

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th July, 1954.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met to-day at 3 p.m.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, and Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meetings of the 18th May, 1st June, and 8th June, 1954, having been printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR OF SUGAR INDUSTRY BANK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House, that I have received a letter on behalf of Mr. P. D. McDermott, informing this House of his determination to stand for re-appointment as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Mr. P. D. McDermott, be re-appointed Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay the following:—

Message No. 20/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly

regarding the accommodation and training at Erdiston College of teachers from the Leeward and Windward Islands.

Report of the Barbados Fire Brigade for the year 1953.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1954.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am commanded to lay the following:—

Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Market for the year 1952-1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:—

• Resolution to adjust the salary scales of Teachers in First and Second Grade Grant-Aided Schools with respect to the second Efficiency Bar.

• Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1954.

• Resolution to place the sum of \$2,718 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954-55 No. 12 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Also, I beg to give notice, of my intention, to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the resolution of which notice has just been given.

• Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to give notice of the following:— Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Labour Welfare) (Special Levy) Act, 1953.

• Hon. C. E. TALMA: Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952.

• Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to give notice of the following:— Bill to provide for the establishment of Wages Councils.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Labour Welfare) (Special Levy) Act, 1953, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952 was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to provide for the establishment of Wages Council was read a first time.

AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS — To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled an Act to make better provision for Local Government in the Island.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— This Order deals with the amendments of the Other Place to the Local Government Bill. These amendments have been in the hands of members for over a week, and everyone should be familiar with them. Members have had a fairly reasonable time in which to study these amendments. I will state that the Government proposes to accept these amendments. I want to make it abundantly clear to all concerned, that Government only proposes to accept these amendments in order to get this Bill on the Statute Book as early as possible, so as to get it started. Government however proposes at the first convenient time after the Local Government system gets into operation, that amendments which they consider important and material will be presented to the Legislature in the original form,—that is in the form in which the Bill was passed by this House. We want to make that abundantly clear because we know that people in all walks of life are anxious to have the Bill in operation, and we do not want to hold it up any longer.

Now Sir, there are in all I think, 55 amendments. Of that number only about three or four transcend the principle of the original Bill. The others are verbal, and sometimes are for the purposes of punctuations and things of that sort. As I go along I will mention the three or four which the Government considers material. Inasmuch as Government proposes to accept these amendments therefore there will be no point in arguing them and the Government proposes to take these amendments to-day *en bloc*.

Now the first amendment which I shall draw the attention of hon. members to, is the one dealing with the Mayor of Bridgetown, which the Other Place has amended to read Lord Mayor. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not in his seat because he raised this point about the use of the term Lord Mayor. The hon. member said that it seemed to him that in making this amendment, the Other Place was trying to poke fun at this House.

That is not so. Some time ago, in reading Schomburghk's History. I learned that ever since 1824 the question of Bridgetown being a municipality with a mayor was debated. It was debated in this House on one occasion. At the following meeting the House of that day did not accept it.

In more recent years, those of us who know Mr. Archer McKenzie will remember that on more than one occasion he raised the question of Bridgetown being a municipality. He raised that point at the Vestry hustings and I believed at public meetings. He kept that thought burning for years, and then at the Vestry,—I happened to be a member of the Vestry of St. Michael,—I know there was much talk about it. But we never got beyond the stage of talk except in 1824, when it came before this House, and the House decided not to make Bridgetown a municipality.

Reading from a file which I have here, I see, that there are three ways in which a City may be created. One is by Letters Patent; the second, by being made the seat of a Bishop, and the third, by general or special legislation. Bridgetown falls into the category of a City created by being made a seat of the Bishop.

The History of that, according to information from the Colonial Office, reads like this:—

The fact is that the Letters Patent of 1842 which created the Diocese of Barbados also created Bridgetown a city. The following is an extract from them:—

And whereas the Parochial Church of St. Michael in Bridgetown within the said island of Barbados hath been therefore used as and for the Cathedral Church of the said Bishop of Barbados and the Leeward Islands and it is our intention to confirm and ordain the same to be a Cathedral Church and Bishop's See.

Now know all ye that in pursuance of our intentions aforesaid and of the powers given by the said Act and of all other powers in us vested, we do by these presents revoke the Letters Patent aforesaid bearing date respectively the 24th day of July, 1824, the 2nd day of April, 1825, the 11th day of May, 1826 and the 24th day of September in the second year of Our Reign under which the existing Diocese of Barbados and the Leeward Islands and the several Archdeaconries in the said recited Letters Patent mentioned were constituted, save and except as to all matters and things done or any proceedings at law commenced under the authority of the said Letters Patent or any of them. And it is our further will and pleasure and we do by these presents confirm, declare and for further assurance constitute and erect the said Church of St. Michael to be a Cathedral Church and Bishop's See and do ordain that the whole town of Bridgetown aforesaid shall henceforth be a City and be called the City of Bridgetown — and do make, ordain, establish and constitute the said City and all the Island of Barbados, and the islands of Trinidad, Grenada, St. Vincent, Tobago and St. Lucia with their respective dependencies to be a separate and distinct Diocese to be called henceforth the Diocese of Barbados, and do ordain and declare that the said Cathedral Church of St. Michael shall be the Cathedral Church and Episcopal See, and that the said Diocese of Barbados shall be the Diocese of the Bishop of Barbados by these Our Letters Patent nominated and appointed and of his successors."

It goes on to say, that "we are advised, that where the title of City has been conferred by Letters Patent the Chief Magistrate is entitled to the title of Lord Mayor. No authority can be found for creating the office of Lord Mayor by Letters Patent; local legislation is the usual and proper course etc."

So, Sir, as I said, in private conversation, the hon. senior member for the City stated, that this amendment originated in other countries, and that it was an attempt to poke fun at this House. But as you will see Sir, there is history behind it. Ever since 1842 Bridgetown was entitled to the honour of having a Lord Mayor; but not being a municipality until now, that honour was never made use of. So much for that amendment.

After that, there are several amendments. It was passed by this House, that the number of the Aldermen from the City Council should be nine, and the Other Place has reduced that number to six. Also, the term of the Counsellors, has been reduced to four years. In section 10 (2) the House said that the Counsellors should be six but the Other Place has reduced the number for each ward to four. I take it, all honourable members have read these amendments and are quite familiar with them. In Clause 20 as passed by this House we made provision that the Alder-

the number to six which would reduce the number of persons who sit from 27 to 24. I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Social Services thought that the reduction from 27 to 24 would mean say, in respect of various members who would have to be elected as a Committee for running the entire parishes, would have to be taken from Aldermen and Councillors together.

There is one point which I want to make. I think I am quoting an eminent Socialist, Mr. Springer who said, that if you disagree with the Other Place, you must realise that the Other Place is a part of the Legislature of this Colony, and therefore you have to be tolerant enough to know when to compromise. If you take Clause 26 you will see a serious error. I am referring to Clause 26, because it refers back to Clause 29. Anyone who is living in an electoral area which would obviously be in the area of the Corporation or Council for three months can vote. That is clear. Let us look at Clause 29 as amended.

Part III paragraph 29 reads as follows:—

"A person shall, unless disqualified by virtue of this Act or any other enactment, be qualified to be elected to and to be a member of a Council if he is of full age and a British subject and—

- (a) he is a local government elector for the area of the Council; or
- (b) he owns freehold or leasehold land within the area of the Council; or
- (c) he has during the whole of the twelve months preceding the day of election resided in the area of the Council.

This clause is amended by the deletion of all the words after "member of Council if" and substituting therefor the following:—

- (a) he is of full age and a British subject, and
- (b) during, and in respect of, the financial year ending on the thirty-first day of March preceding the election, he has paid an amount of not less than fifteen dollars to such Council in respect of rates made and levied under Part VI of this Act and to be borne and paid by him or in respect of trade tax charged and levied on his income under Part VI of this Act, or in respect of both such rates and such trade tax.

Does this mean "either" or "both"? I hope the Hon. Minister has read this section carefully. I want to be very clear on this matter. I think the two legal luminaries in this House at present can tell you something on this. I think it should read "or in respect of either", if not you will get a registration officer interpreting it to mean that you must pay on the ownership as well as Trade Tax.

The section goes on to say (1) he is a local government elector for the area of the Council; or

- (2) he owns freehold or leasehold land within the area of the Council; or
- (3) he has during the whole of the twelve months preceding the day of election resided in the area of the Council."

In other words, this means if you pay taxes at all, you must be a person living in the electoral area and be registered in it. I think this whole section is drafted wrong. I am submitting to the Hon. Minister that the way this section is worded you need not live in a particular electoral area or be registered in it; a person needs not to be a British subject. When this section is read together with section 26 it is absolute nonsense. We should enact legislation for the common ordinary man to understand and not only for legal luminaries to understand. To my mind this whole section is wrongly worded and I hope the Hon. Minister has followed me in my argument. As I understand this section, a person can live in

St. Andrew or Christ Church and can stand for election without satisfying the registration officer that he has the qualifications. That destroys section 26. I am sure the Hon. Minister would have to take this amendment up with a view to putting it right.

With respect to the last amendment raised by the honourable introducer about the question of \$50.00 deposit, I do not think \$50.00 is too much, or will create a burden. You must give credit where credit is due. It is true to say that the Other Place doubled the amount to make it fifty dollars, but it also amended the Bill to say that if the person got one-twelfth of the votes that was enough to save him from losing his deposit. It is not fair to say that members of the Other Place have doubled the amount, without drawing to the public's attention that they have also reduced the number of votes that a person standing for election must get, in order not to lose his deposit. If you offer criticisms, you must also offer praise where praise is due.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of small amendments which I agree with the Hon. Minister for Social Services, are not important. The most important ones are the ones with which he dealt, and on which I have replied in a way. I am now asking for Your Honour's guidance as to whether or not I am in order to move that we go into Committee on the amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before us is, that the amendments be now read a first time, so the honourable member has been really making a first reading speech.

MR. E. D. MOTTLEY: I shall await the second reading, and until I have heard other honourable members. I finally say, that I hope honourable members will express themselves against this idea of Lord Mayor. I know that the Hon. Leader of the House is always willing to see when there is an error. I am sure that the Hon. Minister for Agriculture is bound to draw to his attention that the reading of Clause 29 is wrong, and that it takes a very slight amendment to put it right. As I was saying Sir, I hope that the Hon. Leader will see my point.

The question that the amendments be now read a first time was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I move that the amendments be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I do not wish at this stage to induce honourable members to engage themselves in a very prolonged debate; but in so far as Clause 29 is concerned,—I am not concerned with whether or not the title of Mayor or Lord Mayor is used. I am concerned with seeing a Mayor and Corporation instituted. To continue Sir, in so far as Clause 29 is concerned, I think that although the legal terminology may appear confusing, in this particular case it is very clear what is actually intended.

We are dealing here with qualifications of members. In order to be a member of a Council there are three distinct requirements, A, B and C. The two points set out in A and B are compulsory, and then the points set out in C are optional of the three points. I will make myself clear in the first place. To be a member of the Council the first requirement is one which is compulsory, and that is that you must be a British Subject. The second one is rates to the extent of \$15 per annum. The third also compulsory, and that is that you must pay your requirement is optional of the three requirements. There are three requirements and it must be one of the three. The third is that you must be a local Government elector of the area of the Council or own freehold or leasehold land within the area of the Council, or that during the whole of the three months

preceding an election you must have been residing in the area of the Council. That is as clear as a pike-staff to me. It is far from being confusing or conflicting.

It does not necessarily call for a trained legal mind to appreciate what the qualification is or is not. It is a simple matter. The first requirement is, that you must be a British subject. The second is that you must pay rates to the extent of \$15.00; and the third is optional of the three which are set out plainly. The first is that you must be a Local Government elector. The second is that if you fail to live in the area you must own freehold or leasehold land within the area, or failing that you must have resided in the area for the three months preceding an election.

In the final analysis there are three requirements set out with which a prospective candidate for election to a Council must necessarily comply. Although in truth and in fact this does not go the full way, and although it may not be carrying out the intentions of the majority of members of this Chamber, it can still be regarded as the first in a series of steps to revolutionise our system of Local Government. Perhaps it can be regarded as a safeguard, because you should not in some cases, go from one extreme to the other. It may be argued by honourable members on the other side of the House,—and perhaps rightly so, that you should not go from one extreme to the other, but if you strike a middle course and advance by a gradual process, it may be best for the benefit of the entire island.

We may feel that this amendment goes to the crux of the whole problem, because it amends what was formerly passed by this House. According to the Bill as passed by this House all the qualifications needed to become a member of a Council, was that you should be a British subject and have attained 21 years of age. The question as to whether you are a man of straw, or a man with vested interests, or whether you have paid taxes or not, did not arise. But with the present constitution we have no alternative; and as the Hon. Leader of the House has clearly said, we have no alternative and we will have to accept these amendments. I think we are doing very wisely.

Mr. Speaker,—This amendment is as clear as a pikestaff. I hope that the honourable senior member for the City is now satisfied that no error has been made in the craftsmanship, and the intention of the Other Place is clearly set out.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—Among all these amendments, as the Hon. Minister for Social Services has rightly said, there are just three or four important amendments. I do not agree with him that they cut across the principle of the Bill, because the Bill has been returned to us in much the same way as we passed it. I do not think that the amendments are very important, with the exception of the amendment which seeks to change the title of 'Mayor' to 'Lord Mayor'. I will deal with that later.

A change has been made in the qualification for membership of a Council. Instead of the qualifications being merely that of a person being of British nationality and of the age of 21, and that he must pay a deposit of \$25.00, the candidate must be a person paying at least \$15.00 in taxation. Bearing in mind the conditions obtaining today, I do not think that such is too much to ask of anyone who wishes to run as a candidate for Local Government elections either in the City or in the Country districts. The Hon. Minister for Social Services also seems to find objection to companies being given the right to nominate someone to vote for

them. As the hon. senior member for the City rightly said, such only gives a person nominated by the Company the right to vote in one place alone. A man may live in St. Joseph but he might have interest in the City. If he is nominated by a company to vote for the company, and he votes in the City, he will have to forego his right to vote in St. Joseph.

I think that companies ever since the first World War have come to be recognized in law as being just as important as persons. If they do business and pay large taxes, they should have some right to express their opinions through the person whom they nominate.

As far as the Lord Mayor amendment is concerned, I do not think there is any city outside of the United Kingdom which can boast of having a Lord Mayor. If Barbados agrees to having a Lord Mayor they will therefore be the only place outside of the United Kingdom to have one. I must agree with the hon. senior member for the City that this will make us the laughing stock of the Caribbean area and even further a-field. If anyone makes a motion to delete the Lord Mayor amendment I will vote in favour of that motion. We are Barbadians, and we will not be proud if we have people here or abroad poking fun at us and saying that in this country which has just a handful of people in the City we have decided to have a Lord Mayor of the City. I think such is ridiculous.

The City when it is set up will not have jurisdiction over the Police Force, Education, Poor Relief or Roads. We will be left with Street Lighting, and Sanitation. Even the responsibility for repairs of the churches will be taken away. Must we have a Lord Mayor to do what we will be left with? I think such is the height of absurdity. If the City of Bridgetown is given the right to appoint anybody as Lord Mayor, that would suppose to be from the Church's point of view. In the West Indies today we are by ourselves, and we are today to call our Mayor, Lord Mayor! I think it is ridiculous and I do not agree with this amendment whether it comes from this House or from the Other Place.

The other amendment is the reduction of Aldermen from nine to six. That only brings into a line with the City, the other districts which are being set up. I cannot agree with the Minister of Social Services that we will have an opportunity of amending that. We will have to amend it now. It is only on the first occasion that a Governor-in-Executive Committee will appoint the Aldermen. When the Executive have appointed the first Aldermen, the Executive is finished. On the next occasion the Councillors will have the opportunity of appointing their own Aldermen. Those are the main points in these amendments. The other things are only dotting the i's and crossing the t's; but if anybody moves an amendment for the deletion of Lord Mayor, I will vote for it. This amendment is most ridiculous to the eyes of the outside world.

Mr. LEWIS: I am rising on a point of order. I would like to know if any honourable member can move the deletion of any amendment now, or wait until after the second reading to make a motion for going into Committee. I would like to know if an hon. member can do that or wait until it goes to the Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the second reading and any motion for the deletion of any amendment destroys the entire amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: The only way that we can delete an amendment is when we go in a Committee then?

man should be elected at the first meeting of the District Council. That was amended by the Other Place. They said that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should appoint the first six men as District Counsellors. I think that this is a principle which sooner or later we shall have to challenge. We ourselves were determined on the principle of the election by the people, but the Other Place says appointments by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. There is also an amendment in Clause 26 (a). It is an amendment which in my opinion, from the point of view of the Other Place, we shall have to deal with at the first opportunity. This amendment goes back to the old system, a system which we sought to get rid of; a system of making provision for the Director of a Company to be eligible for election to these Councils. It goes back to big business being represented in preference to the people. We thought it would be a question of people being represented, but the Other Place feels that business should be represented. I take a serious challenge to that. We would have to tackle it at the earliest opportunity. The whole of 26 (a) deals with the right of a managing director to be eligible for election to the Council. Clause 29 deals with the qualification for office. We thought such a proper heading; but the Other Place has deleted it. Certain qualifications were set out there, that the candidate should be a local Government elector for the area of the Council or if he holds freehold, or leasehold land, within the area of the Council, or if during and in respect of the financial year ending on the first day of March, preceding the election, he has paid an amount of not less than \$15 to such Council in respect of rates, made and levied under part six of the Act.

That was not included in the Bill which was passed by this House. Then follow other amendments most of which are verbal, including the word "Lord" before "Mayor" and some punctuations and things of that sort. I do not think these are anything serious. The one amendment which I consider of some importance is in the third schedule, paragraph 4. It is to be found on page 6 of the copy with the amendments. This amendment deals with the deposit which a candidate would be required to make. It deletes \$25.00 and substitutes \$50.00. It is quite obvious that the House did not want money to debar a person who had other qualifications from exercising his right to stand for elections in his constituency, and the House passed the Bill requiring the person to deposit the sum of \$25.00. The Other Place, for reasons better known to themselves, have doubled that sum by deleting the word \$25.00 and making it \$50.00, so that in the first election to the Council instead of a candidate having to put up \$25.00 as this House required when it passed the Bill, the candidate will have to produce \$50.00.

"A VOICE:" Did the Other Place double the number of votes?

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Yes. They doubled the number of votes which a candidate must get in order to save his deposit.

