronze or marble tablets or other monuments should adorn the corridors of the Public Buildings, in testimony of their great services; while the last mortal remains of Mr. Clennel Wickham should be brought back from the Island of Grenada and buried here in a vault, which should bear the stamp of the esteem his memory holds among the people of Barbados.

Mr. TALMA: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully desires to draw to Your Excellency's attention to the bad state of disrepair of The Christ Church Boys' Foundation

School, which accommodates about 300 children at present, and which building is inadequate, — unsuitable and inconvenient in every respect lacking as it does, the ordinary amenities of light and ventilation.

The House therefore suggests that in any School building programme under the present Government Five Year Plan, priority should be accorded this school.

Mr. TALMA: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House is of opinion that the time has come when Government should acquire all suitable Private Water Mains, so as to provide this essential service to all the residents in such areas, many of whom have been deprived of such services for the past 20 years and upwards — e.g. Along the Maxwell Coast Road, Golf Club Road, Saint Lawrence Gap to mention three in the parish of Christ Church; and numerous others in most of the other parishes.

The House also desires to emphasise the urgent necessity of erecting at least six standposts in each parish per year for the next five years or thereabouts in lieu of two per year which is now the usual practice.

The House further is of opinion that the extension of Water Mains should be expedited (if possible) along the thickly populated districts of Saint Matthias Gap, Briar Hill Road and other such places; and also, along certain rural areas as Clapham, Silver Sands, Sea View, Packers Village, Parish Land Road and Silver Hill to mention a few in the parish of Christ Church and numerous others in most of the other parishes.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive present at the next meeting of the House:

Is Government aware of the treatment meted out to certain employees of Codrington Experimental Station who, after serving the Government for periods of 19 years and 22 years and had been forced to resign through ill health, are now denied their gratuity and/or pension?

Will Government please investigate the following cases:—

- (a) Helen Parris — Retired in 1952 on grounds of ill health; and
- (b) Elizabeth Dash — Retired in 1952, on grounds of ill health; with a view to granting these former Government employees relief from their present plight?

Mr. MAPP: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive present at the next meeting of the House:

Is Government aware that many workers have recently been thrown out of employment through the closing down of certain sugar factories and many more face unemployment through the possible closing down of more factories and cooperages connected with the fancy molasses industry?

In order to protect such workers, many of whom have given many years' service to a firm or industry, will Government take immediate steps to initiate schemes of social insurance or contributory schemes whereby pensions and other benefits will be assured all workers in the island?

Mr. MAPP: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee at the next meeting of the House:

1. Is it a fact that the Government of Brazil has relaxed its immigration laws in order to permit the importation of West Indian labour into that country?

2. If this is so, has Government made any effort to obtain employment for local workers in the said country, and are there any hopes?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of DR. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox in each case the Bill to make better provision for Local Government in the Island and the Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Public Health were read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by DR. CUMMINS the Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act 1937 was read a first time.

BILL TO AMEND CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter—to move the second reading of the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— This Bill has been before the Assembly formerly not in printed form, but it was introduced in the last session and has been re-introduced in this session. The main reasons for the Bill are set out in the Objects and Reasons, and are that many years of work and consultation with the experts on these matters culminated in the Conference in Trinidad in 1951 at which it was decided that this should be the form of classification for Customs purposes. All this is only a prelude to what will be necessary when you have an actual Act dealing with Customs Regulations in the British West Indies as a whole.

This Bill seeks to consolidate the old Act, and at the same time have a new classification, so that for statistical and other record purposes Barbados would be providing information which can be easily given when we are called upon to give it. There are two amendments which I would like to make. One arises from a typographical error. In the last paragraph of the Objects and Reasons it is stated that "opportunity has also been taken to incorporate all the exemptions contained in the First Schedule etc." The word "first" is incorrect. It should be the Second Schedule. When we come to the First Schedule I will make a motion dealing with the other amendment. But I can explain now that in the First Schedule all the words from "No. 9 Miscellaneous transactions and Commodities etc., down to the word "lard" should be deleted because those things are dealt with under the Revenue Aid Act of 1941 which is one of the Expiring Laws Acts. It is the intention of the Government that these items should remain in the Revenue Aid Act. They were placed in the First Schedule to this Act because the Comptroller of Customs made out a draft which was for the convenience of people in the trade and which was to be in the form of a booklet. That is how it would appear in the booklet rather than in the Bill, and at the appropriate time I will move the deletion of these words from the first Schedule.

I do not think it is necessary to dilate any longer on the Bill. It is a matter which is purely formal in its content, and I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The Question was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Dr. CUMMINS Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair, and the House went into committee on the Bill. Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The four clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

The First Schedule was called.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT Mr. Chairman,—For the reasons which I have already stated I beg to move that the figure and words from "9. Miscellaneous transactions and commodities etc. down to the words "Lard Animal" be deleted from the first Schedule.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — There are a few remarks that I would like to make on this schedule, not so much by way of criticism of the things in the schedule because I understand that our hands are tied as far as dealing with the Customs Tariff of the island is concerned. There are many outside agencies that govern the various relations between preferential and non-preferential tariff and other things by international agreements many of which we are not directly a party to. So from that point of view I am not on such good grounds.

What I want to speak on is the third paragraph of the Schedule which deals with abbreviations. It is a matter which I would like the honourable senior member for St. Peter to take up. One would I think expect that abbreviations are put in this clause as they would be printed in the Bill. But I find that it is not so. It may not be something to really criticise; but I feel that if you put in this paragraph the abbreviation "Ton" beginning with a capital "t" you should not use common "ts" elsewhere; and similarly with the abbreviation "N.E.S." It is gross carelessness. You will find, Sir, that there are some of the things used as abbreviations that are not in here at all. For example "yd", "val. and "ft." If you are going to put in one set why not put in the other? You start "lb" with a common "l" and "oz. Troy" with a common "o". After that the abbreviations start with capital letters. I mention it for the purpose of asking the honourable member to see that these things do not happen. Greater attention is paid to such matters in the Other Place. If they amend this and send it back to us how would we look? I think it is due purely to carelessness. There are other abbreviations which are not explained. Is there some other part of the Act where they are explained? If you turn to Page 8 of the Schedule you will get a good example of inconsistency. "Cubic Feet" is spelt with common letters, and "superficial feet" with capitals.

I know, as I have said previously, that we cannot deal so much with the contents of the schedules, but something has been drawn to my attention from the time I came into this House. I am referring to tea. The poor man is unable to buy the various brands that are put up in zinc packages—like Mazawattee and Red Rose—which you, sir, are probably conversant with. But cheap tea which the poor man buys, and the better quality brands pay the same duty. While it is difficult for us to tamper with tariff I feel that in a case of this sort if we had gone through this Bill, having it for a length of time, or if it had been referred to a select committee there are things which could have been done. Tea pays a specific duty. It does not matter what is the price or the brand; so the poor man has to pay sixpence a pound duty on his as well as the rich man. There are many things like that. This is one that has been drawn to my

attention, and I have mentioned it on several occasions previously. I take the opportunity now that this Bill is being dealt with to bring the matter again to the attention of the Government, and to ask the honourable senior member for St. Peter if such things have been considered or if we are dealing merely with classification today and with statistics.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I can assure the honourable Deputy Speaker that I have already drawn to the notice of the proper authorities that the honourable member is a very meticulous man where these things are concerned, and that is why I hurried to put right the typographical error in the first schedule. In the original form this is what this Bill was like. It will be appreciated that reading through all this fine type and making corrections was not any easy job, and any error that appears would be merely one of those human errors that some of us have not yet got beyond the stage of making.

As far as the last point which the honourable member made is concerned, this Bill does not seek to change any rates in the Customs Tariff at all. It is purely an amendment for the purpose of classification. It will be seen that no changes whatsoever have been made in duty. So the question raised about tea is not a matter that can be dealt with in this Bill at all.

Question that the First Schedule stand part was put and agreed to.

The Second Schedule was called.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that the Second Schedule stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am taking this opportunity to raise a question that I raised when the matter was more specifically before the House—whether these forms on which the new classifications will be made will either be sold to the merchants and Government will allow the various importers to get them printed themselves. I do not see the colour of the forms stated here. It is laid down that importers of classified goods must make their declaration on the necessary forms. I am wondering if the Government will take this opportunity of allowing the importers to supply their own forms. It would effect a considerable saving where the Government is concerned, and it will not amount to a row of pins where the various business houses are concerned.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Since the debate on the last occasion, I took that matter up with the Comptroller of Customs. He stated that the Government issued forms of one colour which made it easier to work with them. If every importer supplied his own forms you might get forms of various colours. Even if you said blue, there are many shades of blue and you would get confusion. Coming to the financial side of the matter, I do not know if the honourable member is aware that in many other territories there is no stamp duty, while in this island, for every warrant an importer passes he pays stamp duty of a penny. So that the Government collects more revenue by way of stamp duty than if they called on the importers to pay for these forms.

Mr. LEWIS: I am aware of the fact that stamp duty is collected on certain warrants passed. But there are others on which no duty is paid. The Government is giving away forms. I feel that if you abolish stamp duty and let the importers furnish their own forms Government will get away from a lot of printing expenses, and the keeping of stocks of forms. In addition there are no restrictions on the number of forms a person can ask for, and many of them are

used as scrap paper in offices. It is a matter to which the Government might well pay some attention.

If the honourable member would look at the past page but one of the second schedule, the last leaf of the Bill as printed, he will see another matter on which I want to comment. There are the words "Household effects, not exceeding \$600 etc." It does not say whether you mean \$600 in value or in duty. I do not remember this passing the House like that. I will ask the honourable member to bear that in mind.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,— This schedule shows a table giving the list of exemptions from duty on certain imported articles. I wonder if the honourable member in charge of the Bill can tell me in what respects if any does this differ from what has been passed before. I am wondering if any new items are to be exempted from duty today. I think that that should be made clear because something may be put in and slip our notice when it was not put in in the original Act. The honourable junior member for the City just drew attention to a peculiarly worded paragraph. There is another which strikes me as not being worded in the best style. It appears on the last page and is: "Personal effects of individuals belonging to this Island dying abroad." I think that that paragraph could be more elegantly styled. I do not know if that is one of the new items, or if it is an old item just put back in.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Honourable members seemed not to have been listening when I moved the second reading of this Bill. No one who was listening to what I said could think that you could include new items in this Bill. Putting in new items would need legislative approval. This Bill is purely for the purpose of classification and consolidating what has already been passed. There is no change of duty, nor is there the inclusion of any new items. Whatever is in this Schedule is in the old Schedule, and if it is inelegantly worded now it was inelegantly worded before. There have been 21 amendments to the Customs Tariff Act in the last three years, and we are now consolidating those amendments. There is nothing new.

As regards the matter about household effects not exceeding \$600, it is value on which you have to charge duty. If an old chair is valued 10/- you have to charge duty on the 10/-.

Mr. LEWIS: I think I understand that that is so. But when you are repealing an entire schedule it is not a bad idea to see that nothing new slips in. Again when you say household effects not exceeding \$600 you should make it clear that you mean value. What was not clear in the old Schedule we should make clear in this one. Another thing: I was under the impression that things imported by Cable & Wireless were exempt from duty. They are a most favoured company where exemption from Customs Duty is concerned. But I do not see their name here. I am wondering if being Imperial Government-owned they no longer enjoy this exemption or whether it is an omission. I do not know whether there is a special Act exempting them.

Question that the Second Schedule stand part was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in committee with amendments, and His Honour the Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was called and agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas—to move the House into Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. Cox seconded.