These are the main amendments. In some cases they cut across the principle as passed by this House; but in order to save time and in order to get this Bill passed, this Government is willing to accept these amendments. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion. In doing so I should also like to emphasise, as the Hon. Minister of Social Services has said, that this is only a sort of make shift for the time being; but it is Government's intention as soon as the opportunity avails itself to come back to this House with the amendments to this Bill as were originally passed by this House. We regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the vital

principles in this Bill have been more or less attacked, and that the Bill does not carry the strength as it did when it was originally passed by this House. The question of plurality of voting is one which we all deplore. As you know, adult suffrage allows one to vote in the parish where one lives, irrespective of how many properties one might have in other parts of the island. Such peoples cannot vote in another parish. The same principle applies to this particular Bill. For reasons better known to the Other Place that principle has been abrogated.

I merely got up to emphasise, lest it be thought that the Hon. Minister of Social Services was more or less singing a solo, that Government has made it crystal clear, that it is prepared in the first place to accept the amendments in order to get something on the Statute Book; and as soon as we can, we will be coming back to this House with the amendments as were originally passed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I cannot agree with all that has been said, by the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the hon. seconder of the motion, because in reading through the amendments to this Bill, no one can say, unless he is definitely prejudiced, that the amendments destroy or hit at any core of this Bill. This Bill remains substantially as it was before. It gives the right to all of her Majesty's subjects the right to vote, after they have reached the age of 21. If these amendments had taken that particular right away, one could appreciate the arguments used by the Hon. Minister of Communications and the Hon. Minister of Social Services. We must agree that the Other Place forms part of the Legislature of this Colony. It exists, and rightly so too, as part of the Legislature of this Colony. It is not at all times that I agree with some of the amendments which that Body makes; but when you are departing on some new venture, as this Bill seeks to provide, it is always well to have some of the elder statesmen making their contribution, especially when one realises the haste with which some of these Bills are passed in this Chamber. It is well that the Other Place, in calmer atmosphere and without any political wrangling, is given the opportunity to assist to make its contribution to legislation which has been passed by this Chamber. I do not think that we of this elected Chamber should be so politically egoistic as to say that members of the Other Place have no right to make any amendments to this or to any other Bill.

However, there are one or two amendments with which I am in disagreement, and which I want a further explanation by the Hon. Leader of this House. I am fully confident, that if he has the explanation or is in possession of any of the arguments made in putting forward these amendments, he would give such to this House. I may say here now, that I appreciate the fact that the Hon. Leader of this House willingly acceded to the wishes of the Opposition, by not dealing with this Bill last Tuesday, and allowing it to remain over until to-day. I hope that this spirit will always continue in this House. The interim period afforded members of the Opposition the opportunity of satisfying themselves and the people they represent, of certain facts in connection with this Bill.

The first amendment with which I shall deal is that relative to the insertion of the word "Lord" before "Mayor". At first, I did feel that this amendment was put in with the idea of making fun at members of this Chamber, if not the public in general.

I am making this strong appeal to this hon. Chamber. After discussing with the Hon. Minister of Social Services, this amendment, he gave me his reasons. I also discussed it with experienced ex-parliamentarians and with some people who do research, and I have found out that the reasons given

me for the change in title by the Hon. Minister are correct. The reasons are concerned with letters patent. This island having had a Cathedral has been proclaimed as a city. But I would say that all things which are lawful, are not expedient. There is absolutely nothing, which says that because you are having a corporation in the City of Bridgetown and because there is something in Schomburghk's history pointing to a Cathedral City, that you should stupidly masquerade yourself by saying that you should have a Lord Mayor.

I am going to put it as strong as this. I am not going to vote for any Lord Mayor. It is absolute nonsense. I am going to appeal to members of the Government. When you think that this is the first time in the history of this Colony that you can show the West Indies that you have a Socialist Government, are you going to accept in this modern day any stupid suggestion about Lord Mayor? You go to the city of New York, and it is just Mr. So-and-So and His Worship the Mayor. The same is true of Trinidad and Jamaica.

What I am saying is no attempt to hold this Bill up. No one is more anxious than I am to see this Bill come into operation; but in this particular matter we should go very cautiously. We are clamouring to have the capital of the federated West Indies set up in Barbados. Those of us who have travelled realize that the other West Indians look at us as though they feel that we are setting up ourselves, and being above other West Indians. In other words we are supposed to be in the high hack now! How much more will they feel so, if we accept the suggestion to have a Lord Mayor of this city. If we did that, how much would the Lord Mayor be respected in the eyes of the common man who elected him to that position? I repeat that although it might be lawful, it is not expedient. If we have to send the Bill back to the Other Place, let us face that issue. Let us send it back and say that we will not have any stupid thing like a Lord Mayor, to let West Indian and other people laugh at us.

I am telling you sir, that this is nothing but an attempt to laugh at us. We have English settlers and other people here, and they must smile when they sit back and see, that we in a little two by four country want to enact something by which you will have to address whoever is elected Mayor by the title of Lord Mayor. I agree that we should pay much respect to ancient customs and worthwhile traditions. We are just changing our system of Local Government, and we are being told about having a Lord Mayor. I am going to counsel honourable members that we should not accept this amendment.

I am also going to suggest that we should go into Committee on these amendments. I want to impress on members of the Government that although they may have accepted this amendment about the Lord Mayor in good faith in Executive Committee, we should not go down in history as accepting this stupid idea.

In Great Britain every city with a Cathedral has not got a Lord Mayor. I think it applies only to York and London. Of course I was amused the other day, when I saw that there some people who believed that unless you have been a student at a University you have no right to express an opinion. But I would express my opinion when it comes to those people. We heard the Hon. Minister read out that a Cathedral was created in Barbados. You had a Bishop in Barbados, and therefore you declared Bridgetown a City. But people who do research realize that the Bishop in Barbados at that time was also Bishop of British Guiana, Jamaica and the Windward and Leeward islands. One of the jealous

rights exercised by the Crown is the appointment of Bishops. That is why you had a Cathedral in Barbados, and that that is why they declared Bridgetown a city; because as I have said a Bishop here was not Bishop of Barbados alone but of Jamaica, Antigua, Dominica, St. Lucia and even B.G. and Trinidad.

It was expedient in those days, but it is not expedient in these days. Someone has referred to the fact that of all the West Indian islands, Barbados is the first to have a Premier. Such an argument would not apply to the point that we are considering now.

A man endears himself to the community—, 20 years ago the people referred to the Hon. Premier as Sir John Simon. How many people have been referred to as such, because in the estimation of the people they could call him so. Do not let us make ourselves puppets. Imagine the term, "Lord Mayor" of the City of Bridgetown. I am sure that no member of this House will lend himself to that. I still feel that such is making fun at us. What Lord Mayor? I am surprised at all members not telling the Other Place not to make fun at us. Everybody who meets me in the street tells me that the Other Place is poking fun at us. Is it because the entire Act is so amended? I am suggesting when we go into Committee on this matter we deal with it because it will take some time to bring this Bill into being, and we will let the Other Place know that we cannot accept such an amendment.

As you go through this Bill you will see the amendments which follow. One of the most important amendments which the Other Place has made, and I entirely agree with you, is the giving a limited liability Company the right to vote. Unless you understand it and make a study of the matter, you cannot appreciate it. The Hon. Minister has said that it is a relic of the past but it only came in as a first post war amendment. If you read that amendment, it only means that a Company, as an entity as far as liability is concerned, is really a person; and companies are responsible for a contribution. An individual cannot vote in his own right and then vote for the Company. That would be wrong. If a man lives in St. Joseph and the Company is registered in in Bridgetown he cannot vote more than once. In any community where you have people putting small sums of money together for the purpose of building up a business or improving the country and becoming a person in Law, that person is entitled while he cannot vote in his own right and vote for the Company as well, to have a voice in voting either for the company or in his own right.

I am in agreement with this amendment.

One other amendment I should like the Hon. Minister to express a view on. As you will recall in a Bill of this sort, I do not believe that any honourable member can say that he has read the reasons for the changes. Before you could get anybody to change his mind to vote for something against which they have voted,—in the Other Place we have read reasons diametrically opposite to the reasons which have been given in this Chamber, and we might have expressed different views, we should feel that honourable members are well acquainted with the facts.

I am now dealing with the reduction of aldermen from 9 to 6. That is clause 20. For the first year running for Councillors, the original Bill gave the right to the Councillors to elect all Aldermen. So it is in all countries, at least those West Indian. I am wondering if the honourable member can give any authority or satisfying reasons to this Chamber as given to him, why this amendment was made giving the Executive this right. They have reduced

Mr. SPEAKER: We should go into Committee in order to delete any amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: The House might stultify itself by passing the second reading of these amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: If any one amendment is disagreed with, we will have to disagree with all because we are requested to accept the amendments *en-bloc*.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I will begin by saying that as far as I am concerned as a member of this House, in connection with these amendments which have been sent back to us, I cannot say that many are controversial; but there are two of them which cut across the grain of adult suffrage. As regards corporate bodies, I can remember the point was raised and I pointed out that it was foreign to local Government since we are obviously moving towards the principle of adult suffrage. To my mind their voting through a corporation was not a good thing. As the hon. introducer has reminded us, the Government in its wisdom is going in for a compromise and you can rest assured that at a later date they will rectify this position. Equally section 29 happens to be a retrogressive step. I would say that \$15.00 in taxes today is a lot of taxes. Looking at the present day rates in St. Philip and certain other parishes, \$15.00 in taxation equates to something like three acres of land. But it is no good to be harping about this matter. It is a much better thing to have half a cake than no cake at all.

With respect to the very controversial section under consideration which is section 29, it means that if you are to stand for election to a Council you will have to be of full age and pay rates to the value of \$15.00. You must also be a local government elector or you should be a person of full age and pay rates and either own freehold or leasehold land within the area of the Council, and the area must mean a local Government electoral area. It must be given the same meaning as in clause 26 paragraph 3. There you should be a person of full age and a British subject and pay rates, or you should be doing the whole of the settlement preceding the election and reside in the area of the Council. I cannot see why confusion of thought should arise as regards the construction which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has put on it, because that is the construction I have put on it myself. I do not see that it cuts across any principle. If the hon. senior member for the City is thinking that you may own property in the area and be never registered, I do not think that such is the intention at all. If you look at clause 26, before you can stand as an elector you must on the qualifying date and on the date of the poll, be a British subject and you will have to reside for three months before then or own property. I cannot see how it could be argued that by owning property in the electoral area you should be disqualified from being a member of the Council when the very provisions of clause 26 have the same thing in it. As I see the position, Mr. Speaker, if you have the first qualification, that is that you are a British subject and paying taxes, you will have to be registered within the electoral area; and then it is the intention of the Act to allow a person to be also of full age and paying taxes and owning property within the area. I presume that you will have to show registration before you can act. Perhaps we could put in a section making provision for a person residing in the electoral area. Before you can stand for election to that area you must have one of three qualifications but you do not need to live in the particular area. What the hon. senior member for the City is contending, and

what can happen, is that you can own a house, but you cannot be registered there and yet you can stand for election to that area.

Apart from those points which I have made as regards the whole principle of the Bill, it is true to say that the whole principle of adult suffrage has been removed from this Bill. As regards the point as to whether we should have the word 'Mayor' or the words 'Lord Mayor'. I think in most of these matters there is something about having an Episcopal city, and there is also the idea of a Greek City carrying on its religion. The cities in the United Kingdom were represented by the municipal Government between 1835 and 1882; but at the same time you will find that most of the English Cities which happen to have a charter of incorporation actually became cities more from that reason than the fact that they were Cathedral Sees.

I may only point out that there are other exceptions, such as Liverpool and Kingston-upon-Hull, which have Lord Mayors. I pointed out that, to show that it is not because you have a Cathedral and can be called a City, that a town like ours should be one of a Lord Mayor's status. I do not see the reason for all this fuss. I would be quite happy to have the title of Mayor. It is unfortunate that the writer of a leader in the "Advocate" on this question, was probably a little bit too pro-Barbadian; and because of that, may have wished that since Barbados had the first Premier, therefore, it should have the first Lord Mayor. I think that the writer of that article was a little bit too insular in his outlook and a little bit too proud of Barbados. As I have said, I am quite happy to have the title of Mayor alone. Let us have "Mayor" and not "Lord Mayor".

There is another point which I would like the Hon. Minister of Social Services to pay some attention. I noticed that instead of having triennial elections as is the custom of other places we are having biennial elections. I notice that it is now intended to have 38 Aldermen instead of 57 so that may be the reason. Probably you are only going to have elections at the beginning of the Aldermanic term and at the middle of the term.

I think there is something in what the honourable senior member for the City said. In view of the fact, that according to the principles of this Bill, there must be all these Committees, I am wondering whether you will get sufficient people to serve. I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services will give that matter some attention. The tendency is that when you have Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of thirty-six, you should have a Council of twelve, that is, according to the plurality of three. You are now having 24 on the ratio of 2, and I am wondering if that would work.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—This is another occasion on which a Bill has been sent back from the Other Place with unpalatable amendments, which this Government intends to accept. The honourable introducer and seconder are contending that Government has made it quite clear that at the first opportunity it gets, Government will amend the Bill and put back in what was there at first. There are several occasions when such pronouncements were made by this Government; but I do not know of any single instance in which the threat has been carried out. Moreover, Sir, we are dealing with a historical document and we have added our own particular history to it. When this Bill was first thrown out, an honourable member gave notice of an address without producing it. That is a historical event. The address was never presented to the House before it was prorogued and not since.

Sir, if we imported someone to tell us about Local Government and the expert opinion which appeals to commonsense, to democracy, and particularly to a Socialist Government, is that the basis of the franchise should be Universal Adult Suffrage, and if we ourselves are elected to this popular Chamber by Universal Adult Suffrage, why and how can we compromise on such a principle. If you believe that it is people that matter — and we are getting this change to Lord Mayor from associations with the Church, and it is a former Bishop of this island that said, it is people that matter—how can we come back today, and compromise on such a principle which states that it is property which matters. Sir, these things beat me. I wonder whether we would ever see the proposed amendments to place the Bill in its former position. As I see it, the Other Place will get what it wants. The Shop's Act and other Acts have been amended by them; they are putting in what they wanted. The Other Place has also put in the deposit by candidates in the Representation of the People's Act for election to this House. All these things were not initiated by this House.

I do not know if you will allow me on the second reading of these amendments to point to some inconsistencies. You will find that with the amendments proposed in Clause 29, the word "if" is put in the principle sentence, and when you turn to Clause 31 dealing with the disqualification for Office, the sub-clauses begin with the word "if". You can see by this that there is some kind of loose drafting. I think that if this is the way it is was originally drafted in the Bill, at least the amendments should follow that particular form. Beginning of the Sub-clauses with the word "if" appeals to me, and makes them read more intelligent.

It is regrettable, and I am very sorry, that the Government is not prepared to fight the Other Place on these principles, particularly in the view of the fact that Government has said that it believes in them.

If this House was not prorogued on the 1st February last, why does Government want to prorogue it in August? Why not have a long adjournment instead? There is no necessity for prorogation of the House at this time. Why not prorogue it in December so that you will have time to deal with the Draft Estimates in order to bring them before the House early in February or soon after you have re-opened.

When it comes to the question of the amendment of Mayor to read Lord Mayor, I must say, that I do not know if it is a subtle attempt by the Other Place to throw dust in our eyes, or to belittle the office of Premier. There is no other part of the world in which there is a City and a Corporation that they would have less to do than the people have to do here in the City of Bridgetown. We are going to create a Lord Mayor of dust-bins. This Local Government will not have to provide the people with light, water, or a Police Force. The Lord Mayor will have no jurisdiction over any of those things. I do not know if the Local Government will continue to contribute to the Fire Brigade. As it is, the City of Bridgetown will be declared a City in two particular ways: one, it is created by Letters Patent and the other by this Act. This Act declares it a City when it is already a City; probably this Act will be declaring it a municipality. However, I regard it as absolute nonsense to have the title of Lord Mayor, and I think it is only a cause for fun, as my colleague says. It is absurd, to have the title of Lord Mayor. Do not let us accept it; let us be modest enough to stick to the title of Mayor, particularly in view of the fact that we are federating with

other people who really have a Mayor and Corporation in some of its fullest senses. Even in the smaller West Indian Islands, the Mayor and Corporation have to provide light and water and to look after other amenities of the City for the people. What would the Lord Mayor of the City of Bridgetown have to do but to put out dust-bins and to arrange for the sweeping of the City.

They do not have to build a by-way or an alley. I doubt whether under the Public Health Bill they will have any poor relief to distribute. Will we have any poor? The only poor we will always have with us is the Lord Mayor, the Aldermen and the Councillors. Poor Lord Mayor! It is an absurdity.

However Sir, it would seem to me that we have only one course opened to us. There are many amendments. I am not physically able to flog any dead horse today. I am only going to say if no one makes a motion I will at least make a motion on that part of the amendments. I am wondering what procedure the House will adopt. I am wondering why we do not undertake to create some of the other places Cities and let them have Mayors, so that we can have a Lord Mayor in the City of Bridgetown and outside in the other two District Councils. If we did that we could on those grounds at least, justify having a Lord Mayor in the City of Bridgetown. If it is in order for the House to go into committee we can delete this Lord Mayor amendment if the House so wishes. If the House does not go into Committee after the second reading of these amendments there will have to be a motion. The only motion that can be made then is that they be agreed to without amendments. Therefore, if the House does not accept the motion to go into Committee there will certainly be an opportunity for an amendment to be made after the second reading.

I am very sorry to see the provision for nomination of the Aldermen, instead of election. In these days we are against a system of nomination by the Crown, and yet we are accepting something else to get it started, why should we accept the principle that the first Aldermen should be nominated by the Crown? I cannot see the reason for that provision except that those persons who have been controlling the Vestries all these years desire to continue to influence the Head of the Administration for a longer period so that they may be represented.

As far as the amendment dealing with property qualifications is concerned, we are enlarging the City as we know it now, and those merchants who live outside of even the enlarged City still feel that they should have a vote for their business concerns. I do not blame them for trying to get it. If they can get the Government of Barbados to fall for this rather than put up a fight over it and at least show their sincerity to the principles which they profess, that is a matter for the Government.

The question that the amendments be read a second time was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I move that these amendments be now agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the amendment which inserts the word "Lord" before the word "Mayor" throughout the Bill be not agreed to. I do not think I need say much more on it. This is nothing to do with party feelings. I feel, looking at it in a broad way, that we should not allow other West Indians to think as they occasionally think about us,—that we always want to wear the high hat. I repeat Sir, that things which are lawful are not always expedient. I repeat also that if it were expedient in the days when the Bishop of Barbados was also Bishop of the other

colonies as I have mentioned before, it is not expedient to-day. Furthermore, there is no authority for saying that Bridgetown was made a City in the Letters Patent. I am sure that hon. members will agree with me that no harm can be done to the institution of a new form of Local Government, by refusing to have the Chief Executive Officer masquerading under the form of a Lord. It is quite enough for him to be referred to as Mr. So and So, or as His Worship the Mayor.

This suggestion to have a Lord Mayor is not expedient for a small place like Bridgetown. It is sure to be said, that the first time that you have a Socialist Government in power, 'look at what they have allowed to pass.' If you delete this amendment the Other Place will accept the deletion. This is one of those things that some smart Aleck in the Other Place or outside brought up, and they found historical reasons for bringing it up. I am convinced that behind it there is some idea of laughing at us. I now formally make the motion which I made at the beginning of my speech.

Mr. F. C. GODDARD: I beg to second the motion.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I just want to say that probably I am in sympathy with the remarks of the hon. member, but I want to take this opportunity to remind hon. members of the House that it is dangerous to tinker with this Bill at this stage. The Bill has been before this House from time to time since 1951 or 1952. The whole populace is interested in this Bill. We do not want to have the Bill thrown out again. In view of the disclosures made at the investigation of conditions at the St. Andrew's Almshouse, as reported in the Press, it is quite obvious that we do want a Bill of this sort. We should not tinker with it any further.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say that the speech made by the Hon. Minister of Social Services is a regrettable one to make to the people's representatives. It would be the type of speech which I would expect the Government's spokesman to make in the Other Place, and to say, that the people want this Bill, but the people's representatives do not want any Lord Mayor and that they should not make it become law. I hope those instructions will be given to the Other Place. There is no representative Assembly in any part of the world to whom you could say that you had better be careful as to what you have done, because you will prevent somebody from being elected. There is no limit to the number of members you put in the Other Place; we have the power to do it, it is only that we are afraid to do it. We are afraid to use the power we have, and we do not want to offend anybody else; but we can offend the people's representatives passed this Bill without the word "Lord" in it and that word was put in by the Other Place, and we cannot take it out for fear of somebody else? We feel that the insertion of this word is a matter of laughing at the people of this colony. I repeat that the type of speech I have heard from the Hon. Minister of Social Services is one I would expect from the Government's Spokesman in the Other Place. The people's representatives do not want this particular amendment to this Bill. It is the people of this colony that matter,—not the Letters Patent. The representatives of the people are afraid of the position. You threatened hon. members—

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Did I threaten anybody? I have no power to threaten anybody.

Mr. LEWIS: If you tell me that if I am not careful how I tinker with this Bill, that it will not become law, what is that? In other words you cannot give a free vote; you must give a conditional vote.

(Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Yours is free). The hon. member is not free to vote. However, I feel that it hurts my susceptibilities and as a matter of fact, it will be nonsense to vote against all the amendments because they do not all cut against one's grain. They are just ordinary things. We have imported people and spent money to form our opinions and there are the same people who will tell us to obey the mother country, and they are deliberately telling us to turn down these things in the face of what we say.

The question that the amendments of the Other Place be agreed to with the amendments proposed by the hon. senior member for the City was put and resolved in the negative. The division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. LEWIS, ALDER, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—(4).

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, WILLIAMS, J. C. MOTTLEY and MILLER—(11).

The question that the amendments of the Other Place be now agreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. *

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Other Place returning with amendments the following Bills:—

A Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the Acts of the Island relating to Public Health.

A Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the relief of poor in this Island;

A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 and to make certain provisions relating to the income of charities and to gifts made to charities.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the honourable Leader of the House to give us some indication as to what has to be done after tea. Order No. 2 on the Order Paper which is a Bill to consolidate the Laws of the Island relating to the representation of the people, has not been circulated and what is the object of adjourning for half an hour? I should like to know what is the Government's intention.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The Government intends to go on with other business and matters under Private Members' Business have to be dealt with. The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSING BOARD

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker.—Owing to the resignations of the Hon. Premier, and the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, from the Housing Board, this Board is finding some difficulty in getting a quorum to carry on its meetings. Representations have been made to this Government to make the appointments of members from this Chamber to that Board, as soon as possible, so that the Board would be able to carry on its business. I therefore beg to nominate for those two posts, the hon. junior member for St. Michael, and the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—As the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for St. Michael said last week, they served on the Housing Board for many years. It is true to say that what I am about to say now may fall on deaf ears, but I am going to say it nevertheless. There is an old proverb, which says that two wrongs never make a right. Many years ago when people of a different complexion represented this country, many people including myself argued then that it was not fair to have any one section of political thought nominated to Boards. I think that much agitation for that point of view was expressed by the now honourable senior member for St. Philip. Naturally, the House at that time was slow in giving way to that proposal, but it eventually gave way to it. Since that point of view has been expressed, the institution of Party Politics has definitely come about, so much so, that we now have a Ministerial Status. What I am going to say now I know members of the Government will fully appreciate. I will say, that while Government still should have on all Boards a majority of members of the Government Party, whether it be the Peasants Loan Bank Board or Sugar Industry Agricultural Board, it should have also members of the Opposition on them, particularly in view of the introduction of Ministerial status. I am sure that members of Government realise that from time immemorial, the Government in power always placed on various Boards members of the Opposition. It is true to say that the majority of members on the particular Boards were always members of the Government owing to the question of voting; but there were always members of the Opposition. I am afraid that this Government has not got down to that idea yet. This is the first opportunity Government has in observing the true Party spirit of Ministerial Status, and I do not think it is fair to have both members nominated from the Government Party to serve on the Housing Board. I was somewhat surprised at these nominations coming from the Hon. Leader of this House. This is not a plea from myself or a plea from members of my Party. As a matter of fact, I am already a member of that Board. I must ask: has the Government something to hide or to cloak? Have you observed the principle that is observed in England where members of the Opposition are appointed to Committees? I consider it as your duty to nominate a member of the Opposition on all these Boards.

I am therefore, going to nominate the honourable senior member for St. John, whom I think stands second to none for pressing the claims of the people he represents, and because he has shown that he can rise above Party Politics for the interest of the island as a whole. I think he stands second to none also for expressing the views of the man at the bottom, despite the sneers sometimes of some of the stupid members of this House and despite the fact that sometimes his criticisms do not meet with the approbation of members of the Government and even of members of the Opposition. I know that some honourable members are moved by the affability and friendship of those honourable members who are nominated already; but I feel that it must be more than that. I repeat, I am somewhat surprised that those nominations have come from the Hon. Minister of Social Services because he looks at things dispassionately. I am sure, if left to his decision alone he would agree that the honourable senior member for St. John, who on occasions is one of the greatest critics of the Government on its policy of Housing, should be given the opportunity of serving on that Board. I take much pleasure in nominating him a member of the Board.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second the nomination of the honourable senior member for St. John as a member of the Housing Board. It is a matter of regret that a matter like this should occasion controversy. On the introduction of the Ministerial Status, Government members repeated themselves on several occasions, when they said that the operation of the new Constitution in Barbados would be along the lines of the United Kingdom precedent. We were told that in every respect Government would try to follow the principles of constitutional Government in Great Britain, where in all the important Commons' Committees all sections of the House are represented. That is done for obvious reasons. They can never tell what time Her Majesty's Opposition might have to run the Government, and it is felt that the Opposition should be kept in direct contact with all phases of the operation of the Government. The Prime Minister consults the Leader of the Opposition at every step and it is true to say that the Opposition is kept as well informed with actions and policy of the Government as Government members themselves. Now, that being the case, is it not surprising that today, on a Board like the Housing Board, which is supposed to be non-party, on which you have the municipality of St. Michael, the Board of Health, and both Branches of the Legislature represented, that both seats of this Chamber on that Board should be filled by the members of the Government Party? It may be true to say that members of the Government Party formerly filled those seats, but that was before the introduction of the Ministerial Status. This is the first opportunity since the introduction of the Ministerial Status, that we have of rectifying that position, or of assuming a policy more in conformity with the new constitutional setup. Therefore, the Hon. Minister of Social Services, should have considered the advisability of having a member of the Opposition appointed to this Board.

I take great pleasure in supporting the nomination of the honourable senior member for St. John, because from the point of view of length of service and from other points of view, the honourable member stands head and shoulders above any of the other nominees. He has been a member of this House before either of them, and his contributions to the activities of the Legislature in this island are definitely superior to those made by either of the other two nominees. His interest in the island as a whole, not only of his constituency, is second to none to any member of this House. I go further by saying that I believe the contribution he would make on the Housing Board would be second to no other member of the Board from the time it was created until now.

We all know the deep interest which he displays in matters affecting the welfare of the underprivileged section of this community, and I think that his presence on the Housing Board must redound to the benefit of the people throughout the island. Apart from the question of constitutional principle, there is the important question of personality; and I feel, Sir, that there is no other member of this House who from the point of view of political characteristics, temperament and ability can make a better contribution to the activities of the Housing Board than the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two propositions before the House. One is for the honourable junior member for St. Michael and the honourable junior member for St. George, and the other for the honourable senior member for St. John. According to the usual custom the first proposition will be put

first. That is the procedure followed when the House is selecting a Speaker, or when an Officer of the House is being selected.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am not attempting in any way to challenge the ruling which you have given, which is in accordance with Rule 17; but, sir, —

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot address me at this stage. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am speaking to a point of order, sir, as regards the ruling which Your Honour has made in connection with the balloting for these two members. I heard Your Honour to say that they were Officers of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said no such thing. I said that they should be voted for in the same manner as when the House is choosing a Speaker,—in accordance with Rule 10—; and when Officers of the House are being selected,—in accordance with Rule 17. If there is more than one proposition the first one is put first.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would like to find out if these two people can be considered Officers of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are obviously not Officers of the House. I am saying that they should be voted for in accordance with two Rules of the House,—Rule 10 and Rule 17.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would be the last person to challenge one of Your Honour's rulings. But one can only presumably act by analogy to Rule 17 if the person that you are appointing is an Officer of the House, or is going to be an Officer of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying that there are two procedures laid down which can be applied similarly.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Presumably, sir, your analogy can only apply if the position were that the two people were going to be Officers of the House. Your Honour may be in some difficulty as to what procedure to follow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in no difficulty whatsoever. I have stated the procedure which should be followed in this case. There is no other procedure that I can find in the Rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would have preferred some more democratic way; for instance, the single ballot. There might be two candidates whom I might like to see on the Board. If it is done in the way in which it is proposed that it should be done, I may have to decline from voting altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER: The single ballot would not be the correct thing at this stage.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker. — I nominate the hon. senior member for St. John and the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I said before, I am putting the first proposition first. The question is that the hon. junior member for St. Michael and the

hon. junior member for St. George be appointed to the Housing Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if we could not do this by secret ballot.

Mr. SPEAKER: If honourable members want to proceed by secret ballot I have nothing against it. I am only saying what I have found in the Rules.

Hon. M. E. COX: I move that the vote be taken by secret ballot.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members may vote for any two names which are found on the Ballot Paper.

The Ballot was taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The result of the ballot is as follows: The honourable junior member for St. George 10 votes; the honourable junior member for St. Michael 8 votes, and the honourable senior member for St. John 7 votes. I declare the honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. Michael as the members who have been duly appointed to serve on this Board. (Cheers).

AMENDMENTS TO INCOME TAX BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—The Bill intituled an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, and to make certain provisions relating to the Income of charities and to gifts made to charities, has been returned by the Other Place with a verbal amendment. That amendment occurs in Section 2; it is merely a change of the word "to" to the word "and". That is the only amendment. I ask leave that under Rule 262 this amendment be considered forthwith.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this amendment which I have just explained be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—That concludes Government Business. I do not think that there is any honourable member who wants to proceed with any Private Member's Business, and I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at three o'clock p.m.

Hon. H. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 20th July, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Messrs. F. C. GODDARD, V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Minutes of the Meetings held on the 15th and 22nd days of June respectively had been printed and circulated, and if there was no objection those minutes would be taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am not objecting to the confirmation of the Minutes, but I am merely pointing out that I have noticed in the Minutes that one would get the impression that replies to questions are now laid by His Excellency the Governor. That occurs in the Minutes of the 15th and 22nd of June. As I consider such is not strictly correct, I will ask that these Minutes be amended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will point out the error to the Clerk.

There being no objection the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

By Command of His Excellency the Governor the following papers were laid:—

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS for Hon. G. H. Adams:—Message No. 21/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding the prorogation of the Legislature.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1954, providing additional posts of Assistant Secretary and Long Grade Clerks.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1954, providing for certain additional staff for Erdiston Training College.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS (on behalf of the Hon. Premier) laid the following replies:—

Reply to Question No. 48 asked by Mr. L. A. Williams.

Reply to Question No. 49 asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker.

Reply to Question No. 55A asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker.

Reply to Question No. 58 asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker.

Reply to Question No. 59 asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Order, 1954.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Of my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 later in the day to proceed with the Resolution of which I have just given notice.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS (for Hon. G. H. Adams): Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1954."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1954."

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,746 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part I. Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55, No. 14, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, in connection with non-established staff at Erdiston Training College.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$1,250 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1954—55 No. 13 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Hon. members have already received copies of this Resolution which have been circulated to them and it is proposed to deal with this Resolution in all its stages to-day.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Before I go on to the Government business, in consequence of the prorogation of the Legislature on Tuesday next, there are a few little things which the Government would like to deal with before that time comes. With your permission certain papers have been circulated to hon. members, amongst which were two Resolutions which I gave notice of my intention to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with those two money Resolutions in all their stages to-day.

VISIT OF DR. PREST OF CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: While standing on my feet, I have to make an announcement on behalf of the Premier who has asked me to make it. It is an announcement in connection with a survey of finances proposed to be carried out by Dr. A. R. Prest of the Department of Applied Economics, Cambridge University. This announcement is as follows:—

Information has been received from the Secretary of State that arrangements have been made under a central Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme for Dr. A. R. Prest of the Department of Applied Economics, Cambridge University, to carry out a comparative Statistical Survey of the Public finances of the West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras.

Dr. Prest has previously undertaken an experimental study of the Nigerian national income.

Dr. Prest and his Research Assistant Mr. W. G. Demas, will be based at the University College of the West Indies and their study of public finances will be preceded by visits to the several Colonies for discussions with Financial Secretaries and their Staffs.

It is expected that Dr. Prest and Mr. Demas will arrive in Barbados on Wednesday the 21st July, 1954."

3.25 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—Before the business of the House is proceeded with I want to say this. The Hon. Minister of Communications and the Hon. Leader of the House have just intimated that they want to deal with certain matters which were introduced to-day. While I am not objecting to that, I just want to draw to Your Honour's attention that Your Honour having ruled that any private member who wanted to deal with anything must give a week's notice of it, I feel that the Government's position should be similar, unless in circumstances similar to these where it is a desire of the Government to prorogue the Legislature in a week or so. I shall always like to pay the highest regard to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I made no ruling as to that matter. My ruling has been only as regards questions.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is still a matter which comes before this House. If private members must give a week's notice in respect of questions, I feel that the Government's business, unless it is a case of extreme urgency as to-day where it is put forward to the House that the House must get certain matters through because of the prorogation, the House should always have a week's notice before dealing with these matters. I do not want to make these suggestions lightly.

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: On behalf of the Hon. Premier I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/1954 relating to the establishment in Barbados of a Police Training School to serve the Leeward and Windward Island in addition to Barbados.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: On my own behalf, I beg to lay the Report of the Select Committee appointed to collaborate with a select Committee of the Legislative Council on the question of over-population in this Island.

3.30 p.m.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. F. L. WALCOTT

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—Before the Orders of the Day are entered upon I would like to crave your indulgence. I believe that this is the first occasion on which the honourable junior member for St. Peter has been in this House since he was honoured by the Queen on the occasion of Her Majesty's birthday. I would like to congratulate him because he is one of the few young men who has risen to such heights in such a short time. It is less than ten years ago since he was a member of the Barbados Workers Union in an official capacity, and a member of this House. The heights to which he has risen have been very remarkable. It has been due to the energy and force with which he has pursued anything he attempts to do. It has always been tempered with some commonsense. He recently became an Executive member of the I.C.F.T.U., and to have a Barbadian filling that post is remarkable, because there are not many West Indians holding similar positions. He has always been active as Chairman of the Caribbean Organizations attached to this Union. As I said, he has achieved all of this within the short time of less than ten years. Again, I congratulate the honourable junior member for St. Peter. (Cheers).

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not think I should let this occasion pass by without associating myself with the remarks of the honourable Leader of the Opposition. We have reached the stage in Barbados when people would appreciate the sincerity with which this speech comes from the Leader of the Opposition, himself being termed a Capitalist in this community. Speaking for myself, and I believe I am expressing the view of very many people, I too offer my sincere and deepest congratulations to the honourable junior member for St. Peter. As the honourable Leader of the Opposition has said, it is less than ten years, as I recall it, since the honourable junior member for St. Peter made his debut in the public and political life in this colony. I recall well, before he signified his intentions as to what side of the fence he would throw his political weight, I saw in him that sincerity of purpose coupled with ability. I have made several suggestions to persons in my party to see whether or not he could be brought over to this party, because I realized what was in him.

While I was somewhat disappointed as a result of our friendship, when I found that the honourable junior member for St. Peter, then a \$20 a month employee with a capitalist firm, had the courage and tenacity to come out on the public platform and attack Capitalists, I realized then that there was a tremendous lot in the honourable member. Sir, friendship should have nothing to do with one's political views and aspirations. The honourable member and myself have differed on some occasions

politically. We have even had the occasion to attack each other, though not personally, on public platforms; but with all of that I have found the honourable member to be always honest and straightforward and sincere in whatever he had to do. It is therefore rather fitting that in his youth, or may I say in the prime of his public life, that he should be singled out for this very deserving honour for the work which he has done. I say work, because the years which we have passed through immediately after the last war, took very sound heads to bridge the gap between capital and labour; and although the honourable member was rather impetuous in his tenacity and zeal to get the best he could for the workers whom he represented, he always showed that he was fair and had the interest of Barbados at heart.

I think the honour which the honourable junior member for St. Peter has been given is well deserved. It is not merely an honour to the honourable member alone; it is an honour for the people of Barbados. Like the honourable Leader of the Opposition I have much pleasure in congratulating the honourable member on the honour which he so truly deserves. Sir, I am very glad that in this Chamber we can congratulate one of a different political outlook and thought, without having the general public to feel that there is something sinister behind it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to thank the honourable members for the kind things they have said about me. I hope that I would be spared long enough to deserve all that they have said of me. I do not regard this honour as an honour placed on me as an individual, but I regard myself as the recipient of an honour that has been placed on an organization which is doing noble work in this community,—that is the Barbados Workers Union. I accepted this honour on their behalf in all humility. As I have said before, I hope that I would live long enough to pursue this task which I am doing without pride, arrogance, or any conceit; but in all humility I will strive to do what is honest and right. Above all things I would ever have before me the motto: 'let truth and honesty be my guide.' (Cheers).