The question was put and agreed to, and Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

RESOLUTION FOR SPEIGHTSTOWN FISH MARKET

On the Order being called for Mr. F. L. WALCOTT to move the passing of a Resolution to place at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee the sum of \$12,305 to supplement the Estimates 1953—54 as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953—54 No. 4, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution:

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman.— This Resolution for \$12,305 seeks to carry out what has been agreed to in part by this Legislature. The erection of a fish market at Speightstown is something that should have been done about five years ago; but after the heavy rains some years ago which washed away the bridge, and with the reconstruction of the bridge encroaching on the old property of the market it had to be postponed. In carrying out this matter the Government took opportunity to acquire the building adjoining that property and that aspect of the matter is partly completed.

Honourable members will see that under the Plan for the Development of Fisheries we are using \$15,000 out of that estimate for the erection of this fish market at Speightstown, I would say that it is the intention of the Government to make this area more attractive than it is, and we hope that one of the members of this House who has some interest—will do what we expect other people will do. I would also take this opportunity to make a statement with regard to the Fisheries Officer.

Sometime last month one of the Saturday newspapers attacked the Fisheries Officer on the grounds of incompetence because there was a glut of fish and the glut could not be handled due to the absence of cold storage facilities. As far as the political side of it is concerned, I personally would not take any notice of anything that that newspaper writes about me in that way. But as far as a Civil Servant is concerned it is fair that the House should know that on the question of cold storage facilities no blame can be laid on the Fisheries Officer. There was a glut of fish and someone bought them up and put them into cold storage which could not carry them for the appropriate length of time. The person worked on the commercial basis that they would have sold out the fish before a fresh catch came in. But the fresh catch came in too soon and the person had to throw away his. I do not see how the Fisheries Officer can be blamed for that. But it was one of these vicious attacks intended to be political. I am not replying to the attack on the political side, but in order that a Civil Servant who has been attacked may be defended. I will say that it is only a digression that I have made; it is not intended to rope in any discussion on the question of cold storage facilities. The House is aware that funds were voted for Dr. Fulton to investigate that question. The Government is now awaiting his report. It is expected that

it will be placed before Government at any time now.

Where the question of cold storage is concerned the Government has set up a committee to investigate all aspects of that matter.

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution sets out in detail how the Government proposes to spend this money; and I should tell the House that it is the intention of the Government to pass Regulations when these fish markets are erected, so that better use can be made of them. In some quarters it is felt that enough use is not made of the fish markets, and the Government is considering the appropriate regulations. But these are things that cannot be done in a hurry. In drafting regulations you have to use a certain amount of commonsense, and not try to fit into the local community things which are suited to an English community. You have to draft regulations that bear some reference to the people with whom you are dealing.

It is the intention of the Government to erect these markets so that people will not sell fish all over the place. It is a terrible state of affairs to find fish being sold at every street corner. No one is there to wash the entrails down and it is abominable. Eagle Hall corner is a case in point. The odour there is terrible. There are so many human beings there at all times that you cannot wash the road unless you wash the people too.

The erection of this fish market at Speightstown is one of those things that should have been done four years ago. But due to the disaster down there and the washing away of the bridge it had to be postponed. I beg to move at this stage, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,— I very much regret that the honourable senior member for St. Peter gave such a gloomy view of cold storage facilities. To my mind the money spent on this market will be thrown away unless it is run on a proper fish market scale. You must have cold storage facilities for fish. Time after time in Speightstown, around 7.30 to 8 o'clock in the night fish come ashore and the sellers have to actually give them away—25 for a penny and that sort of thing. A few days after there are no fish to be bought. That is a waste of good food. The honourable member seems to think that fish can be put into cold storage and spoil. If the fish are spoiled before they reach cold storage they must be still bad when they are taken out. The fact is that the facilities should be there so that people can preserve the fish they catch and the public can get fish when they want it.

Another thing is that this building seems to be owned by the sea at present—you cannot find the owner — and it seems to me that the sea will continue to own it after the market is built. It is going to be a very costly project. I am very glad to hear that Government is considering the drafting of regulations for these fish markets. There are fish sheds at Paynes Bay and Weston in which not a fish is sold. They merely shelter people who do not work. Call these places shelters if you want to, but they are not fish sheds. I hope that the honourable member will carry back these views to the proper authorities.

I see in the addendum the sum of \$2,118.62 for contingencies. That seems to me a lot for contingencies. (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is 6 per cent.) You should have a proper refrigerating plant. Government will have to come back for more money for this scheme. I do not think that there is any more that I can say. I hope that steps will be taken to carry out my suggestions.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,— I would like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Peter one or two questions. I am always in favour of such schemes for social improvement, but I would like the honourable member to tell me a few things before I vote for this. Para. 2 of the Addendum says:

"The Government has recently acquired under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the property just north of the old fish market at Speightstown and an amount of \$12,305 from the sum of \$15,000 earmarked in the Five Year Plan is now required in order that the necessary work on the new Fish Market may proceed."

I do not think I am asking too much when I ask him to tell us the price paid for the property adjoining. I must say that I do not quite understand what is meant. I never criticise when you come to revised estimates because I know that in any building scheme there is always the chance of having changes and improvements which result in further expenditure. I would like the honourable member to tell me how much was paid for this building and what is the area. Upon that depends my acquiescence in the proposed expenditure.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As far as the actual payment for this building is concerned, we have not yet agreed on the amount because where this property is concerned it is difficult to establish ownership. It has been acquired under the Compulsory Acquisition Act. There seem to be no owners. The Legislature have already given the Government authority to acquire this building. It is the old building that G. W. Hutchinson used before. It has a valuation that the Colonial Engineer put on it, but which I do not regard as appropriate to state now. I can get the facts relative to the area of the land by going through the files if the honourable member wishes me to do so. I do not think the area of the land is the material thing from his point of view because nothing has been paid out. If we paid out money we might never be able to acquire it at all because we do not know when the last owner will come up. Government has to proceed on the assumption that the valuation is a fair valuation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The answer which the honourable member has given may be alright for people who do not understand these things. I understand the point he has made about compulsory acquisition, and I appreciate his reluctance to state the actual valuation because when you get before a jury someone on the jury may know at how much the land has been valued by the Colonial Engineer.

But I want to say this: Within recent months an estimate went up to the St. Michael Vestry relative to 14,000 square feet of land for a market. The estimate was \$35,000, over a quarter of an acre of land. This place in Speightstown just adjoins the old building. The old building is not 3,000 square feet of land, and the new site cannot stand on 2,000 square feet. (Mr. F. L. Walcott) The area is 4,000 square feet.) The area of the new site is 4,000 square feet. We have acquired the property compulsorily; but we have not yet paid for it. I am not now taking the line that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew has taken about refrigerating plant, because I personally feel that with the transport which we have today one refrigerating plant is enough for Barbados for general marketing. If people can be encouraged to take fish on pick-ups out into the country in districts where people have no fish it is a good thing.

The point that I want to deal with is this: I am sorry that on this site the Government is contemplating a fish market only. Speightstown needs a

general market. The addendum speaks about a fish market. As I said, St. Michael plans to spend \$35,000 to cover 14,500 square feet of land for a general market—fish meat and everything. The Government is going to spend \$27,000 for a fish market only. I agree that you need somewhere to sell fish in Speightstown. But if you go through Speightstown on a Saturday morning you will see how vendors need somewhere to sell their wares. People come in from the adjoining parishes to offer their wares in this area, more especially since the building up of residences on the St. James coast, and more than a mere fish market is needed.

I do not want to stress the point about price because it is not expedient for the honourable member to say now what Government's advisers have agreed upon. But I want to speak on this question of the cost of demolishing the old building. Ever since the days, 30 years ago, when the Government started to build new barracks for policemen, ever since those days sellers of buildings have ceased to pay for demolishing them. You advertise the building and people pay you for demolishing it. You must have some reason why you are paying for demolishing this. I believe I am right in saying that nearly all these buildings in Speightstown are built of rubble stone; and it could hardly be argued that being block stone this demolished building would be of value to the Government. On the other hand if the new building costs \$15,000, the seawall, \$3,000, contingencies, \$2,118, etc one can easily deduct that the price which it is proposed to pay for this building is somewhere in the vicinity of \$5,000. If that covers the cost of demolition it seems to me to be a reasonable figure.

I repeat, however, that you should not confine this site to the selling of fish. In Speightstown there is no place where butchers can sell freshly killed meat with the exception of the last business place opened down there. There is need for a place where butchers can sell meat under hygienic and healthy conditions. I say that the honourable member should use his influence to see that the area is used not merely as a fish market but as a meat and vegetable market as well. It is not fair to spend this amount for a fish market only when you know that there are hundreds of hucksters in the same area who need somewhere to sell their goods. The honourable member talked about regulations. What regulations will the Government send down that will deal with a fish market only?

I am making two main points: The first is that it is not good enough in these days to pay for demolishing buildings. Advertise and get the site cleared. The second point is that I believe the money is sufficient to make provision for a market covering not only fish, but meat and vegetables. Compare \$27,000 to cover, say, four or five thousand square feet of land as against \$35,000 estimated to cover 14,000 square feet of land. I take it that they will be markets of a similar nature, open air markets with roofs, concrete floors etc. I do not think that the expenditure proposed is justifiable merely on a fish market.

If the honourable member has any answer to that, I will have to say that either he is wrong or the addendum is wrong. The second paragraph of the addendum speaks exclusively of a new fish market at Speightstown. We are developing today; people are beginning to use more vegetables; they know more about the food value of green vegetables and people who grow these things will appreciate knowing that they will have a proper place to offer them for sale. The honourable member for St.

James who supports the Government knows that what I am saying is correct.

I counsel the honourable senior member for St. Peter not to allow the Government to pay for demolishing this old building. There can be no material in that old building good enough to put back into the new building that you are erecting.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that the honourable member who has just sat down has made reference to some of the points which I had in mind to express. I too agree with his suggestion that markets erected for the selling of fish in country districts such as Speightstown or Oistin where there is no other market should also be built to accommodate the selling of butchers' meat and things of that sort. I, however, must remind the honourable member that the mover of this resolution did point out that this was called a Fish Market for Speightstown because it was part of a scheme which dated back as far as 1947 when money was earmarked for the building of fish markets on suitable sites around the island. I do hope that in the light of present-day requirements, that Government would revise the scheme to make it possible for vegetables and meats to be sold in some parts of the buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I too cannot see how a fish market can be complete without cold storage facilities and I appreciate the remarks of the honourable Senior Member for the City on this point. I feel that money spent on fish markets would not be beneficially spent unless there are proper cold storage facilities. The idea of having a building for the selling of fish is not enough. The scheme should provide for such an emergency as if there is a big catch of fish on a particular day, part of the catch could be put in proper storage so as to be fit for human consumption on another day. I do hope that the question of cold storage which is now engaging the attention of Government will be so worked out as to provide not only a cold storage plant for the Bridgetown Fish Market but also for the markets at Speightstown and Oistin. Let me repeat that unless there are proper cold storage facilities at all these Fish Markets the whole object of a fish market is defeated. There is no point at all of adopting a cheeseparing policy in this matter. In dealing with this matter, we should not think of to-day or even ten years hence but of fifty years to come. I am therefore hoping that the Government will find it possible not only to install cold storage facilities which in their wisdom they are now erecting in the Bridgetown Market, but also in the Speightstown and Oistin markets as well.