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to associate myself with the remarks which have been expressed by honourable members concerning the honourable junior member for St. Peter, and I wish him the best of luck.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—May I crave your indulgence in rising at this stage to say a few words. I do not want it to be said that this silence on behalf of members of the party with whom the honourable junior member for St. Peter has so long been associated, means that we do not entirely approve of the words which have been spoken by the honourable Leader of the Opposition and by the honourable Leader of this House, and also to the fact that the encomiums should come from that side of the table and not from this side. I want to show the honourable junior member for St. Peter that inasmuch as a theory of socialism does not regard it as the primary object that one's contribution in public life should be measured in terms of imperial honours, it is some indication of the intensity of the work which the honourable member has done that has impaned itself even on the consciousness of those in political offices in the United Kingdom whose political views, like the honourable Leader of the Opposition, might not coincide with ours on this side of the table. I would like to say on behalf of the people of the same persuasion like the honourable Leader of the Opposition, that although we

do not measure one's contributions in such terms, it is somewhat a signification of the impact which the labour movement has made in these colonies and outside of it, that the honourable junior member for St. Peter should be recognised in this manner. I would like to assure the honourable member, as he already knows, that we on this side of this table are entirely in agreement with all the expressions which have been voiced here today.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker,—Even at this late stage I too would like to add my quota of congratulations to the honourable junior member for St. Peter on the honour which has been conferred on him. I agree with all the sentiments expressed by the previous speakers. This indeed is a well deserved honour which has been conferred on a hard working and a conscientious man both in public life and in the sphere of the Trade Union movement. I too look at this honour as one which has not been conferred on an individual but as one which has been conferred on the Barbados Workers' Union, of which the honourable member is General Secretary. It is an honour which has been conferred through him on this House of Assembly and Barbados as a whole. I have no doubt, sir, that the honourable junior member for St. Peter would continue in the future to throw in the energy, the zeal and the hard work which he had thrown in during the past. I hope that this is the beginning of further honours to be conferred on him.

RULES 88 AND 89 SUSPENDED

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Earlier, I declared my intention of moving the suspension of Rules 88 & 89. I now beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

3.45 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the two money Resolutions of which notice has been given earlier, and which have been circulated.

Hon. M. E. COX: seconded the motion.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

RESOLUTION FOR BUILDING AT SIX ROADS AND TRADE COMMISSIONER IN CANADA

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for a sum of \$2,718.00. The notes are clear, and I do not think there is any reason to add much to them. The Resolution is under two heads. The first deals with alterations to a building at the Six Cross Roads site and the other under Head 28, relates to expenses of the Trade Commissioner's service in Canada. As the note reads the Trade Commissioner's service for the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras in Canada was taken over by the Regional Economic Committee with effect from the 1st January, 1954. Deficits on the Trade Commissioner's Office Transactions have been incurred annually for each of the last eight years prior to August 1953, and the Trade Commissioner is now liable for bank overdrafts amounting to \$17,831.40 (B.W.I.) at the 31st December 1953. The Regional Economic Committee has agreed that this amount should be met by participating Governments in the same proportion as their

contributions to the Trade Commissioner's Service. An amount of \$1,373.02 is therefore required to meet this Government's share of the overdraft.

As hon. members will see certain irregularities have been discovered, and after certain proposals were made by the Trinidad Government, it was eventually decided that a careful audit should be made. A certain amount of expense was incurred. The Accountant General of Trinidad had to go to Canada to make investigations on the spot, and the total cost was nearly \$10,000. Barbados' share is \$829.00, but as the note sets out, hon. members can be assured that no actual loss of money, was involved. Whatever may have happened, it was very complicated. Because it was originally arranged that the auditing should be done by the Accountant General of Trinidad, he was the officer who had to go to Canada to straighten matters out. It was pretty expensive as hon. members will see.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.
Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I take it that we are dealing with these two heads together. It is unusual, but in view of the fact that it is only two heads I will not raise any objection. I do not think that a matter of this importance should be allowed to pass this House merely with the explanation given by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

We have just reorganised the Trade Commissioner's Service in Canada, and we have established one in the United Kingdom. The Trade Commissioner in Canada has been occupying that position for some years, and I understand that he has just been re-appointed; or some deputy or assistant has been given to him. Do you mean to tell me that we have been in touch with the Trinidad Government who, unfortunately it seems, undertook to look after this Trade Commissioner's Service, and that this gentleman did not do his work, and did not do the auditing; and that we have re-appointed this Trade Commissioner before getting this matter straightened out?

I take it that this is the Canadian equivalent of the money we had to pay. I repeat Sir, why should this gentleman be re-appointed before this matter was straightened out.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—If the hon. member would give way, I will ask what gentleman has been re-appointed. Mr. Stollmeyer himself has nothing to do with these accounts, or with any irregularities.

Mr. LEWIS: Do you mean to tell me Sir, that the West Indian Trade Commissioner in Canada, has nothing to do with this? I am not making an allegation with regard to anyone in particular. I am merely commenting on the slipshod and reprehensible manner in which this matter was handled. I have never heard of Mr. Stollmeyer having any assistant until recently. Certainly he must have been responsible for the expenditure of this money. I did not know that we employed anyone else. Certainly this gentleman should have not been re-appointed to this post until this auditing was completed and matters were straightened up. I fail to see why we could not have paid a firm of Canadian Auditors to audit these accounts. It would not have cost Barbados \$829.00. That is probably what the total cost would have been. This is only a revenue and expenditure account. What else could it be? A Trade Commissioner has been receiving money and expending it, and any reputable firm of auditors could have investigated the matter.

This, sir, is what comes as a result of the R.E.C. conducting its business behind closed doors. No one

knows what is happening. These are public funds, and we should know what is happening. We have just agreed to establish a Trade Commissioner's Service in the U.K. and to take over the service in Canada, and the Government has come to us to-day and admitted that as a result of the irregularities the Accountant General of Trinidad who has not been doing his work, had to take a 'joy ride' to put things straight.

We have had members of this House going to Canada to visit this gentleman and calling on him to assist them, and all these things are going on, and nobody could get it fixed. Delegates from Barbados have been going up there, and there is a deficit of \$17,831.00 and that has been going on over a period of years. This is a matter which the House cannot condone. When you investigate this matter and re-appoint this man, it is easy to say that you have not lost anything. He should not have been re-appointed to the post unless all these matters had been straightened out. He would have got wise to the fact that somebody was keeping a check on him and that he should present proper accounts. He himself could have expedited this matter in order to get the job.

We have just given a 'joy ride' to the Executive Secretary of the Regional Economic Committee. Do you mean to say that the Accountant General of Trinidad went up there and he could not do anything in this matter? It is disgraceful that we should have a promise made by Trinidad—I wonder if the people of this colony know that we have left this work to be done by the Accountant General of Trinidad? We have accounts in this very island which this House knows nothing about. The accounts at the processing factory we do not see. In connection with the Schooner Pool Association, we get the accounts every two or three years. The day the House gave the Regional Economic Committee any service anywhere, they should have insisted on the accounts being laid in this House and made a document of the House. The Inspector of Trees in St. George has to send in a Report and we are told that nothing is hidden. There are irregularities, but there are regular irregularities. This is the wrong way in which we run our business. This is a serious matter which should have been reported before this gentleman took over any service at all. We have asked the Regional Economic Committee to take over this slipshod thing which has resulted in our having to contribute the sum of \$829.00, (some of the hard currency which we would need to buy medicine for the people of this colony,) we have to send up to Canada for him to make this check.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There is hardly anything which, under normal circumstance, the honourable junior member for the City has said, that I would not say. Why blame this Government? The Trade Commissionership was set up and we have put it in the hands of Trinidad to see after the accounts. I say nothing more. This Government is not responsible for anything. If the hon. member used to attend the Regional Economic Committee, he would keep the public out as much as he could. If I were to say something, I would say it more strongly than the hon. junior member for the City has said it; but do not blame this Government.

Mr. BARROW: I must start off by saying that I did not hear the hon. junior member for the City blame the Government for anything except being ingenuous and naïve on certain occasions. It is either that or they are not fully apprised of the truth of the position and they do not feel it politic to disclose the facts to the public. As between the Press

and the West Indies and certain Government Delegates perhaps, who travel backwards and forwards between one part of the world and another, there seems to necessitate a certain silence as regards the expenditure of certain monies on matters of a regional nature, not to say anything about certain departments in Barbados. As I said before, I have not heard the hon. junior member for the City blame the Barbados Government; but if the Government knows more about this than they have disclosed, I feel that they are blame-worthy in not disclosing it for the benefit of this House and for the benefit of members of the House. I heard a remark made by the Government Spokesman that the present Trade Commissioner was not responsible for the deficit with which the Service is faced at present. I would like to say this; I have already remarked on the enlightened nature of public opinion in the West Indies, and the conspiracy which seems to exist between the Press and the powers that be. To the best of our knowledge and information, the Trinidad gentleman who is now occupying the post in Trinidad as Trade Commissioner has always been in charge of the Trade Commissioner Service up there, and he has a full and unfettered discretion as to the selection of his staff; and what is more serious, the payment of the salaries, both to his staff and to himself. He has unfettered discretion in appointing his staff in the same manner as the Parochial Treasurer of St. James or of St. George would be able to fill his office with persons of his own nomination. These appointments were no part of the Trade Commissioner's service so that if there was any default or miscarriage on the part of any member of the Trade Commissioner's staff, and he is trying to absolve himself from liability because a member of his staff has done something which has never been done, there are two strictures which I would like to lay on the worthy gentleman. The first is that he is responsible for his staff and if he allows the whole situation to develop over a period of years without being cognizant of the fact that there was some misfeasance in his office, it does not speak very well of the representatives of the West Indian people. I happened to be well acquainted with the hon. gentleman in Montreal long before West Indians were flying over the Atlantic; and the first time that this gentleman associated himself with the West Indies apart from the Associated Chambers of Commerce was when he made a few public appearances during the war. He is now becoming at one with the undergraduate Society at McGill University. It seems to me, from that time the gentleman regarded himself only as the representative of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, which in truth and in fact was the function which he was performing, and the reason for the anomalous arrangement which existed between the Trinidad Government and the other islands in the West Indies. He regarded himself as minister plenipotentiary at large for the West Indies. The expenditure of the office seems to have increased not at all in proportion to the part which the Trade Commissioner was playing in fostering the knowledge of the West Indies and that sort of thing in the Dominion of Canada. If I throw my memory back, the gentleman's salary was something like \$500 per year; that was the only salary which was ever agreed upon that he should draw. For some time, it was appreciated in some quarters that we were entirely in the dark, and some sort of lateral arrangement was made between the Trinidad people and the Trade Commissioner that he should draw an expense account; but no limit was ever imposed. My information comes from persons in Trinidad, who are in the best position to know; there-

fore, any extraordinary expense which was incurred was incurred maybe, by the fault of no firm management as to the limit to which the Trade Commissioner Service could involve a credit on the West Indian Government rather than through any malicious design on the part of the Trade Commissioner himself, or any employees in his office. I would just like to make this one reservation. Up to quite recent times, not one single West Indian was employed in the Trade Commissioner's office in Montreal. With regard to the Deputy Trade Commissioner, although we would be called upon to contribute towards his salary, the public of Barbados has not been informed that one of the Secretaries of the Caribbean Commission, a Mr. Burrowes a very distinguished West Indian Economist has been appointed to assist the present Trade Commissioner in the discharge of his duties. I think that is a very welcome sign. For the first time a West Indian has been placed in an executive position in the West Indian Trade Commissioner Service. As a matter of fact, he is the first West Indian to ever hold a position in that service.

There are thousands of West Indians in Montreal, —girls and boys, young men and women,—who would have made very suitable candidates for any position in Mr. Stollmeyer's Office; but he never employed one. This is the first time that a West Indian has been appointed to that office for all these number of years. I may say that I am personally acquainted with Mr. Stollmeyer who has a very charming personality and if charm has anything to do with contrast, I am sure he would get all for the West Indies. In view of the fact that I am aware of the existence and the setting up of this office before the Regional Economic politicians took it over, I feel I can talk with some authority on this subject. To suggest that there were irregularities in the office of the Trade Commissioner and that the Trade Commissioner was not to be blamed or could not be called upon to account, is monstrously a suggestion. There was never any executive officer over him, nor was there any West Indian in that office to say that a West Indian was involved. We must remember that it was the Chamber of Commerce of the West Indies that set up this gentleman in office; and it was not until some time afterwards that the various Governments were called upon to make a contribution towards the upkeep of the service in Canada. Only comparatively recently, the R.E.C. itself has been in operation and has been regarded as the Department to which Governments should contribute to the running of that office.

I do not think this Government should be called upon to share any of the costs of this irregularity no matter how it rose. I do feel that it was a irregularity on the part of the Trinidad Government itself and the failure of the other Governments to fix a regular salary. I would be charitable enough to say that it has nothing to do with anybody carrying away money. However if you are saying that it was an irregularity of the kind which I have outlined, and which from my knowledge of the situation and the deductions which I have made and which I consider to be more reasonable, then the only irregularity it can be is an overdraft in the manner of what Trinidadians call "Bu-ball".

I do not think any Government should comply with that at all. To get up and give us the explanation that the Trade Commissioner is not responsible, well, I think the best way to judge that or any issue like that would be to set up a commission of enquiry and have the matter fully investigated, so that we could be satisfied that these were extraordinary expenditures which this office was called upon to disburse.

The position in which we are placed to-day is one which I do not relish. The background of the Trade Commissioner Service in Canada was not sufficiently explained. Although it was poorly explained by myself, that was better than no explanation at all. This is one of the instances in which the Government takes over from private enterprise to the detriment of the public. When we take over from private enterprise we should not have to make good all the miscarriages for which private enterprise has been responsible.

I understand from the note to this Resolution that the Accountant General of Trinidad went up to Montreal to make certain investigations, and that this journey cost West Indian Governments nearly \$10,000. Was his journey necessary, or was it in the interest of his health or in the interest of the health and well being of his friends? Here we find a man who should have been auditing the accounts all the time having to go to see why they were not audited. What kind of situation is that?

You have one of the most competent administrative officers in the whole West Indian Region, as I have heard an eminent British Civil Servant describing him, in the person of the Executive Secretary of the R.E.C.

He went to Canada and reorganized the whole service. Trinidadians, Antiguan, Dominicans, all those people can tell you all about it; but in Barbados we know nothing of these things, because they are kept behind the bamboo curtain.

I repeat Sir, were the journeys of the Executive Secretary of the R.E.C. and the Accountant General of Trinidad necessary? All that has been accomplished is, that, it has cost us \$10,000 for the trip of the Accountant General; and I believe that that gentleman has now gone to the service in another part of the Empire. I hope that he does not burden the taxpayers of the country to which he has gone to the same extent that he is trying to burden us today.

I feel that we should be straight forward with Resolutions of this kind. If we were taken more in the confidence of the Government we would be more fully seized with all the relevant facts appertaining to the Resolution. We are now asking Barbadians to pay for something which to the best of my knowledge, and from the information given us, appears to be illegal, to put it mildly; and we are asked to say nothing, because it was not the Trade Commissioner's fault.

We have not been told that the Trade Commissioner was incompetent. I have no reason to believe he is. If he is efficient I have no doubt that he should be re-appointed on that basis. When we are faced with an issue of this kind we have to be careful how we appear to condone irregularities which are not in the interest of the West Indies as a whole.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to let the honourable senior member for St. Joseph know, that this is not a question of which you will hear any criticism from the Opposition, because they want the Trade Commissioner to do something for them up there. You will not hear any criticism from that angle.

I am not criticising the Government of Barbados because you can see what has happened in the initial stages. Trinidad undertook to look after this business. They must be paying a large contribution towards the service, and therefore they undertook to do it. What I am going to say to the honourable member is that in this Chamber he should be proud of his membership. We are representatives of the people, and I feel that when this Resolution gets to the Other Place it is only in consideration of

what I have just said, that you will hear all the facts.

How could checking a revenue in expenditure account cost \$10,000? We voted \$11,000, to send the honourable senior member for St. Joseph along with other members of a Committee to investigate the whole fancy molasses trade with Canada. and when they came back they knew more than any other living human being in the universe about molasses. But now that one gentleman has had to go and ask for some vouchers and make an audit, it cost \$10,000. Do you mean to tell me that the visit of the Executive Secretary of the R.E.C. cost that too? He not only checked accounts, he reorganized the whole office.

It is well to disclose these things so that the people who are carrying on accounts for this Government, will know that they are going to be exposed if anything dishonest comes to light. I do not see how this Government can justify people being tried at the Court of Grand Sessions for stealing a bicycle, and then come here and say that we must spend \$10,000, to investigate irregularities, and still there are no irregularities. Was some of this money spent so that the gentleman could cover up his own mistakes?

I would hate to think that the members of the Other Place would get more information than we are getting today. But if they do not get that information some one should call attention to it. They get a lot of information that we do not get down here. I see my colleague is getting up to defend this position. When he sits he will forget everything about the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,— Why should my colleague anticipate that? The honourable member made an excellent speech, but let us see if he is going to do what I am going to do, that is, refuse to vote for it. The honourable member as well as the honourable senior member for St. George made out a fine case, and I was wondering why they found it necessary to go on speaking for such a long time.

I listened to the Premier very carefully; and if a motion is made not to pass this, he will ask the members of the Government not to support that motion. What else could he do unless he is conspiring with these people? He himself told us, "I would prefer not to say these things, but after all it is Trinidad." What is the inference? The only inference that I can draw is that there is something dishonest about this. There are only two courses open to the Hon. Premier, either to support a motion made that this be rejected, or to let it be understood that he is conspiring with these people to get this money out of the people of this country.

4.25 p.m.

It is not fair to say that the members of the Opposition would not have voted against this, because they have asked a favour in Canada. The majority of people which you have in the Opposition have expressed their views, and consider that this is a waste of money. It might be alright during the war. There is for instance a father and son opening business in a country, do you think that they would allow you to know what they are doing? The honourable senior member for St. George has pointed out that this gentleman had powers plenary when it came to drawing money with an overdraft, because he only got \$200 a month. If you pay a man \$200 a month even in peace time as Trade Commissioner in Canada, you either have to give him that or expect him to get money from somewhere else. The note to this item says this:— "The Regional Economic Committee has agreed that this amount should be met by participating Governments

in the same proportion as their contributions to the Trade Commissioner Service. An amount of \$1,373.02 is therefore required to meet this Government's share of the overdraft."