If I may be allowed to issue a warning to Government, I do hope that the Government will exercise its fullest powers under the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, so that suitable seaside lands can be acquired adjoining beaches where fishing boats are hauled up. I may tell the Government that fishermen in many parts of the island are experiencing grave hardships through the lack of public-owned spots annexing these fishing boat bays. I know that even an attempt had been made by a private owner of land at Maxwell Coast to prosecute some of these fishermen because they hauled up their boats near to his property. I therefore make this exposition so that the Minister in charge of Fisheries and the Fishery Officer would be able to look into the question. These complaints are island-wide. These fishermen must beach their boats somewhere. Sir, this is a question which must be looked into because the Fishing Industry is beneficial to this island as a whole.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I think the honourable senior member for the City has made an excellent

contribution to this debate. In agreeing with his comments on the high costs for the erection of this fish market at Speightstown one is forced to wonder if so much is to be spent for this purpose whether there will be any money left for the erection of even ordinary fishing sheds at other fishing centres throughout the island. Nobody is suggesting that we should dot the entire sea coast or even the important fishing centres with elaborate fishing sheds along the line envisaged in this resolution for the Speightstown Fish Market, but certainly, Sir, my belief is that if less palatial structures than this are put up, money will be left to erect ordinary shelters, cutting slabs and, perhaps, a few stone benches as well as other reasonable conveniences for fishermen and the general public at other less important fishing centres throughout the island. In St. Philip, for instance, there are two well-known fishing centres, one at the Crane and the other at Foul Bay, and neither of these centres has the slightest vestige of anything approaching a shelter either for the fishermen or for the buying public. I therefore want to suggest that a few thousand dollars should be earmarked for the erection of ordinary sheds with elementary amenities for the fishing public at some of the fishing centres. I merely sound this note of warning because there has been the suggestion for the erection of facilities of this sort at various points along the sea coast and I am worried that if we utilise so much money — unnecessarily to some extent — on one particular point, there shall be none left for similar purpose at other points.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise again to explain to the Committee one point. Honourable members will bear in mind that this resolution dates back as I have said before to 1947. At that time the estimated cost for the erection of a suitable building on the old site without any of the additional amenities was put at \$9,888. Since then, there was the flood water damage as a result of which the nearby bridge had to be erected properly. It was then decided that Government should acquire the adjacent property to the old fish market so as to make that part of the town more sightly. The estimated cost then was put at \$30,000, but according to this resolution honourable members will see that what was proposed to cost \$30,000 is now costing \$27,304.82 because Government further investigated the matter with a view of cutting the cost down. The honourable senior member for the City should bear in mind that this money is not only for the purpose of erecting a fish market but is also making provision for that unsightly part of the town to look much better. While on this point, I would like to inform the Committee that the honourable junior member for St. George has land in that area and he is quite willing to give it over to Government to carry out further proposals which Government has in mind. The Government is hoping that in time to come it will acquire that whole area along that part of the town so as to be able to form an esplanade.

With reference to the point raised by the honourable senior member for the City with regard to calling for tenders for the demolition of the building, I would like to state that that is a departmental policy and I do not know if Government can undertake to demolish a building in the same manner as would a private individual. I do not think that the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. Philip should call for any explanation from me more than to say that the whole question of Fishery Development must come to this Chamber from time to time when provision will be made for the erection of more fishing sheds. If I may repeat for his benefit,

when he is thinking of the cost for the erection of the Speightstown Fish Market with others to follow, he must bear in mind that the cost of this market has been increased by the reconstruction of the bridge, the acquisition of the adjacent building and the re-instatement of the seawall to make that part of the area more suitable. It does seem from these files that it is proposed to make this market more than a fish market because it has been indicated on one occasion that fish, meat, vegetables, etc., should be sold there. However, honourable members must bear in mind that a resolution was passed in August last year to acquire this land for the erection of a fish market. By this Government does not mean that it is revoking any of its policy with regard to fish markets. I hope I have satisfied honourable members that this Government has examined this matter carefully and that the estimated cost of the Fish Market is not as exorbitant as it seems to be having regard to the other necessary things to be done.

Mr. MILLER: Just allow me to say a few words before you put the question, Mr. Chairman. I am hoping that before this market is constructed that it will be properly designed by some qualified architect and that it will be consistent with modern structural work. Much as I would like to give the erection of this market my personal blessing, I still think it is necessary at this stage to mention my general unhappiness as to the structure of the Eagle Hall market which is now under construction. Whoever is responsible for the design of that market, whether it be the Engineer of the Public Works Department or somebody else; on a simple area as that, the person by their design destroyed most of the floor area by failing to erect a modern structure and erecting a structure of 100 years ago. Having to pass that market on my way home adds to my annoyance of what is going on there; therefore, I hope that the market at Speightstown would not suffer a similar fate.

Another reason for my rising is because the honourable junior member for St. Peter made reference to my owning a small spot of land at Speightstown and has decided to give it to Government should it be required for further proposals. I would like to inform honourable members that it is no desire of mine to sell this spot of land owing to the fact that I have five children and am just 42 years of age. However, on being approached by someone connected with a Government Department stating that it might be required for further proposals by Government, I felt that it is required for a good cause and I would be the last person who would stay in the way of giving up a spot of land for such a cause. I would be happy if it would be of good use to Government and the question of cost would not worry me. I hope honourable members will look at it in that way. Sir, I understand from the honourable junior member for St. Peter that it is proposed to obtain strips of land along the coast for an esplanade. To my mind, that is important and will more or less adorn the town.

Before I sit, I would like to compliment the Government on this resolution to bring into being this Fish Market at Speightstown. I feel it should have been there 100 years ago. I would ask the honourable junior member for St. Peter, if possible, to see that accommodation is made in it for a suitable booth or two for the handling and selling of fresh meat. I believe that will create enthusiasm and will further the use of the market.

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

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of this Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Mr. Cox in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and then agreed to.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to move the adjournment of the House for half an hour.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. E. D. MOTTLEY

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking the House to grant me three months leave of absence from my duties as from the 1st July proximo.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

RESOLUTION FIXING SALARY OF LIBRARIAN AND SECRETARY OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY POSTPONED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, to move the passing of a Resolution fixing the salary of the Librarian and Secretary of the House of Assembly at \$2,280 per annum from 2nd September, 1952.

Dr. CUMMINS: This resolution concerns the salary of the Librarian and Secretary of this House of Assembly. It reads as follows:— "*Resolved* that under the provisions of the Officers of the Assembly (Salaries) (Amendment) Act, 1952, the salary of the Librarian and Secretary be \$1,440 x 120 — \$2,280 per annum from the second day of September, 1952, and that the present holder of the post be given one increment as from the second day of September, 1952."

Before proceeding further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to make an amendment in line 2 of this Resolution. After the word 'Assembly' in line 1, I am asking that the words 'Salaries Act 1912 (1912-2) as amended by the Officers of the Assembly' be inserted to precede the words in line 2.

Honourable members will remember that the Librarian and Secretary was appointed an officer of this House in September 1952. Previous to that date, he was considered a Civil Servant, but as was rightly done, he was taken from being a Civil Servant and appointed an officer of this House. Sir, the argument when he was appointed was that he should be paid as a Long Grade Clerk in the Civil Service and that was eventually agreed to; but recently, as a result of the Dos Santos Report in respect of salaries of Civil Servants, the salaries of Long Grade Clerks have been increased to a maximum of \$2,280 per annum and I think it is only fair that the salary of the Librarian and Secretary should be increased accordingly. Therefore, Sir, I move that the salary of the Librarian and Secretary of the House of Assembly be \$1,440 x 120—\$2,280 per annum.

Sir, the present holder of the post is now drawing one increment on the scale and the increment mentioned at the end of the above resolution represents the additional increment given to Long Grade Clerks under the Dos Santos Report. I think that it is only fair that the Librarian and Clerk

should get a further increment because if he were still a Civil Servant he would have benefited by annual increments in accordance with the date of his appointment; but for the four years he was a Civil Servant, he having served under the aegis of the Civil Establishment from the 5th October, 1948 to the 2nd September, 1952, he was never given any increase and I feel today that not only is it fair that he should be given a further increment but that he should be given five increments instead, so that this officer should not be out-of-pocket by being an officer of this House. I am therefore putting this suggestion to honourable members and should they feel so disposed, they can make an amendment along that line and I will be happy to accept it. I therefore move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I feel that in view of what is set out in the Addendum, that the present holder of the post served under the aegis of the Civil Establishment from the 5th October, 1948 to the 2nd September, 1952, that he should certainly get more than one increment. I therefore support the remarks of the honourable Deputy Leader of this House, I too feel that an injustice will be meted out to this officer by giving him only one increment, because if he had remained in the Government Service, he would have received four years' increments. It is only fair and right that we who are sitting as a Labour Government should see that any employee of the Government and more especially an employee of the House of Assembly should not be victimised or treated in any way against the policy of the movement to which we all are members. I therefore beg to make this amendment to the resolution; instead of the words 'one increment' occurring in the last line of the resolution that the words 'five increments' be substituted therefor. I hardly think that we can do otherwise than to make this amendment, and I feel that my remarks is an expression of the sentiments of the whole Chamber.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not hear all of the remarks of the honourable Deputy Leader of this House, but from what the honourable senior member for Christ Church has said I take the opposite view. I counsel honourable members not to let us go over things we have done already. We dealt with the salary of this officer when we made him an officer of this House in September last year. If we read this Addendum we would see that the present holder, served in his present post under the aegis of the Civil Establishment from the 5th October, 1948 to the 2nd September, 1952 without ever having received increments which were paid during the said years to all other employees in the Civil Establishment. The honourable senior member for Christ Church has also made representations along that line for the giving of five increments to this officer. In these matters you create enemies by being outspoken. What salary did the holder of this post receive on the 5th October, 1948 when he was first appointed to the post under the aegis of the Civil Establishment? He was appointed at a salary of \$80 per month which means that he was not placed in the same position as one when he enters the Service. If he had entered the Service as other Civil Servants what would be his relative position at the 2nd September, 1952? Would it be better than the position he was in then? Certainly it could not be better. How therefore can you bring this question of increments into your arguments now? There is no reason why you should bring his period of time under the Civil Establishment into the picture now because when you do so,

you are faced with the whole history of this officer's salary. When the present holder of this post took up the appointment, he received the maximum salary of what his predecessor got for doing the job, and it was done because this officer was not to be at the bottom of the scale as when one enters the Civil Service. When you dealt with this officer on the last occasion, you dealt with his salary and put it on a footing. The most that you can do now is to say that if he was put on the same footing as a Long Grade Clerk and you have increased your Long Grade Clerks to a maximum of \$2,280 per annum that you should do the same thing with this officer. You did not say on the last occasion that he should get four increments, so you cannot say so, now. How can you in the light of what you did on the last occasion come today and say you are going to give him five increments? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have anything against this officer, what I am saying is purely a matter of principle. There is no branch of the Service that received five increments when we dealt with them on the last occasion and I cannot see how you can give this officer five increments now.

Sir, at the end of the Addendum it is stated that the increment mentioned at the end of the above resolution represents the additional increment given to the Long Grade Clerks under the Dos Santos Report. Matters like this before being put on an Addendum should be discussed by a Committee. When things are done in this way, and one is forced to be outspoken, others feel that you have an axe to grind against the officer concerned. This is not the case. I do not want any officer of this Service to think that because an officer happens to be an officer of this House that I would do more for that officer than for other officers in other branches of the Service. Can you with any justification say today that you must give him five increments now because he did not receive them when he was a Civil Servant when you know that on the last occasion when you dealt with his salary you put him on a salary which was above the beginning of the salary scale for a Long Grade Clerk? Sir, we have done this officer no harm in so far as his emoluments by taking him from the Civil Establishment and making him an officer of this House. Let him compare his position with another Civil Servant in similar position that entered the Service in 1948—the same time as he entered the Service. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not concerned with who is vexed or who is pleased: I mean nothing against this officer; what I have said is purely on a matter of principle. On these grounds, I cannot support this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to be very frank in my speech on this resolution. Before I came into this House, the particular officer concerned discussed something with me pertaining to the issue but I will not disclose what it was. I think it is correct to say that in September last year, the salary of this officer was reviewed by this House when his status was changed from being a Civil Servant and the background of the argument at that time with respect to salary was that he received fairly good treatment. On that occasion, we put him in the same category as that of a Long Grade Clerk and since we have increased the maximum of Long Grade Clerks to \$2,280 per annum, I think it would be fair to increase this officer's maximum to that figure. I do not think any honourable member would disagree with that, taking into account that we promised to put him in the position of a Long grade Clerk. What I do not like about this matter is that an amendment has been moved to give this officer five increments as from 2nd September last when at that time it was distinctly pointed

out that the salary he would be receiving then was not based on his length of service. I therefore think it would be grossly unfair to come today and vote for giving this officer five increments.

It is when a mistake like this is made that we create a certain amount of dissatisfaction among the rank and file of the Service. I suggest that if we give this officer five increments on this salary scale, we would be treating him better than any officer in the Long Grade who had given fifteen years' service. I therefore could not be in agreement with it. I agree with the principle of paying persons adequate salaries to live on, but I do not think it would be correct to say that this officer is not receiving an adequate salary now having regard to his term of office in the Service and the salary he was paid on his appointment. I will ask honourable members to be very careful over this matter because even at present there is much dissatisfaction existing within the Service and if we sit here and create more anomalies by giving these additional increments we would be creating more dissatisfaction.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it were possible to look into the hearts of honourable members, you would discover that all would be feeling that this resolution is wrong, but nevertheless, some of them would be saying that they are going to vote for it. I am saying that this Resolution is wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member going to introduce an argument to show that the Librarian and Secretary should not be placed in the position of a Long Grade Clerk when this House has already decided that he should be placed in such a position? All this resolution seeks to do is to merely alter the previous salary scale and bring it into line with that of a Long Grade Clerk.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour for your remarks but I was about to say what I said when this matter came before the House on the last occasion and that was that I believe the salary which we agreed to pay him for his services was a good salary. I am going to remind honourable members that too far east is west. According to the salary of this officer which was fixed on the last occasion, it began at \$120 per month and would go to \$180 plus cost of living allowance. I want to say at this stage that this is a handsome salary for the duties which this officer is called on to perform. Any honourable member who would say anything different to that would be stifling his conscience and dishonest to himself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must really ask the honourable member not to even make it appear as if he is accusing honourable members of dishonest actions.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if certain honourable members want to compensate this officer for anything which he may do for them personally, let them do so out of their pockets. It is wrong to increase this salary today. Do you want to tell me that the duties of this officer call for a better salary than the duties which officers in some departments of the Service have to perform such as a Long Grade Clerk in the Income Tax Office and the Attorney General's Office?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Senior Member for the City saying that the proposals of this resolution are a dishonest act? Certainly, if you are saying so, You are out of order. You might say that you do not agree with them.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I say again Mr. Deputy Speaker that if honourable members want to compensate this officer for anything which he may do for them personally, let them do so out of their own pockets.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will just ask the honourable member to bear with me for my interruption. Will you tell me exactly on what point are you arguing in this resolution? May I remind you again that the idea of placing the Librarian and Secretary of this House in the same category as a Long Grade Clerk is something which this House has already decided. It was agreed to on the last occasion, sometime before September last year. This House has the right of fixing the salaries of its officers.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not agree to it then.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you going to propose an amendment to this resolution? I do not think the honourable member should continue these propose an amendment to this resolution? I do not resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, on the last occasion, I expressed my position on the matter. As I have said before I would be the last person to stand in the way of any person earning an adequate salary for the job he is doing. I am looking at this resolution this way. Call the office of this job "Librarian and Secretary" or change it to whatever name you like, I am satisfied that the post is not worth \$190 per month. If it is worth that figure then the Clerks who are doing work in the Auditor General's Office or the Income Tax Office, whose position call for more responsibility, are worth \$390 per month. Surely, I cannot come in this Chamber and sit down and see a resolution of this sort pass without expressing my disapproval. Do you want me to agree to this resolution for it to cause eventually more dissatisfaction in the Service? I have a conscience. As I have said already, I have nothing against the present holder of the office; I happened to know him when he was a baby; but are you going to pay your Librarian and Secretary the same thing as a Long Grade Clerk knowing well that the job does not compare with that of a Long Grade Clerk? I am very much surprised at the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church who moved the amendment to give the holder of the office five increments. I believe that deep down in the honourable member's heart he meant well but I do not see how any honourable member of this House can agree to that amendment. There is no reason why you should do something extravagant or unreasonable because you are dealing with an officer of this House. I notice that there is a tendency among honourable members to favour officers of this House; some honourable members having the feeling that if they act differently, the officers would get up against them and treat them with disrespect. As far as I am concerned, I hope none of them would ever try to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is making a rather serious charge against officers of this House. No such complaint has ever been brought to my notice by any honourable member of this House, nor has the honourable Speaker of this House ever communicated with me of such treatment to honourable members. On the other hand, any action of such sort should not be dealt with in this way. The action of the honourable member in introducing it in this measure is most deplorable.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I may have spoken too strongly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am yet saying that this office of Librarian and Secretary does not worth \$180 or \$190 per month. You can call it by any other fancy name—Secretary-General for that matter—it does not worth that salary. Power carries responsibility. Must you do this because you are empowered to do it? To do it would be dishonest. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest

respect to you in your position, tell me the duties of the Librarian and Secretary? All things that are lawful are not expedient.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member asking what are the duties of the Librarian and Secretary? I think that every honourable member of this House should be aware of the duties of that office. It does not speak well for the honourable senior member for the City if he is not aware of the duties of that office. I may say that this officer is not employed by any particular member of this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I see no harm being done to this officer if you allow his salary scale to remain as it is. According to the present salary scale, this officer will be going to \$180 per month. This resolution seeks to carry it to \$190 per month plus an increment as from 2nd September last, with an amendment now for the giving of five increments, but I think this would be reflecting against what the House did on the last occasion when we dealt with this matter. At that time I did not think it was the right thing to do and I am of the same opinion now. I believe if you take a referendum on this matter, no honourable member would say that this officer's salary scale reaching a maximum of \$180 per month is not a fair and adequate salary taking into consideration the duties and qualifications of the officer. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not supporting this resolution and I also know that the Leader of this House is the greatest opponent to it. I cannot see how the Government could have sent it down. May I also say that in the expressions of opinion on the increasing of salaries to officers in the higher grade of the Service, you said that it was wrong to increase them; if you said so then, you must say this is also wrong. I do not think this resolution should have been sent down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member mean to say that for the duties which the Librarian and Secretary has to perform, the salary scale as proposed by this resolution is wrong?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. I am expressing the view that this resolution fixing the salary scale for the duties of Librarian and Secretary up to a maximum of \$190 per month should be rejected. Rejecting this resolution, the salary scale of this officer would go on to \$180 per month which, I think, is the correct salary for this office. Sir, I move that this resolution be rejected. I do it with the fullest sense of responsibility. When this resolution is rejected, no harm or hardship is caused to this officer. His salary would go on to \$180 per month which I consider is an absolutely good salary for the duties he is called to perform. If you make comparison of this salary with that of schoolmasters and other persons qualified for technical work, you will see that this salary compares favourably.

Mr. TALMA: I rise on a point of explanation, Sir. If this officer was paid a salary of \$180 per month from the beginning that would be very well. The position would be very clear, but he is paid on an incremental basis. I would also point out that the other officers of this House are paid fixed salaries and the Librarian and Secretary is the only officer who is being paid on an incremental basis.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I still will say that whether this office is paid on an incremental basis or a fixed salary, the duties of Librarian and Secretary are not worth more than \$180 per month. I beg to move that this resolution be rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise to put forward one or two things which I have in mind and which I think would clarify the situation and help honourable members to resolve the question. I take it that since you have given the Librarian and Secre-

tary the status of a Long Grade Clerk in the Civil Service as specified in the resolution, you will have to pay him in that category; therefore, in so far as that is concerned, I am prepared to vote for the maximum which a Long Grade Clerk in the Service would obtain. It is right that you pay him what that post in the Service gets. The honourable member for Christ Church actually said that this officer should be given the maximum on the ground that other officers of the House were being paid a fixed salary.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I made no such suggestion. I merely said that other officers of this House received fixed salaries and that this officer was the only one who was paid on an incremental basis. If he were paid a fixed salary, the position would be very clear.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, it was suggested to give this officer five increments together. There can be no justification for saying that because no officer who is a Civil Servant receives at any one time five increments. In the words of the honourable senior Member for the City, if that were done, it would be a dishonest act. I therefore disagree to the giving of five increments. I may also mention that the officers of this House who are paid fixed salaries are not Civil Servants. If an officer of this House is being treated as a Civil Servant with all the amenities attached to a Civil Servant, he should not be given concessions which a Civil Servant does not receive. If an officer of this House is being treated as a Civil Servant, with their rights and privileges, then he should abide by the terms and conditions of the Service.

Sir, I am willing to support this resolution as it stands but I cannot agree with the suggested amendment. We cannot get away from doing what is proposed in the resolution. Whatever increment this officer is entitled to, he should receive, but you should not add more. The contention of certain honourable members is that this officer should never have been placed in the same position as a Long Grade Clerk but the fact remains that it is done already and because it is done we have to accept it as a fact; we cannot go back on what we have already agreed.

Mr. MAPP: Sir, as far as I can see, the debate on this question is just as a storm in a teacup. I cannot see the reason why all this noise should have been raised by honourable members over this question. It seems to me that the suggested amendment by the honourable senior member for Christ Church was taken too seriously. I really did not take it seriously because I think what is proposed in this resolution treats this officer generously. I must thank Your Honour for reminding honourable members that this House has the right of fixing the salaries and emoluments of its officers, but surely, I think this is a matter which could have been referred to the Debates Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As far as I know, the Debates Committee employ reporters of this House. The Act has been changed so as to make the Librarian and Secretary an officer of this House and because of that anything pertaining to this officer should be dealt with by the House.

Mr. MAPP: With all due deference to Your Honour's ruling, I still think that the wise course which should have been adopted in this matter should have been to refer it to the Debates Committee. I am saying that a matter of this sort cannot be competently discussed in this House; it can only be competently discussed by a Committee of this House. As a result of the differences of opinion on this matter, I think it would be better if this resolution is postponed. I therefore move that this resolution be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. BRANCKER: I second this motion. If we

postpone this matter, we would have further opportunity of exploring the *pros* and *cons* and would be better able to decide whether we would be doing an injustice or otherwise to this officer or to the rest of the Civil Servants.

Dr. CUMMINS: I accept this motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Speaking on the postponement, I would like to note that we are agreeing to the postponement of this matter on the condition that there will be more statement on it when it returns to this House. Sir, this is not a matter like one being returned to the Government for further consideration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have no doubt that His Honour the Speaker will deal with the matter in the best possible way.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I hope that in your position as Deputy Speaker of this House, Your Honour would undertake to find out how Long Grade Clerks in the Service were treated under the resolution which was recently passed by this House because in so far as increments are concerned, no additional increments were given to Civil Servants. Why I say so is because the latter part of the Addendum states that the increment mentioned at the end of the above resolution represents the additional increment given to the Long Grade Clerks under the Dos Santos Report. I take it that this suggested increment is not an assimilation, it means the giving of an additional increment as from the 2nd September last year to this particular officer. I find it necessary to advise you on this matter because the question of assimilation was one of the moot points before the Government when it considered the revision of salaries of the Service and the Government has declared its policy. If, unfortunately, any member of the Government agrees to what this resolution purports to do and which as a matter of policy this Government decided not to do, it would place Government in an embarrassing position.