I quite appreciate the position of the Hon. Premier. I cannot agree with him when he tries to hold aloof the Trade Commissioner and not holding him responsible for the actual running of the business. This deficit has not been encouraged in actual rents or expenses; therefore am I right in saying that there has been some rank, dishonest business transactions which are now being covered up by the Government of this country in their refusal to tell the members of this House how and where and when they have heard? Here is this resolution; for the past eight years these transactions have been going on, and if you have to spend more money than you really budgeted for, then come in here and say so. If you have an overdraft for \$600,000 in a business you would have to show your directors how it happened. If you vote this money you are participating in rank dishonesty. If it is above board, tell us so, and we will vote for it. I do not care anything about the R.E.C. members; if they have agreed with it, let them put their hands into their pockets and pay this money. If the Hon. Premier says that there is more than he can say, if you participate in this business transaction, then you are participating in a dishonest transaction. I am saying that this matter has to be gone into and the money has to be paid if there is an overdraft. Tell us exactly how this \$17,831 was spent. Tell us how you managed to spend this overdraft. I agree with the Hon. Premier that there is very much more than he can tell us. There is much more I could hear outside, and that is why I insist that we should have these Resolutions in our hands a week before they are dealt with. My constituents could tell me something about this matter, and I can use a telephone too. I also heard that the Trade Commissioner had a dishonest assistant in his office. If there is dishonesty in the audit department in Trinidad, should we be called upon to pay for it? If there were dishonesty in Barbados, you would prosecute somebody for it. (A MEMBER: They did). The Government of this country knows of this dishonesty and the Hon. Premier feels very strongly in this matter. If there has been a dishonest Trade Commissioner, whether he is a West Indian or is associated with a big family or not, let us know what the position is. This is a lot of money. It may not be a lot of money for some people. I am sure my colleague will not vote for this Resolution. Anyhow I will listen to the Hon. Premier; I am sure he will reply to this since he feels very strongly on it. He only gave us something slight. Now we are told what is wrong; I agree with all the arguments expressed. You could have used an auditor in Canada, but if you had used a chartered accountant in Canada you would not be able to conspire and cloak up anything. If you had made an attempt to use a chartered Canadian Accountant you could not have hidden this matter. The Governments of the West Indies could not have suggested to him to produce wrong figures or to conspire to hide up this matter. Who is the Regional Economic Committee who could agree to do something for the Barbados House of Assembly?

We agreed that the R.E.C. should recommend this amount and tell us why they recommend it. I am not voting for it unless the Hon. Premier can give us chapter and verse why we should vote for it. He must tell us everything. The honourable members who can get up and express their views and

then vote for it, knowing that there is corruption in high places, can do so if they like.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I think all this debate, could have been saved if this House had been given more information. This Government and this House have a continued liability with R.E.C., and therefore, any deficiency which takes place within the continued period would have to be made up. I do not think this particular matter is one which honourable members should accuse the Trinidad Government either by innuendo or otherwise. The answer to this matter is simple and I leave it to the Hon. Premier to give it. You do not blame the head of the administration for every mistake that is made. As I have said, the answer to this matter is simple and I leave it to the Hon. Premier to give it. All this debate could have been saved if a full explanation had been given. There is too much of the idea that this House is to be treated with contempt, and because of that, a full answer is not regarded as something that is necessary for honourable members to know. As I have said, there is a simple answer to this issue, and if it had been given it would have saved all this acrimonious debate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I have heard much stupidity on this matter. I think my fault is not that of despising the House, but giving it too much credit for intelligence. As honourable members can see, the notes to this matter is fairly full. It never occurred to me that I would have had to teach honourable members their alphabet. As I have said my fault is, that I have given honourable members too much credit for intelligence.

Mr. Chairman,—It is as clear as daylight in the notes that no loss of money is involved. If honourable members had asked me about the irregularity I would have given the explanation.

Let me say this first, it has been proved that the richest people in this island make use of overdrafts at some time or the other. Therefore, there is no question of irregularity in having overdrafts. (A VOICE: Eight years' overdrafts?) There is no question of irregularity in that at all. Honourable members can read the notes for themselves. It is stated: "The Trade Commissioner Service for the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras in Canada was taken over by the Regional Economic Committee with effect from the 1st January, 1954. Deficits on the Trade Commissioner's Office transactions have been incurred annually for each of the last eight years prior to August, 1953, and the Trade Commissioner is now liable for bank overdrafts amounting to \$17,831.40 (B.W.I.) at the 31st December, 1953. The Regional Economic Committee has agreed that this amount should be met by participating Governments in the same proportion as their contributions to the Trade Commissioner Service. An amount of \$1,373.02 is therefore required to meet this Government's share of the overdraft."

When I referred to the Government of Trinidad I was not accusing the Government of Trinidad of anything. When I referred to the R.E.C., (of course, everybody knows my opinion of the R.E.C.) I feel that the R.E.C. allocates too much to itself and does not do what it should. That is what I meant when I said that I could have said something stronger. Honourable members know that I did not attend the last meeting of the R.E.C. They know that I am not a lover of the R.E.C. I do want to make it very clear that when I said "I can say more" I was not talking of this specific occurrence. Let me also say again that this question of an overdraft is not

a reflection on the Trinidad Government. Mr. Stollmeyer thought it would cost so much for running his office, but it cost more each year so he had to have these overdrafts, with the knowledge of the Trinidad Government who was responsible for seeing after the accounts of that office. This is merely a question of not having enough money to run the department. Those were the facts adduced by the Accountant General of Trinidad. If honourable members read 2 b, they will see that it is something different from 2 a. Do not accuse this Government of lying.

(A VOICE: Nobody is accusing the Government of anything.)

For all these years there have been these overdrafts, simply, because, the man who had to do the estimating was estimating wrong. When I say wrong, I do not mean legally wrong. For the benefit of those honourable members who asked for it, I will give the figures of these annual overdrafts. However, to say that we are not paying this amount is just silliness. This Trade Commissioner Service was taken over by R. E. C. in January this year; but the Trinidad Government since this service was created on the authority of the other West Indian Governments, year after year, was seeing after this service. Therefore, the Accountant General of Trinidad knew of these overdrafts, and he must have considered that these overdrafts were perfectly in order else he would have said something about them or would have suggested some better method in running the finances of that office. Every colony has been told what is set down here and is being asked to pay their share. This is a simple matter.

When it comes to the second matter, that is a different thing. I expected when honourable members read the last paragraph that someone would have got up and asked what is the nature of the irregularities; but nobody has asked anything about that. I have a habit of not concealing anything; but at the same time of not speaking at any greater length than necessary. As long as I live, no honourable member is going to bulldoze me into doing what I do not want to do. It does appear as if the Assistant Trade Commissioner used to take money from official funds when he was, I suppose, hard up, and paid it back later out of his salary.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,— I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier is throwing a serious aspersion on a distinguished West Indian. There has not been an Assistant Trade Commissioner in that office until recently. As a matter of fact I do not think the gentleman I mentioned has taken up office yet. If there had been one before, he was never recognised. Mr. Stollmeyer may have appointed someone and may have given him that designation. There has never been an Assistant Trade Commissioner in that office until the appointment which was made about three weeks ago.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I want to say that the day I have to depend on the honourable member to tell me what is correct conduct, I will go and poison myself. I would not be fit to be alive. He is telling me not to put myself in trouble by slandering someone. For years there has been an Assistant Trade Commissioner. It was discovered that he had been in the habit of borrowing official funds and repaying it out of his own money. But not one cent of loss was involved. Of course it was highly irregular. It was misconduct, and the officer admitted it to the Accountant General of Trinidad when the investigations were made. Legal opinion was taken as to whether steps should be taken against him, and it was decided not to take steps. I repeat,—

not one cent was lost; but it was highly irregular to use official funds and then pay it back out of his own money. Often when I get up and waste my time giving information honourable members on the other side are discussing B.G. or 'Rosedale.' I am not wasting any time until I am asked for information. (A MEMBER: You will get trouble.) I like to be in trouble. That is the only time I feel I am living. We are told that the costs of auditing and investigating in Canada are very high. This investigation was done by Canadians along with the Accountant General of Trinidad, and it cost quite a lot.

The officer was called upon to resign. The honourable senior member for St. George was greatly daring; but one expected anything from that hon. member. He talks about there being no previous Assistant Trade Commissioner until this new appointment, when the advertisement plainly stated that the post being vacant, applications were invited. But everything I say must be wrong for the honourable member. He must get it off his chest. Mr. Chairman,—I apologise. I was just going to make a reference, but I forgot that other honourable members are involved. I am still stupid enough to believe and to hope that people will learn sense, and that when there are members of this party they will try to get a sufficient sense of responsibility to be aware of their duty to the party; and that they will not be so stupid as to hold out the olive branch to people at whom they should be pointing a gun. (A MEMBER: You can point all the guns at me!) Throw a worm at some fish and they will bite.

This is an ordinary transaction. The Trinidad Government was responsible for the auditing. These irregularities were discovered, but were not put to an end, until 1954. When the R.E.C., decided to take over the service they went on record as saying:

"As a result of consultations between the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies and the Trinidad Government, the auditing of the accounts of the Trade Commissioner for 1950 and 1951 was undertaken by Mr. H. B. Savage, Chartered Accountant of Montreal.

In February 1952 Mr. Savage submitted an interim report on the 1950 and 1951 accounts which disclosed a disturbing state of affairs. Certain irregularities were noted which seemed to involve the Assistant Trade Commissioner. As a result of this Report the Government of Trinidad decided to arrange for a more detailed investigation of accounts and the Auditor was instructed to examine the accounts as far back as 1942. At the same time the unsatisfactory position of the accounts was reported to the Comptroller who agreed with the Government's view that further action should await the complete report of the Auditor.

In October 1952 Mr. Savage forwarded his report on the 1942-49 Accounts which disclosed that further irregularities had taken place."

The Regional Economic Committee decided that financial arrangements in connection with the Service should be tightened up, and that the bank overdraft should be met by the participating Governments in the manner indicated in the note to the Resolution.

The name of the bank is not mentioned, but I do not see that it matters. For eight years this thing has been going on. Blame the Trinidad Government and the Governments of all the other countries for allowing the Trinidad Government to continue to be responsible for this auditing. I see from the file that the Government of the Bahamas has ceased to participate. I also see that the deficit of 1951 transactions was \$2,102. In 1952 it was \$3,481. In 1953 it was

\$2,503, on the 31st December, 1954, it was \$10,060, Canadian Dollars. Do not blame Antigua, St. Kitts or any other Government except for allowing that method to go on. We all knew about it, and we all left it to the Trinidad Government to see after it. We were supposed to know year after year about these these overdrafts and that these things were happening. I repeat, there is no question as far as the overdrafts are concerned, of spending money wrongly. How can honourable members suggest that every possibility can be covered by an estimate? One thing that arose which made estimation difficult was bulk purchasing. There was a time when one did not know what commissions would have to be paid, and one discovered that one would not have enough money after making an estimate. I mentioned that as one of the things which caused what has happened, to happen. In every business almost every day, an estimate could turn out to be inaccurate.

I say once again that as far as the second item is concerned, it was an irregularity. I have told honourable members the extent of the irregularities. It was a question of borrowing and putting back; but no money was lost.

This investigation proved conclusively that it was impossible for Mr. Stollmeyer, unless he could make a detail check in the office, to discover anything; and it was clearly set out that he was not negligent in any respect and he was not to be blamed for not having discovered this matter. If I may read a few extracts which were sent up by the Regional Economic Committee at its last meeting,—I would be very much surprised to find that Reports of the Regional Economic Committee are not laid in this House; I am sure that they must be laid in every colony,—This Committee in its Report stated this:—

“At the sixth meeting of the Regional Economic Committee held in Barbados in August 1953, it was decided that subject to the approval of the British West Indian Governments concerned, the Trade Commissioner's Service in Canada should be taken over by the Regional Economic Committee with effect from the 1st January 1954, provided that certain administrative and financial preliminaries were completed before that date. Among such preliminaries was the thorough investigation into the alleged irregularities by the Assistant Trade Commissioner and the completion of important disciplinary action arising from such an investigation.

The Trinidad Government undertook to complete action in connection with the alleged irregularities and arranged in September, 1953, for the Accountant General to proceed to Canada to conduct an on-the-spot investigation. The Accountant General submitted his Report on the 26th November, 1953 together with copies of the Auditor's two Reports.”

That is how it happened. Irregularities and misconduct took place, and although he did put back the money, it is obviously an irregularity, because some people put back money and others do not. However nothing has been lost. The only thing which the honourable member could cavil about is the frightful expense of getting Canadians to audit anything.

To say that we are not voting this money is just sheer nonsense. You can argue with justification that it costs a lot of money to make this investigation; but we have to pay our share. I have not seen the figures divided as between the Accountant General of Trinidad and the auditing in Canada. The Accountant General made use of an Auditor for the purpose of this particular investigation, and the Bill came to \$10,000 Canadian currency. In a note signed by the Chairman, it was set out that it was the decision of the sub-committee to consider this new arrangement.

It is understood that the Government of Trinidad has incurred a charge of approximately \$10,000 British West Indian Currency, for the cost of the auditing in Canada and the expenses of the Accountant General in carrying out the investigation. The Committee recommended that inasmuch as the cost was incurred by Trinidad, the expenses should be met in proportion to our contributions to the total cost of the service. I have copies of estimates for different years; there are contributions from the different Islands;—there is expenditure, personal emoluments and so on. I could give all members all this information, but it would take a long time to do that.

The first part is an ordinary overdraft. Because of a shortage in the estimates, that continued,—with the knowledge of the Accountant General and with the knowledge of the West Indian Governments. The next point is that they were irregularities on the part of the Assistant Trade Commissioner, which if they had involved us in any loss, it would mean that he would be called upon to give up his job. Finally the cost of the audit has been tremendously high, and the R.E.C., has suggested that we pay in the same ratio as we pay by way of subscription to the service.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If there is an overdraft it carries interest. I am asking whether there is any interest involved. If this gentleman has been taking out money for three years, it is obvious, that there would be some interest connected with this money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is something which I cannot answer immediately. This is something which does not appear on the papers. It says no loss is involved.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the honourable member to appreciate that we may be dissatisfied with what he has to say, because we feel that an explanation of this sort does not do the honourable member any credit. This gentleman has been getting money interest free so as to keep himself, and perhaps he has paid it back, or has not.

Sir, — To say that this is a simple matter is not true. There is no bank worthy of its name, that would employ a manager or an accountant or anybody who would go on giving an unlimited overdraft to somebody without a guarantee. Not only that, but you are not going to give that person a guarantee, unless he renders accounts. So some sort of accounts must have been rendered. That is why I say that I would like to get the name of the particular bank in Canada that was rendering these overdrafts to this extent. Sir, there are some very smart bankers. As a matter of fact, I do know that the managers of the Canadian Bank in Barbados have taught banking to many of the managers of the other banks. When it comes to banking and Life Insurance you have to go to the Canadians to learn these subjects. Anyhow, any manager of a bank would get dismissed if he was just sitting down and giving out overdrafts on say so, or something like that.

If we look up the Annual Estimates, we would find that the big sum of \$4,344 was given to the Trade Commissioner Service in 1952-53. Before I touch on that, allow me to say that auditing any part of the world is a very expensive thing, if you ask people to go backwards. It is a great deal of trouble. As a matter of fact, it is not auditing; it is searching for things which you are led to believe were not properly accounted for. Therefore, to go back eight years to search for things is a long time. This is a peculiar thing with which we are dealing. If we were contributing every year to

that service and that department was keeping accounts up-to-date, under those circumstances if the money this service was getting had been insufficient, all that you would have to do would be to increase the vote. If, say \$4,000 was not enough, they should say give us \$5,000; but it does appear as if the people there did not know what they were doing. Suppose this gentleman had died, what would have been the position? The next thing is this—If this gentleman has paid back every cent of this money the other question does not arise. I am saying that \$10,000 is an illegitimate overdraft for the running of this service. Sir, in this island we are countenancing slackness in these matters. I come in here, and at almost every meeting I preach to Government that one of these days something of this kind would happen. Government will not, although I have preached to them several times, put statements to the people's representatives of funds which are voted; therefore, we cannot help you at all nor can we make any suggestions to you.

Now, if the Accountant General of Trinidad has absolved this gentleman from blame it means that the accounts must have been presented, and the Accountant General had done nothing about the matter at all. The R.E.C. has a legal instrument for bringing it into being; and it was done through me. Probably, the bank was acting on that. I would like to know by what stretch of the imagination should we be asked to accept this liability. If we were asked to accept the liability of something that had happened since January 1954, when the R.E.C. took over the Service, I would agree; but all these things were done before. Let the Trinidad Government pay it. As a matter of fact our representatives on these associations should have had the guts to say so. Probably they said: 'this deficit is here; we do not know who is responsible; let us wait until R.E.C. takes this service over; then we can ask that body about it: let us go six months afterwards and tell that legally constituted body that there are these irregularities.' Sir, there is another resolution coming up for consideration of a similar thing to this.

This is a regrettable matter and if I vote alone, I am going to vote against it. As I have said if it were for anything that went wrong since January 1954, then I would say we must accept responsibility for it. On this question a division of the House must be taken; therefore, I would suggest that we deal with this resolution head by head. If necessary I would move an amendment to the motion before the House that Head 22 stand part.

With regard to Head 22 I see \$120 is to be voted for a part time supervisor. Does that mean \$10 a month or does it mean that that is the amount necessary for the remaining eight months of the financial year?

Mr. Chairman, — I would like to know about these salaries. Are they for a whole year or only for eight months? It looks like a very small salary to me to pay \$8.00 or \$10.00 per month to this person and \$3.00 per month for someone to keep this place. Is that in keeping with any other scale of wages? I understand that it is only part-time, but it looks very small to me. The library must be opened fairly often during the week to accommodate people. I move an amendment that Head 22 stand part of this Resolution, or I will move that the other head be deleted.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: However much we may say it was slack, it is a fact that every West Indian Government knew about this thing; because all of us

knew that the Trinidad Government was responsible for this accounting, and the Trinidad Government could say from year to year, "this is the position." I am saying that we must have had some means of knowing about it. There are hundreds of reports and such documents which I never read. I believe that like the late Dr. Hawkins, the honourable junior member for the City is about the only person who minutely reads everything. The honourable member on my left reads Minutes backwards and he is ready to spot any mistake that may appear. We cannot say that we did not have the means of knowing. Every colony had the means of knowing.

No one could accuse me of being a person who spends his time praising the Government or the present set-up in Trinidad. We sat down and allowed the Trinidad Government to see after the accounting. They knew about these overdrafts. Now that the Trade Commissioner Service has estimated and has had to borrow money from the bank how can we say that we are not paying our share? How can we vote against this?

The amount that the House is being asked to vote is nothing to do with the irregularity. It is like coming down with a supplementary estimate. It is as if we were building a school, found that we had under-estimated the cost, and had to come down with a Supplementary Resolution for say \$5,000 to complete the job.

The honourable senior member for the City will be surprised to hear that Barclay's Bank in Montreal is the Bank involved. No one can say that Barclay's is a careless bank. As regards the actual figures which the honourable senior member for the City asked me for, I will say that there is a gentleman called Mr. Savage, a Canadian, who did the auditing. His fee was \$5,148 (B.W.I.), while the investigation carried out by the Accountant General was \$4,778 (B.W.I.), making a total of \$9,926 (B.W.I.). As regards the question which the honourable member asked about interest, I do not have the actual years, nor do I think it is set out how long these irregularities lasted. The phrase used is, "after a long period." The period of the overdraft is eight years.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not think it is fair to say that we had the means of knowing unless he means that the Barbados Government had the means of knowing. It is nice to put it that way. The Hon. Premier referred to the fact that this overdraft was from Barclay's Bank, and he also referred to the fact that the West Indian Governments sat down and allowed Trinidad to look after the accounting. I am going to put to him something which I will call an elementary business principle. This Trade Commissioner's Office was running in Canada. They were finding this overdraft necessary. Let the honourable member convince anyone outside of the Mental Hospital or his own Party that for eight years this office could run an overdraft amounting to \$17,000 and that they would not have to send a monthly statement to the auditing authorities in Trinidad. Barclay's Bank would not run an overdraft for \$17 far less \$17,000 under those circumstances. The only way that they would not have to give that monthly statement would be if they were running a business out of their own pockets. But they were doing their business with the backing of the Trinidad Government. Someone would have to back up the overdraft.

I agree that a plot was laid for dishonesty. I cannot imagine Mr. Stollmeyer running this business for eight years and not looking at the statement and seeing that this overdraft was being carried. With

the greatest respect to Mr. Stollmeyer, I say that if he is not dishonest, he must be inefficient. Which honourable member of this House would run a business that way unless he wanted to go bankrupt? Of course if you run a business badly and you go bankrupt your friends say you are a fool. If you make money, they say you are a thief. But no one could convince me in this case and in these circumstances that we should vote for this amount.

The Hon. Premier cannot make any excuse for Mr. Stollmeyer. Mr. Stollmeyer was, so to speak, the Manager of this Service, and he would have to see every one, two or three months a statement on the business. Mr. Stollmeyer was running the Service, paying salaries and so on. What was the overdraft for. The Hon. Premier talked about bulk purchasing. He could not have been serious. This overdraft came about as a result of conspiracy to defraud. It was nothing else but that. This Service was being run; Mr. Stollmeyer's salary would be so much, his Assistant's salary would be so much, other expenses would be so much. This office was being run at \$10,000 a year. What was this overdraft for?

Therefore it was a definite fraud. If I were running a business, and you were managing it and you could not find out that this overdraft was being carried, and if the Trinidad Government did not draw it to our attention, I repeat, I am not voting one cent of this money. Let the Trinidad Government pay for it. If the Trinidad Accountant-General is being defended, the time has come when you have to get up in here and say how you feel about these things. There is a tendency in this island to defend one set of people if they are high officials; but that should not be so. I do not think that the amount charged for going back and investigating for eight years is extravagant; but to ask us to pay a portion of the expenses incurred by the very person whose duty is to investigate this business, if we did that, the Trinidad Government would come to the conclusion that we are a bunch of nitwits. How are you going to pay money for this person, when it was his duty to look after the matter? I do not think we should pay any of this money at all. Ask the most junior member of any bank if you can run an overdraft without having to give a statement every year. Think of any business in Bridgetown being run by a manager who would not have a statement every year showing an overdraft and for whom he was running it. Somebody must be responsible for that. Now when it comes to this matter, I am seconding the motion for the deletion from this schedule the part which deals with the expenses of the Trade Commissioner.

I would like to say one last thing. I must thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation in the end, and I want to warn him. He referred to the fact that he felt it was unnecessary to teach people the A. B. C. of things and so on, because we offer co-operation to the Government in respect of things for the advancement of the people of this colony. Do not let him think that we are giving up our right and that we do not understand things. Whenever anything is for the interest of this colony we will demand a proper explanation from the floor of this House; and if the Hon. Premier does not understand anything, he should not come in here with it, because we will fight with any matter until it has been explained to us. I regret that in this matter I cannot vote one cent. Nothing convinces me that a man of Mr. Stollmeyer's ability, — this is a small office when you compare it with other offices, — in managing this office would not have known about this big overdraft, and that his assistant had been borrowing money or using money

which would be a case of embezzlement for another person or conspiracy, or that this man had been using official funds and Mr. Stollmeyer knew nothing of it. Now the auditor from Trinidad goes up and it is said that the money had been used and put back; but for of all that period, we have been carrying an overdraft and paying interest. Somebody has been using money and putting it back and you cannot tell me if the interest on that money which was used, has been paid back. Nobody has been instructed to start a prosecution. Mr. Stollmeyer would have to know about this dishonest practice or he would be incompetent. I am gracious enough to say that he did not know about this matter, but he would be incompetent if he did not know about it. Let me say this, that when you are in a high position as Auditor General in Trinidad and you find out this thing and you ask the public to pay \$2,000, you cannot call the matter squared. I beg to second the motion for the deletion of this part of the Schedule.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It would be unfair if I did not reply after the powerful appeal to honourable members not to vote this money. I say again the honourable member has forgotten some of the things I have put to him. We all knew every year that there was this overdraft. Take 1954 when Mr. Mordecai went up and Mr. Savage did the auditing. Mr. Mordecai said that the Trade Commissioner's Office could not do so many jobs. The Trade Commissioner could not see after all the accounting; he cannot do everything. You say that anybody is manager when things go wrong.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not say that at all. I said that the manager of an office like this would have seen the statement every month and would have known what his accounts were.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I withdraw that. All I am saying is that people in certain positions would not know everything that is taking place in an office. Unless Mr. Stollmeyer was making a detail survey, he could not be held to be negligent in this matter. I say again that since 1931 we have agreed to this arrangement that Trinidad should do the accounting. We knew that there was an overdraft. I think it was the honourable junior member for the City who said that Mr. Stollmeyer was not sufficiently well paid. I am not condoning any overdraft. For fifteen years Mr. Stollmeyer never had a chance of seeing his aged mother. Sir John Chandler and Sir John Saint have said that the office was not properly paid. You pay a clerk at Fogarty's \$15.00 per month, and do you not expect him to borrow money; you are asking him to borrow money.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: If the honourable member would give way to me, I would like to say that in 1947—48 we voted £419 for the Trade Commissioner Service in Canada and about five times that amount was spent. In 1946—47 the sum of £356 was voted and nearly six times that amount was spent, therefore they have been asking for more money and they must have been making some kind of check, or they would not know about this matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Trinidad Government has told us that because of the desire not to spend too much money, and because we did not increase these people's money, these things took place. Along with that they have not been estimating as carefully as they should. They were unable to make two ends meet therefore, they had to get a loan from Barclay's Bank. If it were a 'pooh-pooh' bank, it would insist on knowing what were your transactions month by month.

Mr. LEWIS: The Hon. Premier is entirely wrong. These Canadian bankers have come down

here, and have taught the Englishman's system of banking. They would have disputed it immediately.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Is this a meeting of the St. Michael's Vestry, where a member gets up every minute? I would like to know what reputable bank would want to see every transaction. I say that Barclay's Bank is a reputable bank and it would not give you overdrafts if you were not showing them your transactions from time to time.

However indignant we may be, there is nothing on this question of overdraft at all. Even if it is that you did not give this gentleman enough money, or that he could not foresee everything, he had to get more money. Is that a crime? I repeat, for us to say or for any other West Indian Government to say, it is Trinidad that did it therefore, let Trinidad pay it, that would be dishonesty, because the Trinidad Government was the agent of all the other Governments. The Trinidad Government was appointed by all the other Governments to see after their interest. The Trinidad Government has accounted and told us that for all these years there were these overdrafts and we did not stop them. It is only when we put our feet down on the matter and said that this accounting was not done properly enough, and called upon the Trinidad Government to give a full statement that we found out. We then discovered what was taking place. We then discovered that these people were not having enough money, therefore that was the cause for these overdrafts. (A VOICE: eight years?)

It could be eight hundred years. If we allowed it to happen for all those years and now say that we are not paying, is nothing but dishonesty. Honourable members may be surprised to know that our contribution to this service is only 7%. Trinidad's contribution is 45%. I have only said that to show that each colony is paying according to the proportion of service it receives; and to show that we are part of the system, and we share in the expenses. If we are part of the system and we agree to it, to say that we are not paying, such is dishonesty. If half dozen fellows agree to go out on a spree together and to pay five dollars for defraying the cost of drinks etc., if after everything was totalled and the secretary told you that your amount came to \$7.50 because of over expenditure, would you say that you are not going to pay it? (A VOICE: We would pay but we might not go back with that man.) That is what the people of the Bahamas have done. They have paid, but they have declared their intentions of coming out. Let us do that if you like. Nor would I cry over that. If some one were to get up and say we in Barbados have had enough, let us get out of it, I may agree; but we must pay our share of 7%, and let Trinidad pay theirs. Let somebody get up and say, in the future Barbados must come out of the R.E.C.; but do not say today that we are not obligated. Let us not go on record as having done a dishonest thing. It would be dishonest if we took part in an arrangement and now we are not sticking to our part. I make my last plea. Honourable members can be as indignant as they like over this matter. Say that we have had enough of it; but do not let us say we are not paying this.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—I have been looking through the manifesto of the Party to which I belong to find out whether in any part of it we agreed to subscribe to any fraudulent transaction but I have not found such a thing. I listened to the impassioned defence made by the Hon. Premier, but I am not convinced by the explanation which has been adduced. I feel up to this moment, the Hon. Premier is not fully apprised of the facts in

this transaction. That organization approached the Government for \$356 in a particular year to run its affairs and after going through their accounts carefully over that particular period they found that the amount that was necessary was \$1,709 in addition to the \$356, that meant that their expenses had increased by 500% in that particular year.

When we come now to the year 1947—48 we find that they asked for a contribution of \$419.60 and they spent \$2,011. That meant that they came back to the Legislature for a further amount in the vicinity of \$1,600. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph now wants to tell this House that we have to assume the responsibility for the irregularity which has occurred; and that we knew about it all the time. I was not even in the island of Barbados. No one in Trinidad or Canada voted for me as far as I know. I have got to answer honestly to the electorate of my parish as to how the taxpayers' money is being spent. It is obnoxious to my reasoning powers to suggest to me that an organisation which could come back for specific supplementary votes year after year, from the beginning of the eight-year period down to now, increasing their expenditure by 500 per cent. could have to run an overdraft.

In 1948—49 they asked for \$2,200. They found out that there was a big difference between what they were asking for, and their actual expenditure. But they preferred the course of coming back in the subsequent years and asking for supplementary votes. Now the Premier is telling us that we must take on ourselves, by some act of transferred liability, this guilt, by the very fact that we are participating in the Trade Commissioner Service in Canada; and therefore not only are we liable for any defalcations made by this gentleman when he was in control of this service, but we would be letting down the other West Indian Governments, and would be dishonest if we refused to condone anything which appears to be dishonest.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member must not misquote me. No money loss due to dishonesty is involved in this matter. The amount to be voted is purely the cost of the investigation. What the House can do is to tell the Trade Commissioner not to come back for any more supplementary votes and to estimate better.

Mr. BARROW: I wish that the honourable member had not interrupted me. He said that the only money involved in this Resolution is the cost of the inquiry into the irregularities that have occurred. If spending your employer's money, regardless of whether you put it back or not, is not fraudulent conversion, I do not know what they call it in Canada. The Honourable Premier went further. This is such a jury matter, that he is accusing the jury of dishonesty if they do not acquit his client because they failed to be convinced by the Counsel for the Defence. I am not persuaded by the argument that the \$17,000 is nothing to do with the defalcations. I am not saying that it is so one way or the other; but I am not satisfied that it is not so.

When the Accountant General made his monthly or quarterly statements all about this overdraft should appear. In such a statement liabilities would have to be set off against assets. The Hon. Premier tells us that we knew all about it. I doubt whether he himself knew about it. He suggested that the Trinidad Government knew about it. I doubt that such is true either. I doubt whether a \$17,000 overdraft could go undetected for a period of eight years, or that the bank would allow it. It

is said that the fraudulent conversion was between one yearly audit and the other. That is why I rose again. When the Hon. Premier suggested that we would be dishonest if we refused to pass this vote, I considered it from a different angle altogether. When I joined the honourable member's party I did not say at any time that I would condone dishonesty or fraud; and I cannot do it today. I cannot find anywhere in my manifesto where, when I am not convinced about a certain thing which does not involve socialist principles, that I must vote for it.

The Hon. Premier talked about poisoning himself. I suppose he would prefer to poison me. That would be an easy solution. But until he does that I will not associate myself with anything which savours of dishonesty, and which I am not convinced is in the interest of the public.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman.—In this matter there are several factors involved. What I think is responsible for the unnecessarily long debate is the fact that the Hon. Premier failed to give us the necessary information in the first place. A Resolution like this would probably require a good lot of information if the Hon. Premier was hoping at least that the members of this Chamber would vote for it.

The question is whether or not we should vote this money. We are committed to it. There is an agreement already in force and which has been honoured for the last eight years, by virtue of the fact that we are a participating colony. The most we can do is to fail to participate in the future. What I am not happy about, is the Premier's attempt to justify this irregularity by saying that this Assistant Commissioner did not cheat or steal, but that it was just a question of taking out funds and replacing them. In Barbados you can get sent to prison for stealing a yam, or a potato, or a cake of soap.

It is claimed that legal advice was sought as to whether or not a prosecution should be brought and it was decided not to. I do not think that that is the best thing which could have happened. As I have said, we are already a participating colony, and we cannot say that we will not vote this merely because there have been irregularities. The most we can do is to cease to participate in the future. If you had a business undertaking with a merchant and your servant stole something it would not mean that you would be able to get out of that undertaking. You cannot say that you are no longer responsible. When you are about to employ someone you check his character and testimonials as well as you can; but if he cheats, you are not to be blamed. You must have some faith in human beings.

What I cannot understand is how you can spend almost \$10,000 purely in investigations. It leaves you to imagine several things. It is all right to say that the money we are being asked to vote does not represent money that was lost through dishonesty. But the fact remains that if there had been no irregularities there would be no need to spend money on investigations.

Whatever happens through the Assistant Trade Commissioner, whether he stole this money or not, he is cheating the taxpayers of these colonies because it involves the cost of nearly \$10,000 to investigate this irregularity. This is really condoning what is regarded as cheap larceny! (Mr. LEWIS: It is expensive larceny!) It is expensive larceny; but the idea of failing to vote this money because we believe that there was some irregularity when expert legal opinion was taken as to whether or

not you should punish this man, is a question of whether or not we should accept it as the best thing or not. What we should decide to do, is to fail to be a member of this scheme; but this expenditure is simply a humane responsibility which you cannot deny. You have agreed with these people. Something has happened beyond the control of any participating Government, and because of larceny do you decline to pay this money? This money has to be paid for the investigation into this matter, and the least thing that participating Governments could do, would be to check up and see what has happened. Let us say that it is our obligation. If we have put ourselves in this matter then we are obligated to pay.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.15 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I ask leave to postpone this Resolution.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1954—55, NO. 13

PINE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution for the sum of \$12,050 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, is to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part II—Capital as shown in the Schedule to this Resolution. Honourable members will remember that last year the sum of \$69,130 was approved by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation and sanctioned by the Secretary of State for the colonies on the 10th October 1953, for the construction of the Pine Primary School. The sum of \$10,000 of that amount was spent in the financial year which has just ended, and there was a revote of 49,120 in the financial year. Included in this amount is the sum of \$5,000 to construct a road leading from the St. Barnabas cross road to the school, and also to construct a yard. This sum has proved insufficient to carry out that work. The House is now asked to supplement that amount by voting for the sum of \$1,250, to complete the construction of the required road and yard. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would just like to ask one question on this Resolution. Is this increase an expenditure for new work or the construction has exceeded the estimate? Are we making that road longer or the yard bigger? I would like to know that, because I feel that it is time that the

Highways and Transport Department estimate on these matters with greater accuracy.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I think the public appreciates the work done on the St. Barnabas School and I too am glad that a good job has been done. But I would like at this stage to remind the Government that in 1949 this Chamber passed an Address to the Head of the Administration suggesting the building of a new school in the parish of St. John or the reconstruction of the existing school. I took that Address to the Acting Governor Mr. Perowne and he visited the school which was mentioned in that Address. He saw where it was very inconvenient for the pupils and the staff to endure the difficulties which were experienced there, and he immediately got hold of the Public Works Department. He got them to change the windows so as to give a little more light. I think that it was during that time that the Government had under consideration the building of a modern school in the parish of St. John.

I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Government bench, what has become of that programme. The Address was passed since 1949, and since then many new schools in other parishes have been constructed; yet up to now, nothing has been started in St. John. Mr. Chairman,—I am not magnifying the case. I feel that at some time or the other honourable members have passed that area and have seen the condition of that school. The walls are low and one can reach the ceilings with ease with upstretched arms. It can easily be said that this school was built about 200 years ago when storms were more prevalent in this island; but today conditions there are not conducive to the better well-being of the children. I am appealing to the Government to go into this matter because, at the time that my Address was passed by this hon. Chamber, the suggestion came from some honourable member of the Government, that the construction of that school was under consideration.

Sir, I hope the Hon. Minister of Works would search up the files over this matter. I hope that at any future discussion of construction of additional schools, he would pay some attention to the necessary claims of the large body of pupils and members of the staff of that school. I would ask the honourable member to pay a visit to that school when it is in session and see conditions for himself. I mean the St. John mixed school.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I cannot answer off hand the question asked by the honourable junior member for the City. All the information I have is, that of the funds provided, \$5,000 was not sufficient to carry out the work of the construction of the required yard and road. I presume however, owing to the large excavation made, that it had to be rebuilt with large boulders, and that may have accounted for the increase in cost. I cannot say that there has been any more work done than was anticipated originally.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.
7 p.m.

RESOLUTION FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF AT ERDISTON

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for the sum of \$1,746 under Head XX, Education, in respect of Erdiston College. This provision is required to meet the proposed increase in buildings, staffing and teaching facilities at Erdiston, in order to accommodate not only teachers from the Windward and Leeward Islands, but, additional

teachers from Barbados, — a scheme which the House knows of already. The Resolution, as honourable members will see, includes \$200. Cost of Living Allowances, and makes provisions for the following additional staff: Two maids, two gardeners and one scrubber. If honourable members need any more information, will they please ask me for it.