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have accepted the motion for the postponement of this Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am fully aware of that, but the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter is speaking on the motion for the postponement.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, this matter is so very vital that perforce, I must make these remarks for the benefit of those who are going to deal with this matter. I do not want charges to be made like what the honourable Senior Member for the City was forced to make a few moments ago. I feel sure that with the advice I have given, Your Honour can use your influence among honourable members who may deal with this matter. I am asking you to ascertain what is the assimilation policy of the Government and what is the correct position of Long Grade Clerks in the Service so that you can do nothing unfair to this particular officer. We must bear in mind that when we pass a resolution like this, the Governor-in-Executive Committee nor the Accountant General can alter it; and as it is now, it will make a mockery of the whole position. As far as I can see, this officer is entitled to the salary scale of \$1,440 x 120—2,280. I do not know what his increment is on this scale nor do I know the date on which another increment becomes due. By this resolution, he will receive another increment as from the 2nd September, 1952. I therefore ask you to go into the matter most carefully.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Speaking on the motion for the postponement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad that the Government has accepted this motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has not fully appreciated the position. This

matter does not concern the Government; it is a matter for the House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am glad that Your Honour made that point clear particularly when the honourable Senior Member for St. Thomas was speaking on the matter, because I too thought that it would have been a matter for the Debates Committee. According to your explanation, this would not be a matter for the Debates Committee or the Government to settle but for the House. Because this Resolution looks like creating a charge on the Treasury, I am at a loss to understand where the resolution originated. Sometimes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you say things to make people believe you are ignorant of what you are speaking but if I am considered a fool in this matter by some, let them enjoy that belief. According to what Your Honour has said, any honourable member of this House may come in here with a Bill to ask that the Clerk of this House be paid £3,000 per annum, if I give this as an illustration. I am saying that a Bill to that effect, according to what Your Honour has said, would be quite in order, but for me, it would be very dishonest.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I could not regard it as such. I take it that the honourable member is straying from the motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, —the hon. Deputy Leader having accepted the motion for the postponement of this resolution for further consideration, I would say no more at this stage other than to say that I cannot give the advice which the honourable junior member for St. Peter gave but that whoever takes part in discussing this matter before it reaches the floor of this House again should go most carefully into what is the worth of the office of Librarian and Secretary.

The question that further consideration of the resolution be postponed was then put and agreed to.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker.—I would like to ask leave that Order No. 9 standing in my name be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, —I would like to ask leave that Order No. 1, standing in my name be the first Order of the Day.

On the question being put that Order No. 9 be the first Order of the Day and on a division being called for the question was resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs BRYAN, MAPP, TALMA, HOLDER, Dr. CUMMINS, Cox, MILLER and Mrs. BOURNE (8)

Noes: Messrs SMITH, BRANCKER, VAUGHAN, ALLDER and E. D. MOTTLEY (5).

BILL TO AUTHORISE SALE OF "SCARBORO" LAND

On the order being called for Mr. Talma to move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to sell a parcel of land at "Scarboro," Christ Church, to the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the Island:

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — This is really a matter of a formal nature which will entail very little time. It is a Bill to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to sell a parcel of land to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of erecting a post office and library. There is nothing controversial in the Bill. It is merely a matter of procedure. The library and post office to be erected are two of the projects set out in the Memorandum of the Five Year Plan. They are essential things, and things which should have been done since 1947 under the old Ten Year Plan.

I move, Sir, that the Bill be read a second time. Mr. MAPP seconded the motion, which was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA seconded by Mr. MAPP Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA seconded by Mr. MAPP the Preamble to the Bill was postponed.

On motions of Mr. TALMA seconded by Mr. HOLDER in each case the seven clauses of the Bill were called and agreed to.

The Preamble was agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA seconded by Mr. HOLDER Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. TALMA seconded by Mr. HOLDER in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS RE PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS

On the Order being called for Mr. E. D. Mottley to move the passing of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly is of opinion that in view of the fact that Pan American Airways are operating an air service in the West Indies, that it is in the interest of Barbados that the company be invited to operate direct services from New York and Puerto Rico respectively to this island and the House of Assembly requests that your Excellency take the necessary steps to implement this Address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I do not believe that this Address should be controversial. From the time that air transport started in these parts there has been a feeling that we should not, as far as Barbados is concerned, play second fiddle to Trinidad or any other West Indian Colony. I am going to begin at a point at which I would anticipate criticism. I understand that there is an international agreement — which none of us members of the House are conversant with—which will have to be discussed at international level, and we would have no say in such matters. Be that as it may, we know that we have an airport and that that airport cost us a handsome sum of money. We know too that there is no direct communication between Barbados and the U.S.A. by air, and people coming here from the U.S.A. must be transhipped from Trinidad, Antigua or Puerto Rico.

Now if one reflects and asks what good would it do to have Pan American Airline coming here, I suppose that everyone knows that there would have to be give and take between an American Airline and a British Airline. That is, if an American Airline got permission to land here, they would have to give similar concession to B.O.A.C. to land elsewhere. That is something which is much beyond the notice of members of the House. Be that as it may, what we do know is that we have begun to pay more attention to the Tourist Trade and in that connection direct transportation from New York here will mean quite a lot. Some may ask why New York. It is well known that the City of New York means much to the people of this colony.

I do not profess to know the intricacies of high international agreements, but I know that our air-

port has cost us, and is costing us a great deal of money, and that we should make it clear that since we have to depend much on the tourist trade we will not support an isolated airport any more than we would support an isolated harbour in this modern age; but that it should be open to the airlines which are willing to operate here.

I know that certain honourable members who have intimated to me that they are willing to support this Address are prepared to say that the Address should be amended to say that we should not only ask Pan American Airways but any reputable airline operating in the West Indies, to make a stop here. I am willing to accept any such amendment if I think that accepting such an amendment would ensure the passing of the Address. I see the wisdom in not merely saying Pan American Airways. I know the benefits to be derived from having direct communication with New York, but I also realise that there are other lines, like the Dutch Airline running from other places and I am willing to accept an amendment by which they can be included.

I repeat, Sir, that I do not think we should maintain an airport at the expense of the taxpayers for the benefit of any one airline, whether it be British or else, but we should also invite other airlines that will mean something to Barbados both by way of direct communication and advertisement. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to second that motion, and in doing so I do not think that there is much that needs to be added to what the honourable mover has said. After all, it is recognised that the most efficient and extensive air service in the world is that conducted by Pan American Airways, and one would naturally hate to think as a Barbadian that that Service is debarred from being permitted to use the facilities of Seawell Airport. K.L.M. is another very efficient service. Now we are served exclusively, or almost so, by B.W.I. Airways. I understand that there is an attempt by another company to provide a more punctual service than that provided in the past; but, Sir, with the difficulties which seem to be increasing in providing transport facilities for people to and from this country, and with the fact that the British Government has apparently done nothing to assist us in travelling by sea—we have to depend almost exclusively on the French Line for opportunities to visit the U.K.—I strongly favour this proposed additional service to the existing one whereby tourists might be able to come from the U.K. by Pan American Airways via the U.S.A.

The matter is one for adjustment. If peradventure we required B.W.I. Airways to agree to share the facilities at Seawell with not only T.C.A. but also with P.A.A. then the latter might have to concede a similar concession in respect of another port to which they have access. That, Sir, does not concern us. What does and must concern us is whether we are suffering from the lack of shipping opportunities. Carlisle Bay being no longer the most important port in the British Caribbean, we must try to make up for that by ensuring that Seawell provides every possible opportunity for persons who either want to travel and are unable to get a ship, or who prefer to travel by air.

Consequently, Sir, I support the Address which expresses the view that since P.A.A. operates services to other Caribbean colonies that company should be invited to operate a service to and from Barbados. It will be for the company to get over the difficulties of adjustment and any other difficulties which might stand in the way; but as far as Barbados is con-

cerned this Address extends an invitation to them to utilise our airport.

When we want to relieve, if only temporarily, our difficulties of over population and unemployment, we do not hesitate to turn to the U.S.A. We look north; we send a telegram; we pass addresses in this Chamber with a view to getting that country to take some of our people and provide them with employment. We must work on a reciprocal basis, and a gesture such as the passing of this Address must cause the Americans to be more kindly disposed towards us, when from the elected Chamber of this colony there comes an Address inviting the greatest American commercial airline to operate here. They must look more favourably upon us when we ask them to help us in solving our unemployment problem, even though it is only a temporary solution.

I am happy to support the passing of this Address which is nothing more than an invitation which, if it is passed, is extended from the elected representatives of the people of Barbados to the American airline to call at Barbados, and to have the facilities at Seawell improved by having not only B.W.I.A. and T.C.A. calling there, but the greatest of them all, P.A.A.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — It should be unnecessary to emphasise the importance of this Address; but knowing as many of us do, the mysterious apathy of Government towards certain avenues of developing the tourist industry in this colony, I am compelled to reiterate the importance of a service like this. I am interested in this almost exclusively from the point of view of the development of the Tourist Industry in this country. Right now that industry is confined to a seasonal phase. With this direct service I am sure that you will have an opportunity of making tourism an all year round business. As I have said, Sir, we anticipate from past things, and from the recent attitude and pronouncements of the statesmen of the Government, we anticipate Government's opposition to this Address. So it is necessary to state clearly and unequivocally the tremendous importance a direct service from America to this country would mean to the development of the tourist industry. It is at times incredible to realise what can be controlling the minds of members of the Government when they oppose a measure like this. Tourism is a major industry in certain island communities. And Barbados is at the stage where it is criminal folly to put any obstacle in the way of the further development of the Tourist Industry. It is the type of industry that employs varied groups in the community. It furthers the interests of capitalists; but it also furthers the interest of the domestic worker, the taxi driver and similar other groups of workers whose livelihood we cannot afford to ignore.

I live in an area where I have got practical experience of what tourism means to this country. We have always known that it meant something of considerable importance; but I did not realise its great importance until I lived in the area where I am now. There is a marked difference noticeable between business in the tourist season and business outside that season. A hotel will employ hundreds of people for three or four months, and give more than half of them what is termed a "holiday" when there are no more tourists. That situation is likely to be considerably changed with the implementation of this Address. The members of this House should make a study of the other island communities where the Tourist Industry is one of the principal industries of the country. Take Jamaica, Trinidad, Bermuda: all of them have direct communication with New York by air.

I do not subscribe to the nonsense about tourism spoiling this country. That is obscene. You cannot spoil people by putting employment in their way. Barbados should not be the private reserve of a few. We should be open to the world. I am sure that people will come to this colony who have not been here before. And they in turn will encourage others to come. A few months after this service begins the people of this country will begin to see the considerable benefit of having a direct air service from New York as far as the development of the tourist industry is concerned. We have every opportunity now of making this industry an all the year round business and not one confined to three or four months of the year.

I could speak with some heat on this question. It is one on which there should be great agitation if Government sets up an opposition to it. Government must understand that year after year the unemployment situation is worsening. Almost all groups of the community are complaining about the lack of employment; and as I have said, tourism is an industry that aids every type of employment. It is one of those fundamental industries which automatically develops other types of industries. Puerto Rico is concentrating on making tourism at least second to sugar. Jamaica is concentrating on the same. So also is Trinidad and little Grenada is doing a good job. I think I am correct in saying that we who have more to offer than those countries I have mentioned are suffering from what I called earlier a mysterious apathy as regards any further development of the Tourist Industry.

You hear people saying that the Tourist Industry will make the cost of living higher. But if the cost of living is made dearer and people are working for more than they are working for today, the increase in the cost of living will be offset by the increase in employment. But I do not accept the theory that a development of the tourist industry will make the cost of living any higher than it is today. Development of things like market gardening will be encouraged.

To deal specifically with this address, sir, I would say that one of the main avenues for the development of tourism is the improvement of facilities of travel. No community can develop the tourist industry to any worth while extent unless there is a means of facilitating travel; and this Address offers Barbados that means. Consequently, Sir, I cannot imagine any member of this House offering the slightest opposition to this Address. Indeed, I personally am prepared, if the honourable mover finds any opposition to it on the part of Government, I am prepared to co-operate with him and get a public demonstration to put the importance of it before the Government. We cannot go on allowing a blind administration to keep back in every way the development of this country. Whatever may be the private, personal opposition controlling the members of the Government we cannot sit down and allow them to obstruct the development of tourism in this country.