I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I see that there will be two maids, — one for the Barbados Scheme and the other for the Leeward Islands Scheme. Is the Leeward Islands going to pay one of them? I am referring to the information contained in the Civil Establishment Order No. 10. I take it that this \$15.00 a month is the regular pay, and that these people might get some accommodation too. I also notice that the scrubber is to get the same salary as the maids.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is referring to the Civil Establishment Order. I am not saying that he is wrong. I am not one of those who stick to the strict letter of the rules when there is no point in doing so. As far as the Order is concerned, as a result of the Barbados Scheme you need an extra tutor, and she will be able to cope with the teaching for the Windward Islands Scheme. As a result of the Leewards Scheme you need an additional cook. A cook is a cook. It is not to say that the Leeward Islands people's meals will be cooked in a separate saucepan. It will be just an additional cook.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—This is a new agreement which we are entering into with other West Indian colonies. In the past we have entered into similar agreements as innocently as we are about to enter into this. If not innocently, then at least with very little discussion. We only seem to criticise subsequently, the enormous supplementary grants which are asked of us to contribute to the expenses of the running of these schemes with which we are affiliated.

I would like to take the opportunity now that we are discussing this Resolution to elicit from the Government, the assurance that we are not going to take any financial burden which should legitimately be carried by the other colonies. I hope that the Hon. Minister for Education is considering the remarks which I am making. If we are entering into an agreement to train 32 teachers at Erdiston from other colonies, we should see to it that these colonies pay what is their due. I hope, sir, that the honourable member will make sure that the training of these teachers does not become a burden on the taxpayers of this colony. When we are federated these things can be done; but now each colony has to look out for itself and for its people. While the project may appear to be a good one, I still do not want the taxpayers of Barbados to subsidise education in these other colonies. At this stage therefore, it is proper that the Government should make sure that these colonies pay adequately for the maintenance and training of the teachers they send up here. I hope that the honourable member will make a statement on the suggestion that I have made.

Mr. LEWIS: This scheme will last for some time, and at least one post is to be established, — that of assistant cook. If the assistant cook has got to be put on the established staff, why should the maid be put on the unestablished staff? I suppose it is in keeping with the principle followed in other institutions. But it does appear strange that the maid, who is just as necessary as the cook, should be on

the unestablished staff. We are taking on someone and incurring pension rights for them. I do not know what provision is being made for part of the pension to be paid out of this scheme. I think it is a wonderful scheme to have people coming from one island to another to be trained. I am sorry that the training is being done in Barbados only. I think it would be a very good thing for Barbadians to get an opportunity to go out to be trained somewhere else. It is time that Barbadians went out to see somewhere else.

As far as the maid is concerned, I suppose the explanation is a simple one. In other institutions, I suppose, maids are on the unestablished or non-established staff. But it does not seem right that the maid and the cook should be on a different footing.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—My colleague anticipated me somewhat. I agree that it is a very laudable scheme. I hope that in the not too distant future there will be schemes available to send elementary school teachers from here to as far as British Guiana. I hope that the Minister for Education will note that down as a matter of future policy. On the threshold of federation we should know more about the customs and the way of life of our colonial brothers. Teachers should be given this opportunity to exchange visits. It is the teachers who would best be able to pass on to the others what they have learnt.

7.10 p.m.

I want to know this: Do the cooks and maids get their meals? I agree with my colleague. I cannot see how the assistant cook is pensionable, but the maid and scrubber are not pensionable. I can tell you that all the parochial institutions in St. Michael, all these employees are pensionable, and they are fed substantially. I want to assure the honourable member that the salaries paid by the Parochial Institutions to their employees are better than what are proposed here. As a matter of fact, if you look at the Parochial Pension Act you will observe that the employees are pensionable by Statute. I should therefore like the Hon. Premier to be able to say what is the reason for making the post of assistant cook pensionable and not the maid and the scrubber. They are part and parcel of the establishment. If you have the cook you must have the scrubber and the maid. It is not merely a question of somebody coming in and getting a day's work to do, and going out and coming in four days' time. This is an establishment in which people will have to work for thirty days a month. I believe the Hon. Premier will be able to answer me as to whether these subordinates are being fed.

Just let me say this; we have acknowledged today that domestic servants are better cared for, and that you get better service from them if you see to it that they are fed with the same type of food as they would get elsewhere. I appreciate the difficulties which would obtain up there; but I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to answer the questions I have asked. As I have said, this is a very laudable scheme; I wholeheartedly agree with having these teachers coming up here, and I would like to see an interchange of Elementary school teachers. I know of instances where persons have been in the service of this country for many years and through illness or unforeseen circumstances, have had to be transferred to other colonies; and unless they have the good fortune of getting a certificate for illness they will have to give up all their time; whereas, if you have a policy where teachers could be interchanged, their service could be taken into account and consideration

could be given to them. I do not agree that any teacher in any Secondary school is better than a teacher at an Elementary school. I feel that the Elementary school teacher is more responsible for the building up of the majority of the people in this colony. I repeat that arrangements should be so made, whereby secondary school teachers do not lose their service in Barbados or Grenada or St. Vincent. I do not see why the policy of interchange should not be adopted. I leave this matter in the hands of the Hon. Premier, in whose hands is the whole educational policy.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I would like to congratulate the honourable senior member for the City who is a member of the St. Michael's Vestry, for making it clear that it is not necessary to have an inquiry conducted into the conditions existing at the St. Michael's Almshouse. The meals are so much that they do not have to cut down the provisions from 30 cents a day to 25 cents a day. I do not know whether the cooks are fed, but I do not think they would be paid \$7.00 per week and not fed. I presume that they are fed, but I will enquire into the matter. I would just like to mention that none of the gardeners at the different institutions are established. I am informed that neither the scrubber nor the gardener is on the establishment. It may be that the Civil Service Association has never put up the matter to the Government. As long as you are having these Institutions you will always have need of a cook and a scrubber and gardener. As far as the whole idea is concerned, even without Federation, we may have the Leewards and Windwards sending up people to Erdiston.

In reply to the honourable senior member for St. John I will say that the current cost has been worked out. The recurrent cost will be in the vicinity of \$49,000. If the matter is worked proportionately, the Leewards and Windwards will pay their fair share and they will have 32 teachers.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable junior member for the City seems to deplore the fact that this training for West Indian teachers has been established in Barbados. I know that there is a school of thought both in this House and outside this House, which feels that Barbados is almost the worst place in which any sort of Federal Institution should be instituted. Similar views have been expressed with regard to making Barbados the site of the Federal Capital. The proponents feel that since there is no mark of any deep national feeling or any militant public spiritedness, the other colonies have nothing to gain by any close association with us, and much to lose. It is manifestly beyond the financial ability of most of the smaller West Indian colonies to establish their own training school for teachers. As a matter of fact, at one time it was felt to be beyond our ability even to do it for ourselves. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, the proposal was made not so long ago that teachers should go to Trinidad for training. That was before we established Erdiston, and I recall that on the floor of this House people like the honourable junior member for St. James and Mr. H. W. Springer, raised their voices in holy horror at the thought of sending poor, innocent, christian-minded teachers to an ungodly place like Trinidad to be dominated with the foul atmosphere.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I hope that those are not my quoted words.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member would remember that he was bitterly opposed to the idea. It may be true that in this colony there is a deplorable absence of any real public spirit. There are many matters in the body politic of which we

may with extreme regret, be forced to admit; but I cannot think of any other West Indian colony which is more suited today to fill the role of mother of West Indian families than Barbados.

Trinidad Sir, happens to be a desirable choice. Jamaica is not central. I do imagine that there are certain people who regard British Guiana as eminently suitable; but I still think that there are others in the majority who might feel that even if that country had any potentiality in the past to that position, owing to conditions today, it has not the claim to the same role. That being the case, Barbados is the only choice.

I do feel that people like the honourable junior member for the City, who like most of us deplore the sickening political atmosphere in Barbados and other phases of conditions in this country, might eventually convince themselves, that we have the most to offer and that they owe a duty to the community and to themselves, to endeavour to change the conditions in Barbados which in their opinion make this country so suitable for setting the example to the rest of the West Indies. It is up to them to arouse a deeper sense of West Indian Nationalism in Barbados; and to arouse a deeper sense of public spiritedness and to endeavour to instil into the minds of people in this country a greater appreciation. This can be termed to be their natural heritage through their position in the West Indian scheme of affairs as Barbadians; and they should breed a deeper and more abiding loyalty to West Indian Nationalism than now exists in this Island of ours.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I do not know how many members of this House realize that we are only carrying on a tradition. The old Rawle Training Institute which was attached to Codrington College has trained many teachers from the Leeward and Windward Islands in its day before it was abolished some years ago. That teaching was passed on to Trinidad and Jamaica. However I think it is a very admirable thing that this training for teachers should be re-established here; not from the point of view of more strangers coming here and gaining a unique philosophy of this ever unique colony, but I think it is very good for Barbadians themselves to mix with people who do not have such a unique outlook as they. Mr. Chairman,—I knew my country better, by going abroad and mixing with other people. It was only then that I could see the defects which were evident in Barbadians; therefore it is good that 32 teachers from abroad should come here and be trained along side our own. I think they have an outlook from which our teachers can gain. Their cultural background is different from ours. Ours is uniquely English,—Victorian for that matter.—and I think that it is all for the good of Barbadians that they should mix with people from the Leeward and Windward Islands who have a French outlook.

There is only one thing on which I would like to issue a warning. I remember well that at the Rawle Training Institute, teachers from the Leeward and Windward Islands had one complaint, and I hope it will not obtain here again. Apparently food was very cheap in those colonies in those days and teachers were able to get it full and plenty, but when they came here, they could not get sufficient to eat. I do hope we would not establish that reputation again.

Mr. LEWIS: In fairness to myself I should like to make an explanation. I feel that in spite of the fact that we have our own training college, it would be a good thing if we encouraged some teachers from Trinidad to come here and be trained

and we send an equal amount there to be trained also. If we take what the honourable junior member for St. John has said,—he suggested that never mind the number of people with whom he has mixed in Barbados, he did not know some of the faults of Barbadians until he went outside. Therefore it would be a good thing if some of our teachers go outside and mix with others. I too think it will be a good thing if some of our teachers are trained outside.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I think I should mention that consequent on this increase of staff, the operative cost of Erdiston Training College would go up. Some time later, when this House assembles after prorogation, I shall come with a supplementary resolution for an amount to cover that cost. I think I should let this House know that before hand.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am willing to agree with that motion, provided that postponement of that Resolution for \$2,718 really means postponement. If it is an attempt to wait until this House gets thin, and pass it then I think it would be entirely wrong. I would therefore suggest with respect to that particular Resolution that we pass the money for the Public Library alone. The other amount can be postponed until this House meets after the prorogation, when the Hon. Premier would get more information on it. We could pass it in a different atmosphere.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Having seconded the motion for the postponement of this Resolution made by my colleague, I want to say that I am going to put faith in the motion before the House; because from the time I have known the honourable junior member for St. Thomas who is now Leader of the House, I can say that he is not only honourable in title, but in everything else. You would have to bring the guns of Singapore to make him do otherwise. His attitude has always been honourable. Since he has assumed the role of Leader of this House, he has never told us that he was going to postpone a measure, and when the House got thin then take the opportunity to do it then. Postponement for him means postponement until another day.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: As has been said, we would need this money for the Library. So I am going to ask to withdraw my motion, and that the Resolution for \$2,718 be reconsidered.

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

RESOLUTION FOR LIBRARY AND TRADE COMMISSIONER

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I accept the motion made by the honourable junior member for the City.

The question that Head 22 Public Library, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I move that Head 28 be postponed.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member could withdraw this part of the Resolution and bring it back after the prorogation. I merely

suggested doing that, so that there might be no doubt of any kind whatsoever in the minds of honourable members.

The question that Head 28 be postponed was put and agreed to.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I move now, sir, that the Resolution for the sum of \$515.00 do now pass.

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — I beg to move that you do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

7.35 p.m.

AMENDMENTS OF OTHER PLACE TO PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— Order No. 2 which stands in my name is to move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Public Health.

There are quite a few amendments, sir; 27 in all. There are one or two of serious importance and the others are mainly grammatical errors,—errors in punctuation and things of that sort. The first one is quite obvious. It is an amendment to Section 1 changing the figures "1953" to "1954". The second one deletes "area" as defined here, and substitutes a new definition which is in order. The old definition of area was included because at the time that this Bill was before the House the fate of the Local Government Bill was unknown, and it was put in to suit this Bill, so to speak. That is amendment (a) to Clause 2.

Amendment (b) changes the words "one hundred and thirteen" to "eighty-seven" in the definition of "statutory nuisance." There are quite a few of such amendments. The most serious have to do with the matter of inspection under the Factories Act. If this Bill had been passed as it originally was, there were provisions which would have caused a sort of dual control. It was agreed to by the Government therefore, that certain amendments should be effected which would avoid the position of dual control. The amendments take the form of deleting certain provisions dealing with inspection. This provision already appears in the Factories Act. For example, Clause 87 (1) (e) refers to any "workroom, shop, office, factory, workshop, warehouse or other place of business". Those places are already provided for in the Factories Act, and naturally sir, it is considered just and proper that they should be taken out of this Bill. An amendment for a similar purpose is amendment (e) to clause 155.

I think that I should draw to the attention of honourable members the amendment to this clause. That is amendment (b) to this clause. It results in the deletion of the words beginning "in cases" in line 6 to the end of the clause. That, sir, is the result of an old established difference of opinion between the Government and the present Sanitary Boards as regards to the provision of water at schools for sanitary purposes. The Bill as passed by the House provided for the payment of half of the cost of such water by the Education Department and the other half by the Sanitary Authorities in the vari-

ous parishes. That has been deleted by the Other Place so that the full cost would have to be borne by the Education Department.

I am sure that the honourable senior member for the City will bear me out when I say that this has been an old conflict between the Government and the Sanitary Bodies. I am not saying that the conflict is over, because we may come back with an amendment embodying the principle which was in the Bill as passed by the House. Of course Barbados is a small place. In big countries the Local Authorities provide schools. In Barbados the Government provides the schools. (A MEMBER: Provides the money to pay the masters.) It is felt that it is only right that the Local Authorities should contribute their portion of the cost of sanitary amenities at the schools.

As I said, sir, those are the most important amendments. I now move, sir, that these amendments be read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion.

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the amendments be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—Before the amendments are read a second time I would like to say a word or two, even at the risk of having some foul mouth type of Minister-Journalist misinterpret the true position by coming out in the newspaper with glaring headlines about trying to delay the passing of these Bills. I would like to say to the Hon. Minister in charge,—because I am so acquainted with this Act, and as he himself knows I have on several occasions discussed with him the original Bill and discussed—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member made some remarks about a foul minded Minister-Journalist. Does that refer to any member of this House?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I said "foul mouth type of Minister-Journalist."

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the honourable member use the word "type"?

7.45 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is what I said. I am saying, sir, even at the risk of being the subject of the headlines to which I referred, because I am so acquainted with this Bill, because I dealt with it exhaustively when it was before the House, and because the Hon. Minister in charge of it has discussed it with me from every angle on former occasions, that I am going to agree to its passing today. I just want to counsel honourable members about this.

You have a serious duty to perform as a member of this House. When you have such amendments to a Bill which is so voluminous as this is with a number of amendments made by the Other Place, you should demand not only that we be given the amendments but that we should also be given the Bill as passed by this House. I was not here when this Bill was dealt with last year. There are other honourable members who were not here and they have not got any copies of the Bill. I repeat that when you sent out amendments you should also send with those amendments a copy of the Bill, so that honourable members will be able to compare and make suggestions and see whether the amendments are amendments with which they can agree or not. I am not one of those who would defend the Other Place for the sake of defending the Other Place; but as a former honourable member for St. George, Mr. H. W. Springer, has said: "the Other Place is part of the Legislature but I

do not agree with every amendment they make. I remember that last week when we were dealing with a section of the Local Government Bill, it was said that if we took out a particular word the Other Place might not agree with it. If something does not read well and you make an amendment or you postpone it, I cannot imagine the Other Place being so pig-headed as to attempt not to pass it. They cannot afford to do that in this day. They have a greater sense of responsibility. Sometimes honourable members want to force something through the House, dominate other honourable members and then they pass it by a majority at two o'clock in the morning. I am only telling honourable members that I shall vote for these amendments today although I was not in the House. There are several other honourable members who were not here when the Bill was passed; but it is customary to send out the Bill along with the amendments which have been made to it.

I am excusing the Government today because of the information of the prorogation of the Legislature on Tuesday next: but I am not committing myself to the policy of sending out amendments from the Other Place and asking me just to agree with them before I can make any comparison with the Bill as passed by this House. I have been able to secure this copy of the Bill late this afternoon but there is not one copy of the old Bill in the place. It would be infinitely better when Bills of this sort come up to have a sufficient number of copies printed so that honourable members can have copies and be able to compare the Bill as passed by this House with the amendments which have been made. Everybody knows the hard work which we had to do on this Bill when it was considered by this House in 1948, and I commend to the Government the suggestion which I have just made.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am in the same difficulty because, whereas in the case of the "Maude" Bill I was able to put in my amendments, I really do not know what I am passing now. I do not know if I am agreeing to good law or to bad law. That is the position. All I have here is a series of amendments and I do not know, I repeat, whether I am helping to make good legislation or bad legislation. The other point is that this House will be prorogued next week but if you are working according to conventions—the Hon. Premier says that he would like to get through a certain amount of legislation and then the Legislature will be prorogued—honourable members will take a recess. That is largely regulated by Standing Orders in the House of Commons. As far as I am concerned I am not opposing this matter.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I appreciate all that honourable members have said; but as I have said already this procedure was adopted so as to expedite matters so that the House may be prorogued. I would like to say that I keep Bills which have been passed by this House and it would be advisable if honourable members would do the same (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This is not the same Bill). The Bills which are passed by this House I keep in my possession until they are passed by the Other Place.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The most of these amendments are alterations to the wording or renumbering of Clauses and so they are not very important; but some other amendments are very important. For instance, in Clause 155 there is an amendment to Sub-clause (d) by the addition of the following words:—

"No bye-laws made under the provisions of this sub-section shall have any application to a factory as defined in the Factories Act, 1947;"

Honourable members should be in a position to see what that amendment refers to. I am aware that many of the factories in this island have no proper sanitary arrangements. There should be some provision made whereby people should be able to take their lunch under proper conditions and not in the open, or under the trees, or some other inconvenient place. We have reached the age when lunch rooms should be provided by the factories.

I think such should be included in any Public Health Act.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I think that what the honourable junior member for St. Thomas must appreciate, is owing to the particular circumstances, if these amendments are not accepted tonight the Bill would have to be printed and gone all over again; but he is responsible for that. There is no reason why we should have been called to consider these forty odd amendments at this time. We should have been given the opportunity to consider them some other day, but we cannot because this Legislature will be prorogued at the next meeting. That is forcing our hands with a vengeance.