Sir, of the few Addresses that have been introduced in this House since the opening of the new session there is none in which I am in more hearty agreement than this one the purpose of which is to have Pan American or some other airways offering direct service from the U.S.A. to this island. I endorse this Address introduced by the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. MAPP: Mr Deputy Speaker.—This Address moved by the honourable senior member for the City was I believe brought here last session and was partially debated. As far as I can remember,

some time after this Address was debated a communique appeared in the local Press to the effect that Pan American Airways had not applied for a licence to operate an air service to this island. Now, Sir, it seems peculiar that this House should want to do for Pan American Airways what Pan American Airways does not want to do for itself. I do not think that the Government would have issued a communique to that effect if it were not a fact. If P.A.A. really were taking a thing like this seriously, and the Government's statement was incorrect, any reasonable person would expect that P.A.A. would have refuted it. No such refutation was made. To ask the House to make an application on behalf of a private company is to my mind going too far. It is making a mockery of this Chamber. It is merely using an honourable Assembly like this as a pawn in the game of P.A.A., asking it to do for them something which they do not seem to be interested in doing for themselves. I think that is asking too much. It is an insult to our intelligence.

A member gets up here and talks a lot of high falutin nonsense about the tourist industry; and all the time what are we doing? We are being nothing but the agents of P.A.A. Ltd. I cannot regard it as anything more than that. They have not applied for a licence to come here; and we must beg them to come. For what? I feel that if the honourable senior member for the City was serious and really felt that Seawell should be an open airport he would have introduced an Address to that effect without discriminating as far as any one company is concerned. This House as a responsible body would have asked the Government that Seawell should be an open airport at which any air service at all could operate between this island and other countries. Not merely Pan American Airways. They did not put us in this House. We are not here to represent them. We are representing the people of Barbados. I would have expected to see an Address asking that Seawell be an open airport. But what do I see? The Address states: ".....In view of the fact that Pan American Airways are operating an air service in the West Indies, that it is in the interest of Barbados that the company be invited to operate direct services etc." Is P.A.A. the only company that operates air services in the West Indies? Are they the only one operating such air services besides T.C.A. and B.W.I.A.? It sounds very suspicious to me. I do not think that this House should be a party to it.

P.A.A. are not interested on the face of it. There is no foundation to the idea that P.A.A. are eager to bring tourists here and the Government do not want it. It is nothing but using this House as the instrument of some private concern. I think it is time to learn to treat this Chamber with more respect. This is the House of Assembly. It is not St. Michael's Vestry. You cannot make this House into an agency for private people and private concerns. It is really too much to ask me to support an Address worded in this way. I hope that the last thing this House will think of doing is passing an Address like this.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am wondering whether or not the honourable senior member for the City would be willing to accept an amendment to his Address. I would like to move as an amendment if he agrees, the deletion of all the words and the substitution of new words. After the formal words "The House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor etc." it would read: "The House of Assembly is of the opinion that in view of the fact that Pan American Airways and the Royal Dutch Airlines known as K.L.M., are operating air

services in the West Indies, it is in the interest of Barbados that these companies be invited to make Barbados a regular port of call in their itinerary, and particularly to ensure that direct communication by air between this island and New York be established.

2. The House would thank Your Excellency to take the necessary steps at an early date to implement the terms of this Address."

There are a few words I would like to add. Some years ago a local company in the early stages of its formation decided to form an airline service for the West Indies. I know that the company was actually registered and some shares sold, amounting to tremendous sums of money. One plantation owner came to grief because it was discovered and he was forced to surrender a lot of his interest in the plantations if he wanted to have a share in this local airline company. It was denied the right to operate in the area.

There are occasions when members of the public have to make trips to the U.K., and they have to pay \$80.00 for a flight by B.W.I.A., to join P.A.A. at another port. We have people who want to go from here to America and they have to pay this additional charge because there is no arrangement under which these companies can come into Barbados. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if we are doing the best thing to invite these two companies. The honourable member may have the foresight by which he can see into the next two decades. I do not have that foresight. But I do feel that there should be some arrangement by which a person leaving here can go direct to New York by air. There is also some reason to believe that competition would force air rates down and cheapen air travel. We all appreciate that air travel is here to stay.

I am asking the honourable senior member for the City to accept my amendment and let us get on with a thing that can be of service to the colony.

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I regret that I did not know that the honourable senior member for the City was prepared to deal with this Address this evening, or I would have been able to bring in the necessary data. I must first of all thank the honourable senior member for St. Thomas who has put the Government's case very well indeed. When the honourable senior member for the City raised this question last session, as I saw it when I was sympathetically inclined towards the Address. But since then I have become convinced that there is some sort of catch. I am not accusing the honourable member of knowing what is behind this. I believe that he has brought forward this Address in good faith. But if you read the communique which the Government published on this question you can see that there is something very fishy about the matter.

Despite the fact that this Address was before the House and was discussed last session, P.A.A., have not up to now shown any willingness to operate a service in Barbados. Seawell, as we all know, can be called an open airport. You will remember that this House objected strongly in 1942 to giving B.W.I.A. a monopoly. What the House did do at the time was to decide that during the emergency—

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understood the honourable member to say that P.A.A., never applied for a licence to operate here. I am wondering if no application was ever made through their agents or anyone authorised by them.

Mr. COX: No application was made by an agent or anyone. The only application is the Address

before the House. As I was saying the House said that during the emergency they would agree that preference be given to B.W.I.A., and say, for less than a year after the emergency. But they were not prepared to give a monopoly to any company. The position since then has remained the same. There is an agreement under which this company or any other company operating a foreign service can apply. As I have said, P.A.A., has not applied. If they had applied I have no doubt that they would have been given permission to operate a service here. That would of course involve reciprocal treatment. As you know, if P.A.A., got permission to move people from Barbados, B.O.A.C., could make a similar request for moving people from, say, Puerto Rico. I do not think it is too much to believe that P.A.A., knows this and that that is the reason why they have not applied.

Again I must say that I agree with the view expressed by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. I cannot see how we could sit here this afternoon or any other time and agree to an Address such as this unless we were satisfied that the company, or an agent for the company had made application for a licence to operate in this country, and had been turned down. We would have to be convinced of that and then the House could express the opinion that they do not agree with Government's opposition and refusal to grant a licence to P.A.A., to operate a service to this island.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the honourable member says "government" he means the Government of the U.K.

Mr. COX: It is understood that this is an international question. But it is still a fact that things such as these must still be referred to the local government. No application has been made and to pass this Address we would be pressing for something for P.A.A. which they do not want. We would be putting them in the position of saying "they did not want to operate any service here. But you have pressed me and I am willing to give you a service." If B.O.A.C. made a request then for reciprocal treatment in Puerto Rico or anywhere else, it might not be justified because we had actually forced P.A.A. to operate here.

I feel that this Address should not be passed. I say it with all sincerity. I do not see how we could sit here and pass this Address when the Government made their position clear in the Press, saying that the company had not applied for a licence, even though the company saw the willingness of the House of Assembly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you will remember that the Government put in their communique previous to the last discussion also. I would like to know at this stage, whether the honourable senior member for the City will accept the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. George.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will, Sir.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Although I appreciate the cogency of the argument adduced by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, and the honourable senior member for St. Michael, I would say that in my view logic is one thing; but practical results and benefits in an island such as this is an entirely different matter. (Cheers). While we are twisting and turning and paying too much attention to procedure, courtesy, etiquette and things of that nature, thousands of people will remain suffering and in want through our not doing not only what is justifiable but what is expedient.

I feel that this Address merely serves as a sounding board to discover the sentiments of the elected

representatives of the people, knowing full well, as the Americans should know, that Barbados is even more English than Great Britain. There are certain people in Barbados that are more English than Englishmen. It is for that very good reason that this Address has been brought forward. Red tape and procedure can go; but the benefits to be derived if such an Address is passed must be borne in mind. An Address of this nature coming from the elected representatives of the people would indicate to the Americans that we are thankful and grateful to them for all that they have done for us, not only in war but in times of peace. I feel that numerous benefits will accrue if this Address is implemented. One thing is that we will have tourists here in season and out of season. If such a service is developed we should be thankful not only to P.A.A. or K.L.M. but to the honourable senior member for the City for bringing forward this Address. I think that the honourable of the House should let the Government know what junior member for St. John has put the case of the Tourist Industry thoroughly, and I hardly need reiterate what he said. We have the accommodation for larger planes to call here and bring in a greater number of passengers. The increase in the number of services will cheapen the rates. I can hardly think of any bad point which can be stated by way of outweighing the numerous good points of the Address.

I could probably speak much longer; but I do not see the necessity. I repeat: This Address serves as a sounding board. It seeks to find out the true sentiments of the House. Procedure may be a good thing in its place; but it should not blind us to the benefits to be derived from inviting an American company to make direct flights between Barbados and New York. It will develop the tourist industry and help relieve our unemployment problem. Hotel and taxi workers and many others will derive a benefit from it.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — The benefits to be derived from the implementation of this Address will not only be from the point of view of facilitating people getting out of the island; but of facilitating people who want to travel from the U.S.A. here. On the other hand the Government has more or less said before now that P.A.A. have not applied for a licence. The position at present is that we are served by B.W.I.A. which is a subsidiary company of B.O.A.C. My information is, and I hope that the honourable senior member for the City will bear it in mind, that the present policy of B.O.A.C. is to ask B.W.I.A. to reduce their costs as much as possible. They have given them three years to strike a balance. Presumably when B.W.I.A. strikes a clear balance it must mean that we will have a monopolistic airline in the area with no competition. I have always been worried by the rates which B.W.I.A. charges, although I have been told that they are no higher than those chargeable under the international air regulations. I have been told that the rates of B.W.I.A. are lower in that respect. What I want to say is this: If B.W.I.A. are working under a subsidy and the rates are so high, and they are asked to strike a clear balance, how are they going to get through? I cannot see how they will reduce their costs even with the possible programme of using aircraft of less fuel consumption etc.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member saying that that is a reason why P.A.A. should come in?

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am saying that that is a very good reason why they should be asked to come in. If B.W.I.A. becomes wholly independent and without competition, what will the travelling public have to pay? That is my greatest worry. I am told that the British Government will not allow them to use Constellation Aircraft. Even with Turbo Jet

Vikings there will be a big charge per mile. We must bear in mind that we must also look at this matter from the point of view of people travelling between the islands. I think we should take a broad view of the problem. This question of rates has always been my worry, and I am convinced that we will have to face the possibility of their being higher. Although these things are governed by the international regulations, I think that we in this small island should make it known that we do want our airport to be an open port so that no one can squeeze us.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — Speaking on the amendment, I would say that this amendment to my mind does not improve the Address at all. The gist of my opposition to this Address as it appeared first was that this House should not be a special agent for any company. If we feel that it is in the interest of Barbados to promote more competition we should have an Address saying that Seawell should be an open airport. But to invite a company that on the face of it is not interested in operating a direct service to this island, since it has not made any application is in my view going too far.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member including K.L.M. in his remarks?

Mr. MAPP: Yes, sir. The same principle applies to K. L. M. to the extent that K. L. M. on the face of it is not willing to apply. No address naming any private company should be entertained by this House. Why set out to plead the cause of a particular company or companies? If we want to say that Seawell should be an open airport let us say so without naming any particular company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member had an opportunity of moving an amendment to the Address. But he did not do so.

Mr. MAPP: Am I not at liberty to make an amendment to this proposed amendment?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member can speak on any amendment that is proposed after he has spoken.

Mr. MAPP: I am speaking on the amendment. I am saying that neither the original Address nor the proposed amended Address should be entertained. The last honourable member who spoke put up a very interesting case. But the case was not strong enough. You may see the possibility of running out B.W.I.A. altogether. If we feel that by promoting competition you will benefit the island, say so. My point of view is that if possible a nationalised B.W.I.A. should be operated by the Federal Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member is going outside the terms of this Address. I will point out also that the honourable member has already argued on the Address from the point of view of P.A.A. If his argument in respect of K.L.M. is the same I do not see that he has any argument for continuing to speak.

Mr. MAPP: An amendment has been proposed to the effect that K.L.M. should also be asked. I am arguing against that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member is using the same arguments in respect of K.L.M. as he used in respect of P.A.A. he is merely repeating his arguments.

Mr. MAPP: I must repeat my arguments; but I will promise not to carry the repetition too far. The honourable junior member for St. George made his amendment after I had spoken the first time. If the idea is to cut costs, I think that from the point of view of the West Indies, and looking at the matter from a long term point of view, the best thing would be to have a nationalised air service. Obviously that would not be possible in the immediate future.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is again going outside the terms of the Address.

Mr. MAPP: I will close now, sir. In view of the fact that Your Honour does not want me to repeat what I said at first I will close with the argument that where K.L.M. is concerned we would be committing the same error if we became a special pleader for K.L.M. That is not the role of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member had an opportunity of introducing an entirely different Address or amending the original one.

Mr. MAPP: I really felt that the question was too involved.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not see why the honourable Senior Member for St. Thomas should be so confused on this matter. It does not seem as if he is interested in any Airways Company operating a direct service here. Sir, I view this matter from the benefits which I believe this island would derive as a result of more planes coming here, and especially if they come from the United States. I have heard it said on many occasions that this island should have a direct air service operating to and from New York owing to the inconvenience caused by having to take a service from here to Trinidad, then to Puerto Rico and then another to the United States. Therefore, if this Address can cause the authorities to realise that we feel we should have this direct service, I see no harm in this address. Some honourable members have expressed the view that the B.W.I. Airways which operate here, have no say in this matter, but any negotiations for the operation of a direct air service here must be done at Cabinet level. I can very well see the reason for this contrary opinion by those honourable members. They have expressed that view because this Address has been brought in by the honourable senior member for the City whom they feel is championing the cause of a private company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is justified in making that statement.

Mr. ALLDER: Yes Sir, the honourable senior member for the City has been accused of championing the cause of the private air company mentioned in the Address, but the accusers have failed to see that this is something which would benefit the island. Even if it is the intention of the honourable senior member for the City to champion the cause of the air service he mentioned in the Address, I still see that what is expressed in this Address is what the people of this island desire. They feel that it would facilitate the tourist trade here and because it would create competition, it would cause the rates to be reduced.

I have a feeling that the British West Indian Airways Company which operates here and which is supposed to be owned by West Indians is not so owned, but is represented by a few West Indian personalities for another big British Company so as to maintain a virtual monopoly in the British West Indies. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think this Address pleads the cause of a particular airline company. The fact is that the company mentioned at first in the Address owns airplanes and is likely to operate a direct air service from New York to this island. If we feel that we should have such a service then this Address will express our wishes and will cause the Government to realise this should be so—I think this Address should have passed this Chamber without any contrary comments because it will benefit the colony if its terms are carried out.

Mr. SMITH: I never expected that this Address would have taken up so much time of this House. Sir, the terms of this Address are as plain as A, B, C; all that it seeks to ask is for the bringing in of another airline to Barbados so as to get a direct link-up with the United States. I understand that by next week this House will be called upon to vote a few more thousand dollars for the upkeep of the Seawell Airport. Must we spend all of that money on this airport for only one company to operate here? I would like to see the Seawell Airport as busy as the airport at Caracas where airplanes of various companies land almost every hour of the day. I believe that every time a plane lands at an airport, landing fees have to be paid. I do think the same thing prevails at the Seawell Airport. Simple mathematics show me that if this island gets six dollars as landing fees for one plane, it will get twelve dollars for two and twenty-four dollars for four. If that is so, why should we sit here and by our actions allow only one airline company to operate here? The honourable senior member for the City has been accused of introducing this Address because he is interested in a particular airline company and not because he is so much interested in the benefits to the people of this colony. I am not so much prejudiced. If I think the St. Michael's Vestry by getting in this House of Assembly could do something to benefit the island as a whole, I would be the first to lift it up and bring it in this Chamber. I think more dollars would find their way in the Public Treasury if we grant this concession. It will also cause a saving to the people who may happen to travel by this direct service owing to the fact that they would save the fare between here and Trinidad. Speaking personally, I would not mind taking a short holiday in the United States accompanied by my wife, but a feeling of anxiety comes to me as I think of the many times that a plane will take off and land with me in it before I reach my destination. I feel that we should be able to travel by a direct air service from here to New York or back. Some honourable members stated that the particular airline company mentioned in the Address was not asked whether it could operate such an air service here neither does that company want to do so. I do not think the honourable senior member for the City would have been so ignorant as to name this company in the Address before he had obtained a hint that it was willing to do so. There was also the argument that this company turned down a proposal to operate here a few years ago. That might be so, but if I be allowed to give an illustration, you might not have seen your way to do a thing yesterday but would be able to do it tomorrow. I think these arguments were only introduced because it appeared as if the honourable senior member for the City is representing a particular agency. It is time that we get away from petty narrowness like this and think in the interest of the community as a whole. I am not thinking of Pan-American Airline Company alone. I will say let any other or all airline companies operate here just as it is done in Caracas. The more that operate here, the more dollars they would bring in. America is responsible for 25 per cent of the economy of this island. If this is so, why should we do something to keep an American Airline company from operating here. I think if this company was not willing to come yesterday, it is willing to come now. Nothing happens before the time. I understand that the honourable senior member for the City has accepted the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. George to include another airline company.

The few honourable members who have spoken in opposition to this Address have not convinced me by their arguments. I see no reason why this Address should not be passed. I feel when the senior member for the City brought in this Address, he brought in money to this colony. Everyone of us would agree that so long as you bring in something from America, you are bringing in some money. I will only say once more before I sit down that if the honourable senior member for the City was only working in the interest of Pan-American Airlines, he would not have accepted the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. George. Let us pass this Address.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move the adjournment of this House for half an hour.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker—whether this Address passes this House or not, I feel that I have discharged my duty by bringing it in. I shall be brief in my reply. As a matter of fact, I did not think that I would have to do so. With respect to the accusation against me that I am an agent for Pan-American Airlines, I am not surprised at the accusation because when the minds of people sink to a cesspool in a gutter, they can only think of mud and mire.

Mrs. BOURNE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. George.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot do so now.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I welcome discussions on any matter which I bring in this Chamber. It will be remembered that I said in my opening remarks that I would appreciate any honourable member making any amendment which he might consider would make the Address more explicit.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that this House be adjourned for half an hour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Andrew broke into the reply of the honourable senior member for the City to second your motion for the adjournment. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew should have done so immediately after you had put the motion. I therefore could not accept it at that time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not understand that the hon. senior member for St. George wanted to contribute to this debate, else I would have sat and awaited his speech before I began to reply. If Sir, unfortunately, in my opening remarks I seem to champion the cause of Pan-American Airways, I would say if you read the Address carefully, you will see that the real crux of it is for the implementation of a direct air service between New York and Barbados. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas in his remarks said that we have an air service of our own already. I will ask the honourable member to think again on this and ask himself whether we really have an air service of our own.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member has misquoted me, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He should try to quote other people correctly. I said that we should have an air service of our own and should be interested in it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I wrote down that part of his speech. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas went further by saying that he travelled by this service to the United States. The honourable senior member for St. Michael said that this matter looks fishy. I would say in reply that if anything looks fishy, it is the fact that the Government from the outset seems to want to prejudice the minds of the people of this colony against this American Air-

line Company operating here. I know that every man in the street will tell you that he wants direct air communication, not between Barbados and England, but between Barbados and New York.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may be allowed to explain, I would say that two things led me up to the bringing in of this Address. You have heard the saying, "He who wears the shoes feels the pinch." One of the reasons is because I personally had occasion to feel the need of direct service to New York. That has motivated me in bringing in this Address.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member replying to anything that has been said?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am replying to the accusation that I am representing the interest of Pan-American Airways and not the interest of the people of Barbados. I am saying that I am not representing the interest of that company inasmuch as that company has not yet asked this Government or higher authorities to operate a direct service between here and New York, but the service is a necessity for the people of Barbados. We should ask somebody to do so, that is the reason why we should insert an airline company in the Address I do not matter whether it be Pan-American and or Columbia Airways.

(A VOICE): If that is so, do not accuse the Government of being prejudiced against Pan-American Airways.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, As a matter of fact, I discussed this question with members of the Government before voicing it on the floor of this House. I pointed out that I knew that it would be a question of an international agreement and will involve B.O.A.C. I did tell them that those things were matters of little interest to me. I know those questions would have to be agreed on at Cabinet level. All I am asking is that you ask those American Airline Companies whether they would operate a direct service between here and New York and guarantee that service will be run on some sort of schedule. I am going to sit down. I am convinced as to the necessity for the Address. I have seen many people suffer as a result of this island not having direct air communication with the United States. I have seen people actually pawning their jewels so that they could get money to go by air to the United States. It would have been much easier if we had a direct air service. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph said that I could not be such a fool to bring in this Address without knowing something about it. Of course I know that Pan-American Airways did not apply, but I also know that some months ago when the honourable senior member for St. George talked of the introduction of jet propelled planes by T.C.A., on reading a Pan American journal, I saw that the Pan American Airways proposed operating these jet propelled planes in 1954 and the article did state that if such a service was put in operation, it could operate an eight-hour service between Barbados and New York. Seeing what this would mean to Barbados and having knowledge of what I personally have suffered as a result of no direct air communication between here and New York, I feel this Address would be serving a good purpose. I again formally move the passing of this Address as amended.

The question that the Address do now pass was then put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mr. BRYAN, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—12.

Noes: Mr. MAPP.—1.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable Senior Member for the City, the Senior Member for St. Lucy and the Junior Member for St. George to present this Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. BRANCKER: As your Honour pleases.

Mr. MILLER: As Your Honour pleases.

BILL AUTHORISING HIGHWAYS COMMISSIONERS OF ST. GEORGE AND ST. THOMAS TO INCREASE SALARY OF THEIR HIGHWAY INSPECTOR

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave that Item No. 10 standing in my name under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking for leave to deal with Item No. 10: Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of St. George and St. Thomas to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways of each of the said parishes and to increase the amount payable to the said Inspectors for travelling allowance.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to authorise the respective Commissioners of Highways of the parishes of St. George and St. Thomas to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways of each of the said parishes and to increase the amount payable to the said Inspectors in respect of travelling required for the due performance of their duties.

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

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I am not in agreement with the petitions of these Highways Commissioners with respect to their getting the necessary authority to increase the salaries of their respective Highways Inspectors.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member saying that something is wrong with the petitions?

Mr. MILLER: I am not in agreement with the Bill and for several reasons. I made my point of view clear in this House almost three years ago when this same Bill was discussed. If I may repeat, during the last election period, I was asked whether I would be willing to put forward this Bill in the House for the Highway Commissioners and I objected. My reason for objecting then still prevails. I told the Vestry of St. George that before I put forward this Bill in the House, I want to be sure that they gave similar consideration to their casual workers. I was told that these workers were paid similar rates as those which were paid by Highway Commissioners for other parishes. I have been made to understand that the chief reason for seeking to increase the salary of the Inspector of St. George is to make it possible for this old gentleman to receive a good pension. If this Vestry is willing to assure this House that they will pay a normal increase to their subordinate staff and other casual workers, then I would be prepared to put forward this Bill in this House for them. I object to the singling out of a particular individual for increase of salary. I have no prejudicial feeling against the officer concerned, but I do not see any reason why any individual should be singled out of a number of Vestry employees for increase of pay. What also hurts me more is that

my colleague objected on the same grounds and is now bringing forward it.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never spoken on this matter before the House. I never knew of the grounds for objection to this Bill by my colleague until he expressed them here.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, my colleague was with me at the office of the Churchwarden of St. George when I objected to the bringing forward of this Bill in the House and after I voiced my objection, he too objected on the same grounds. I would not have said this so plainly had not my colleague risen and said what he did. I see no earthly reason why my colleague should have taken exception to my statement. It was a time when the Heads of those Departments were going around trying to obtain votes and my colleague was also going around in his usual acrobatic way.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like you to call the honourable member to order. I do not think he should attack the character of a person. He made some pungent remarks when he said that the Heads of Departments were paying voters and I was going around in an acrobatic way.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, The honourable member and I were sure that the Heads of the departments of this Vestry were going to be increased but we were not sure that the chaps at the foot would be so increased.

Mr. BARROW: Your Honour, before the honourable member proceeds further, I would like you to make him withdraw the aspersion on my character.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The matter of withdrawal is a matter for the House, but I think myself. . . .

Mr. MILLER: Sir, If the honourable member takes exception to something which I said, but which I do not think is insinuating against his character, I however withdraw the statement a hundred times. If I may continue my remarks on the Bill, all that I was asking the St. George Vestry was that if they considered an increase for the Heads of Departments, an increase should also be given to the subordinate staff and casual workers. I know that was not asking too much. For the four and a half years I have been a member of this House, this Bill was before the House. Since the new elections, this Bill has been in the hands of more than one honourable member and because of the circumstances, it has always suffered postponement.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the House adjourned, the honourable Junior Member for St. George had completed his speech on the Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of St. George and St. Thomas to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways of each of the said parishes and to increase the amount payable to the said Inspectors for travelling allowance. The honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas moved a short adjournment which was seconded by the honourable Senior Member for St. John. If these honourable members wish to add to the debate, they are at liberty to do so now.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have no intention of speaking on the matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I would like to make in this matter is that the introducer of this Bill seems to be under the impression, which is a false one, that because the Vestries petition the Legislature for these things that it is not to be of any particular concern to honourable members of this House whether or not they agree to these matters, they should be passed; but old legislators saw fit that all these things by Vestries should have legislative sanction and for the precise reason that the Legislature should be well aware of the actions of the Vestries and would be able to say whether those things are reasonable. When it comes to the question of salaries, this is one of the things which is very important, because some Vestries would pay unreasonable amounts to their officers.

Looking into this matter, I am not interested in the persons concerned, but with regard to their salaries, you are now paying them £500 per annum as basic salary and £100 for travelling allowance. If you compare these road inspectors who are not as well qualified to do their jobs as some officers in the Public Service, you will see that you pay Senior Officers in the Department of Highways and Transport \$2,160 per annum as their maximum salary as against the \$2,400 which these officers are to receive by this Bill. When it comes to doing their job, these Road Inspectors have to go and get assistance from the officers of the Department of Highways and Transport to carry out certain road constructions. What I do not like about the matter is that you are seeking to increase these Road Inspectors without taking into account their ability or qualifications for the performance of their tasks. There are with the exception of St. Michael, St. Lucy and St. Andrew the other eight parishes with their Highways Commissioners, each parish having its own Road Inspector. These Road Inspectors are not more than ordinary officers; they are not engineers; some had been overseers at plantations before taking up their appointments. When you look at the period of time they work, you will see that some of these Highways Commissioners and Road Inspectors do no work at all during the crop season; they only attend to road construction and repairs after the crop season, that is from around the middle of June to December. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph is a Health Commissioner for St. Joseph and he can bear me out in this statement.

Sir, this matter is a concern of the Legislature because it affects public revenue, not from taxation by the Central Government it is true, but by parochial taxation which ratepayers who live in the various parishes are called upon to pay. However, do not blind yourself to the fact that some of these Highways Commissioners do not always go into these matters carefully and as a result, sometimes, they have to seek further assistance through their respective Vestries from the Central Government in order to raise funds for the carrying out of the work they have to do. If you look through the Colonial Estimates from time to time, you will see a gradual increase given by the Central Government to these Vestries for the upkeep of roads. Moreover, as a result of these Bills coming before the House, when the Maude Bill is put into effect, it will impose certain commitments on the Central Government. I am not going to vote for this Bill today because I do not believe in the timing of it. I will not support it because when you pass this to enable certain parishes to pay their Road Inspector £500 per annum, it would seem as if you meant to say that every Road Inspector is entitled to that salary.

Mr. SMITH: After hearing the argument of the honourable members who spoke against this Bill,

it leads me to believe that these honourable members think that the cost of living does not affect these Road Inspectors. Sir, these Road Inspectors have to carry themselves decently clad, at all times; they have to pay for the upkeep of a motor car; and in most cases, they have children to educate. The honourable junior member for St. George raised objection on the grounds that other people in the lower brackets of the employ of the respective Vestries have not been increased. I do not think that could be a fact because workers of today are not so ignorant when they hear that the wages of workers in the adjoining parishes are increased to sit idly and do nothing about it. I therefore cannot believe the statement of the honourable junior member for St. George that the wages of the parochial workers of that parish have not increased for five years. I will also say that the Highways Commissioners' hands are tied in so far as granting an increase to their respective Road Inspectors. They cannot do so unless they come to this House and seek the necessary authority. They are some people who like the dog passing over the bridge with a bone in his mouth would drop his bone to catch at the reflection in the water beneath and in so doing lose his bone. How on earth can you get proper work done when you underpay the head workman or give the others under his charge an increase and do not give him any? He could not give of his best under those conditions. The honourable junior member for St. Peter made comparison of these parochial Road Inspectors with people doing similar work in the employ of Department of Highways and Transport. He is comparing these parochial Road Inspectors with the Overseers of that Department who are the officers at the end in that Department. I do not agree with that comparison; there are two different types of employees.

The question you must ask yourself is this: Are these increases given merely because these Highways Commissioners want to make an increase or because they find it necessary so to do owing to the increase in the cost of living? I must point out that these road inspectors in the country parishes do not have the money to spend on roads as what the Central Government gives to spend on their road construction. Added to that, the parochial road inspectors very often have to be an overseer, driver, clerk, and everything else at the same time.

Sir, you should give these Vestries the necessary authority to increase the salaries of their respective Road Inspectors. The honourable junior member for St. George said that if the Highway Commissioners of St. George would assure him that they would increase the wages of their casual workers, he would seek to get this Bill pass. Does the junior member for St. George want honourable members to leave their homes and business and go to the Commissioners of Highways for St. George to see whether they have increased the wages of their workers? I believe those workers had an increase since 1948; it might not be a handsome one. These Highway Inspectors can only get an increase when we pass this Bill. Recently this Government had to increase the salaries of its Civil Servants. Since the petition for this authority was before the House and the taxpayers of the respective parishes were opposed to the Bill, they would have voiced their objections in the various newspapers, and would have told the honourable junior member for St. George.

Sir, the money which pays these Road Inspectors is derived from the ratepayers of the respective parishes. The money which the Government grants to the various parishes is for the construction and repair of roads. I feel the Government should have

taken over these roads long ago. I believe if the Highways Commissioners did not want this power and to have a say in the road repairs of their respective parishes, they would have handed over them to the Government already. I do not think this House has a right to tell a Vestry how it should pay its employees unless the salaries or wages are out of proportion to those paid for similar work done elsewhere. When this House does that, it is the same as your telling me how to spend my money. I do not think any honourable member has any right to object to this Bill. Must we sit here tonight and starve some poor fellow who is trying to earn a living for himself and his children? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the arguments against this Bill are too mean. We, in the majority, are Labourites and one of our principles is to fight for better wages and living conditions for workers. Now as it comes to the paying of an increase in salary to an individual, some honourable members who are Labourites are saying that you must not pay the increase. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. BARROW: I will just reply to one or two points. The first that I will reply to is one by my colleague when he expressed the view that I had agreed with him not to bring forward this Bill in the House because it was undesirable to increase the salaries of the Highways Inspectors of St. George and St. Thomas, most particularly, that of the Inspector of St. George. I would just like to say that I never agreed with my colleague to do so either in the presence of the Parochial Treasurer of St. George, in the presence of anybody else or between us. The next thing I would like to clear up is that as a representative of a parish, where a petition is respectfully worded, I think it is the constitutional duty of a representative to present the petition of the local authority to this Assembly whether the representative agrees with it or not. In this case, why should not this House pass this Bill which merely is to enable the Vestry and the Commissioners of Highways of the respective parishes of St. Thomas and St. George to spend their own money to increase the salary of one of their employees owing to the increase in the cost of living and to increase the travelling allowance in view of the increase mileage of roads which those inspectors have to supervise. The Commissioners of the parishes of St. James, St. John, and St. Joseph have already been granted authority by this House to do a similar thing. On the occasion when those three parishes petitioned the House I did not hear this bitter opposition from my colleague and the honourable junior member for St. Peter who spoke so blatantly on the motion. This petition for the granting of similar authority to those three Vestries mentioned, was prevented by the honourable junior member for Christ Church and having a distinct recollection of the debate on that Bill, the only remark which I heard came from the honourable junior member for St. Peter when he said something to the effect that until the Maude Bill was decided by this Chamber, Government was not going to entertain the idea of granting these petitions by the Vestries. At that time, I considered those remarks a form of political blackmail. I cannot see what the passing of the Maude Bill has to do with the payment of salaries by Vestries in view of the increased cost of living. I do not think we should be so childish as to say that until the Maude Bill becomes law that we should pay remunerative salaries to parochial workers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no personal interest in this matter and if I did, I would disclose it to the House. I am merely performing what I consider is my constitutional duty. I consider it a form of political blackmail if we say we must wait until the

salaries of all the subordinates of these Vestries be increased before we grant this increase in salary and travelling allowance to these Highway Inspectors. I can tell this House that one of these Highway Inspectors has approached me showing cause for this increase and why he thinks his present salary inadequate. I believe all workers believe that their remuneration is inadequate. I do not know if this Inspector approached my colleague also. I feel these increases are justified.

Mr. MILLER: I rise at a point of the word "blackmail" as was spoken by my colleague. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not asking for the withdrawal of the remarks but indeed, it is not the best thing for him to use such remarks.

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

On the motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. TALMA, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. BARROW seconded by Mr. TALMA the Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It read as follows:—

"2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Highways Act, 1900 and amended by the Highways (Amendment) Act, 1947 and The Highways (Amendment) Act, 1951 or any other Act amending the same it shall be lawful for the respective Commissioners of Highways of the respective Parishes of Saint George and Saint Thomas and they are hereby authorised to pay to the Inspector of Highways for each of the said Parishes such salary not exceeding Five Hundred Pounds per annum as shall from time to time be fixed by the respective Commissioners of Highways of the said Parishes and it shall also be lawful for the said respective Commissioners and they are hereby further authorised to pay to the said Inspectors in respect of travelling required for the due performance of their duties such sum not exceeding One hundred Pounds per annum as shall from time to time be fixed by the said respective Commissioners."

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am drawing attention to the fact that the salary as well as the travelling allowance are printed in sterling in this Bill when it is customary nowadays to deal in dollars. I am wondering whether the honourable Senior Member for St. George would accept the amendment that instead of the words "Five Hundred Pounds" in line 9 of the Bill that the words "Two thousand four hundred Dollars" be substituted therefor and instead of the words "One hundred Pounds" in the penultimate line that the words "Four hundred and eighty Dollars" be substituted therefor.

Mr. BARROW: I am glad to accept that amendment especially in view of the fact that a similar Bill which dealt with the parishes of St. James, St. Joseph and St. John had these amounts converted into dollars.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

The Preamble was read and agreed to.

On motions of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. Talma, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF LEAVE FOR MR. ADAMS

Mr. CUMMINS : I am asking leave for the extension of leave for the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph for one month as from next Tuesday, the 23rd instant.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS : I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day fortnight, Tuesday, 30th June, 1953, at 3 p.m.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.