The next thing is that the usual process for printing these amendments has not been carried out. There were 57 amendments to the Maude Bill which we dealt with on the last occasion, and the amendments were not printed in a way that we could see the words which were cut out or the words which were put into the original Bill. Everything was printed in the same way so that you would have to read through the whole Bill and the amendments to see what was happening. You could not see at a flash how the amendments affected the original Bill.

As far as these particular amendments are concerned, they are cyclo-styled. This Bill, like the other Bills takes a great deal of thought. Sometimes, there are three different authorities who are responsible for a particular highway and sometimes, none of them knows who is responsible for the gutter or for the pavement or for the highway. Added to that, the Factory Act is mixed up with this Bill. Even in the legal phrases, they make mistakes.

Another thing is, that this Bill was introduced ever since in June 1953, so to say that honourable members must have a copy of the Bill at this time is unreasonable. It is true I have my copy. The Hon. Minister must also bear in mind, that the Bill as was passed by this House was passed with amendments, therefore, when we are looking at that Bill, without these amendments would confuse you.

It seems to me when we are finished with these elaborate Bills a person would not be able to walk about his own house or dig in his own garden. I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister of Social Services with his special knowledge of the people from practical experience and from his profession, would see to it that this type of legislation would not be unduly burdensome on the people, but that it would be a credit to himself and to the island.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the amendments were then agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF THE POOR IN THE ISLAND

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services. To move consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled An Act to make provision for the relief of the Poor in the island.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: These amendments were made by the Other Place to the Public Assistance Bill. I regret, Sir, that the original copy of the Bill, as was passed by this House, was not circulated along with the amendments; however, the amendments are only a few.

The first amends Clause 2 by changing the date from 1953 to 1954. The second is the same thing. It amends Clause 27 by changing the date from 1953 to 1954.

I think I should say a few words with respect to the amendments to Clause 30 of the Bill. Clause 30 is designed to render assistance by way of loans to people who might not be altogether paupers, but who need some assistance. To guarantee that loan, the Bill as passed by this House asked the employer of the person needing assistance to guarantee that loan, and to assist in collecting it. The Other Place agrees in principle with this assistance by way of loan; but when it comes to the matter of collecting, they feel that the person to whom the loan was granted should be responsible and if necessary it should be collected through the Petty Debt Court. Accordingly those sub-sections—2, 3, 4 and 5—which relate to the employer assisting in collecting that loan have been deleted. As the matter stands now, it is a matter between the guardian authorities and the person to whom the loan is given. As it is now, sub-section one becomes the main Clause—the others are clauses having been deleted—and it reads as follows:—

“Where assistance granted to any person is considered a loan to that person under this Act, or where any agreement or reimbursement has been entered into, any amounts due and owing in pursuance of any such loan or agreement may be recovered on the plaint of the Council in the Petty Debt Court having jurisdiction in the Area of such Council.”

Sir, that shuts out the employer from the responsibility of collecting this loan as was first agreed to by this House. The other amendments are of a milder nature. They are dealing with punctuation and grammar. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion.

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

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

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

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

8.15 p.m.

On the re-assembling:

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE TEACHERS ORDER, 1954

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.—The next Order is to move the passing of a Resolution to make

it lawful, that with effect from 1st April, 1952, the salary scales payable to teachers in First and Second Grade Grant-Aided Schools as set out in Appendix B to Resolution No. 33/1949, shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

As honourable members will see from the Addendum the purpose of this Resolution is to bring the salary scales payable to the teachers mentioned, into line with those payable to Elementary School Teachers under the provisions of the Civil Establishment Teachers (Amendment) Order, 1954, by fixing the second Efficiency Bar at the seventh point in the scales for both men and women teachers. At the present time the second Efficiency Bar is placed at the fifth point in the respective scales for men and women.

It may surprise honourable members to know that this is as simple as that. From the time of Sir Errol Dos Santos' recommendations that scale was fixed for Elementary School Teachers. It is only now that we have got around to fixing it for teachers at Secondary Schools.

I move, sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I will repeat now, what I said during the consideration of the Estimates. I do not think that the Government has any justification for perpetuating the long out-moded system of paying a smaller salary to women than men in the teaching profession. The last time that I raised this point, I heard the vague argument that even in Great Britain under a Socialist Government that system was not abandoned. But those who know anything about Great Britain know that the system does not exist in Great Britain now. There is no authority for arguing that you must pay a woman teacher less than a man when she is in possession of the same qualifications as the man. You do not make difference with women as far as their income tax allowances are concerned. You do not give them any extra concession when you pay them a lower salary.

We today, sir, are nothing to do with an aged old practice. We must evolve something that relates to the present day conditions, and which has a scientific basis. Women teachers have to take the same examinations and sometimes have the same qualifications as male teachers. They have to do the same work. When a woman is appointed as a doctor at the General Hospital she draws the same salary as a man who is appointed to a similar post. The Government accepts that as a principle. Those of us who have any pretensions to be socialists must see now that the time has come when we must drop the old idea that women are of an inferior status and must be given lower salaries than men for doing the same work. It is time for us to begin to regard the teaching profession as a profession. Government must realise that women teachers, whether they are at Elementary or Secondary Schools, should get the same salary as their male colleagues, once they are doing the same work and possess the same qualifications.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—Some years ago mine used to be the lone voice on the point which has just been raised by the honourable member. Then there was a little chorus, when I was joined by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. Well, sir, at one time the honourable junior member for St. Peter was on the Cabinet along with the honourable senior member for St. Michael. One wonders why, with that strong combination on the Cabinet agreeing with the principle of equal pay for women, we did not begin to see results. Of course they were

not Ministers then; but the honourable senior member for St. Michael is a Minister now. But I have no doubt that he being one of the dominant voices in the Cabinet, he will be able to persuade his recalcitrant colleagues into seeing the light of day.

There is nothing more unjust, than that of people doing the same work, being discriminated against because of the sole reason of sex. I presume that the honourable senior member for St. Michael is of the same view now as held before. I presume that he is just as persuaded of the justice of the principle of equal pay now, as he was before he was a member of the Cabinet; and I presume that we will be seeing results in the near future as a result of the honourable member's persistent pressing. Of course, in the case of women, I do not think there should be any need of pressing. One cannot imagine any minister as intelligent as the Minister for Agriculture not seeing the justice of women's claim.

Perhaps, sir, women have not been sufficiently vocal politically to make people realise that they (the women) are the majority of the population and can seat or unseat ministers as well as floor members of this House. There is no getting away from it that the time is long overdue when we should seriously consider the principle of equal pay. We do not have to follow England all the time. If we do not follow her in this case, we would be doing right.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—This is an old story which we hear every now and then. There is the argument that in the case of the Civil Service males and females get the same salary and they cannot do equal work; but in the teaching profession where it is obvious that they do equal work, the Barbados Government makes a distinction in the salaries.

Now the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that this was a very simple Resolution. It is not the first of its kind. There have been other simple Resolutions worded almost exactly like this, and after the House had passed these Resolutions we have discovered that some other people could rewrite these Resolutions. I hope that if, as the Resolution says, this adjustment is to be made from the 1st April 1952, and there are any teachers who have left the Service since then, they will get any increase provided for in this Resolution. This is a Resolution which could only originate in this House. It is a Resolution that has to do with money, and after it has passed it becomes the law of the land. I hope that when it is passed we will not get a repetition of cases of people not getting their just due.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER, No. 8, 1954

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The next Order is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1954.

As honourable members will see, the Resolution seeks to give effect to the Order which provides for the creation of the additional post of Assistant Livestock officer who will be responsible for the work of artificial insemination at the Central Livestock Station. This is a simple matter and I move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

9.15 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE - SUGAR ORDER

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon. It is a Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation, and Labour Welfare) Order, 1954," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the fifteenth day of July, 1954, under the provisions of Sections 3 (1) (c) and 4 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947 (1947-13), as set out in the Schedule hereto.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Order, 1954.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—As the Addendum sets out, this Resolution seeks to give effect to the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1954, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the fifteenth day of July, 1954, under the provisions of section 3 (1) (c) and 4 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947 (1947-13). As honourable members would see the Schedule sets out in Clause 2 that the old rate of \$13.20 remains unchanged; but there is the new parity figure of 290 wine gallons instead of the old figure of 330 wine gallons in respect of fancy molasses. Under Clause 3 of the Bill the distribution of the levy remains in the three funds and the usual amount is allocated as follows: \$4.80 per ton to the Capital Rehabilitation Board, \$6.00 per ton to the Price Stabilization Reserve Board and \$2.40 to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in respect of Labour Welfare. The present position of the balance in the various funds to the 30th June, 1954 is as follows: The Rehabilitation Reserve Fund, \$161,789.09; Price Stabilization Fund, \$5,615,118.82, and Labour Welfare Fund, \$2,928,941.42. That is the state of the various funds. The only point in this Resolution is that the parity figure is now 290 wine gallons instead of 330 wine gallons as heretofore. The rates of levy are the same as last year and the Order is in the usual form. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution is simple in itself, but it contains some subject matter which they should have dealt with, and also should have made a statement of broad policy on as to the future. These funds have been going on for seven years. I want to show by analysis where in other cases no change has been made. In cases where a change has been made, the Government has not seen fit to make an explanation as to the change. In respect of the Rehabilitation Reserve Fund the amount collected was \$5,240,410.41. This Government has not yet seen the necessity for a review to be taken as to how much more money you want to use for Rehabilitation purposes so that you can see if the £1 per ton, of that requirement, is not to be changed. I am more acquainted with this matter than many members of the Government. I see that the Premier is laughing, because when things are done he gets the credit for them. What is the position today? How many factories have closed

down since 1947, and what were the needs in 1947? Ask any member of the Government that question. I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture cannot answer me.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. I gave those figures last week when the honourable member was not present. Within the last ten years twenty-six factories have been closed down.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am asking if the Hon. Minister knows what the needs were in 1947? What was the position of the Sugar Industry in 1947? So far as the funds are concerned, can you tell us what is the position in 1954 so that we can see what is the relative position between 1947 and 1954. What is the position when a factory is closed down after it has received money from the Rehabilitation Fund? Where do these funds go? Some of us have to think of these matters because we cannot allow pride or arrogance to guide us through life. We have to go through life on bare results which you can prove to the people you represent. The Hon. Minister should be prepared to say what is the position with the Rehabilitation Fund. He should be prepared to say that he is convinced that there is no need for a change from the allocation of \$4.80 per ton. I do not want to imply that you can abandon the Rehabilitation Fund at this stage; but I do say that after seven years' working we should have a progress statement giving a broad picture of the situation so that you could say: "This is how the Funds are being used." This is nothing which one wants to keep in his breast, and which is not for mortal beings; you do not want to say you are the Almighty in certain things but other people are stupid to these things.

Sometimes you want the same people who support you to carry out certain desires; but when it suits you to ridicule them, you do that. I am accepting the olive blossoms from those who are throwing them out.

The Hon. Minister said that the amount of Price Stabilization Fund is \$5,382,000. You are not using this Price Stabilization Fund. No Socialist Government, (not even the Tory Government in Great Britain today, and from all International standards) can begin in any of these colonies to lower a standard of living by reducing the price of a commodity to such a level that it would create cut-throat competition. Prior to the first World War, the standard of living was very low, through the low prices of primary products. For that reason there was an international agreement which aimed at stabilization of prices, and the doing away of the old cut-throat prices. Therefore, let us look at this matter in this light, let us see to what advantage we can best use this \$5,000,000. Are you going to use it? You are putting more to that fund but I do not see the necessity for such. Some of us never had the opportunity of going to a University, but Divine Providence shows you light. He shows you where progress can be made. I want to suggest that this \$5,000,000 is a princely sum to set aside to the Price Stabilization Fund; and it does appear, and I think you would agree with me, that it would be better to make a fresh levy so that more would go to the Labour Welfare Fund.

The amount set down to the Labour Welfare Fund is \$889,354.56 and there is \$2,928,000 set down to the Reserve Fund. Now, there are over 10,000 people who have made applications for loans from the Labour Welfare Fund, and those loans cover \$4,000,000. We owe it to the Government for resisting then, the idea of paying out this money in wages; because if it had been given to the Industry

it would have found its way in the people's pockets, and there would have been no saving. I take this opportunity of paying tribute to the Manager of the Labour Welfare Bank, Mr. Douglas Haynes. I consider that he has done much in making this a function of the Government, and something which should be respected.

When it comes to this marginal difference we are fortunate in this island through big interest in the Sugar Industry, for the amount which we get from this difference. Those of us who have to work around a table with those people, know that when negotiations are going on in these matters they do not get up and shout: "we did it," or "I did it," or "our organisation has done it." The marginal difference this year is \$3.66 per ton.

With regard to your Rehabilitation Reserve Fund you have stated that you have expended all the money; but you will remember that from 1947 when these funds were created you began to make use of that money from the inception of the fund. You will remember that although the Labour Welfare Fund was created at the same time, you did not put the money that accrued to that fund into operation until 1950. Therefore, the workers were not in a position to get any benefits from that fund until 1950. Something between two and three million dollars accrued to that fund during that time but you never expended it. If you had made use of that fund from its inception you would never have had this \$2,000,000 reserve. I want to say that our need for housing the agricultural workers is so great, we cannot do anything else with this fund. At present, there are 10,000 agricultural labourers who have sent in applications for loans from this fund to make repairs to their houses.

What is the situation today? We have this *ad hoc* arrangement of establishing playing fields, and granting loans for the repair of houses of workers in the sugar industry. Would it not be better, if you reviewed the situation according to present-day conditions? Would it not be better, if you went to some of the rural areas and put up some social amenities, like latrines and baths? I am not mixing this with your comprehensive housing scheme. I am only taking into consideration the Labour Welfare Fund. I think it would be a good thing to review the situation in that light. I am not in favour of emergency schemes such as, when you purchase land at Cave Hill; nor do I agree with your purchasing land at Rosegate. I have criticised those things in the past, because as soon as you begin to function like that, you are functioning on what I would term the 'parish pump idea' — that is, when the pump is priming you give something here and something there. I feel you should agree to a situation where this money should be used for a specific purpose, and for what it was intended. After the Labour Welfare Fund was established, it was decided to use it for the following purposes: first, the establishment of playing fields, and secondly, the repair of people's houses. This fund was established in 1947, and I think at this stage after 7 years, the Government should review it. I have certain views in my mind about that Labour Welfare Fund. I feel there can be no better scheme on which you can spend it, than on your going to the rural areas and putting up latrines and baths. I know that there are some people who think that because the law says that these things must be done by the local authority, you cannot build these things, and because of that you should not speak of them. I feel Gov-

ernment can build them out of that fund so long as there is need for them, and also to prevent primitive methods from permeating. I wonder sometimes how things in Barbados strike visitors or people who have travelled abroad. Ask yourself this simple question: when we establish a latrine, are we not establishing it for one of the normal functions of the human body—something that can take place at any time or anywhere? If you go to Bathsheba you cannot find such social amenities. Sometimes there are as many as 1,000 people holidaying at Bathsheba. Of course, when the necessity arises to anyone of them, somewhere out would have to be found; but I do not think we should continue with primitive ideas in 1954. If my grandfather had a cause to do something in some primitive way I do not see the reason why I should do it that way, or even my child.

With regard to housing for the people in the sugar industry, you have only touched the fringe of that point; you have not touched half of it yet. As I have said, there are 10,000 workers who have made applications for loans to repair their houses, and the amount of those loans comes to over \$4,000,000. I think one of the best means of curing juvenile delinquency would be by providing good housing for these sugar workers.

9.35 p.m.

I feel, sir, that the time has come when we should review this matter very carefully. I am not suggesting that we should stop rehabilitation of the factories from getting any funds. But we are going through a change in this island. The change is such that in the Trade Union Movement we have introduced a system of superannuation in the factories, because the factories are closing down at a rate which gives one a headache. When you consider the rehabilitation of factories you must not forget the human element. The whole purpose of rehabilitation is to increase your productive capacity. When that is achieved by forcing people out of work, do you not see that you must adjust yourself to a changing condition?

One gets vulgarisms thrown at him for saying what I am saying now. I am prepared to take them all; but when I start to throw them back, I hope I will not hear anything. I have not the slightest intention from now on of compromising with anyone, no matter who that person may be. I have to work for my living.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister has in mind that whatever the state of affairs may be, the status quo must remain. I feel that it should be his business to see what is the true position. It is true that this particular matter may not be in his department, but if he would accept a suggestion, I would say that as Minister for Agriculture, it is his business to see that he gets an agricultural economist attached to his department. Although I have a certain measure of respect for Hon. H. A. Cuke I do not think it is right that the only person to whom the Government can turn for information on the economy of the Sugar Industry is private people. That is fundamentally wrong.

It might have been all right when there was a Tory Government in power. If I want to know anything about the economics of the industry and I ask a member of the Government, no one can tell me anything. There is no department to which I can go for such information. There must be agricultural economists in various parts of the world, the services of one of whom the Government can obtain.

When the Minister for Agriculture wants to find out even such a thing as the margin of difference, there is no Statistical Department or Econom-

ics Department to which he can turn. He has to take it from private enterprise. I have no doubt whatsoever about Hon. Mr. Cuke's honesty; but I am talking about a matter of public policy.

I know, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, that some of what I am talking about does not really appertain to the Minister for Agriculture. But let me remind the House that there are questions which the Hon. Minister for Social Services cannot give a reply to, when he is asked for information. There is the question of loudspeakers for disseminating news to the people. Government felt that they could save that money, but at the same time they had the idea of putting over a 'Government Hour' on Rediffusion at night. The only one who does not realise that this is a waste of time is the Government. Government wants to get down to the people, and they do it by removing one of the means of disseminating news to them. At the same time they want to put a private radio in everybody's house; but it is too much to pay \$2.00 a month to have a public loudspeaker.

When it comes to the question of housing, I feel that in some of the rural areas the Government should take some of the Labour Welfare Fund and use to provide housing on the same basis as the Belfield Scheme. You have to think of the most economic way of housing the people. The Aided Self Help Scheme is a good one; but it is slow. If a man needs a house during his lifetime and he takes longer than a lifetime to finish it, it means that when the house is finished he is dead. The time factor is important in housing. You do not want to finish a house to put in a corpse. You want a house to live in, and sleep in, and to have a good time in sometimes; because having a good time is an important factor in human existence.

Those, sir, are the suggestions I wanted to make. They do not affect my voting for this measure. But I wanted to tell the Government of things as I see them. In other quarters there is a change in outlook relative to the workers in the Sugar Industry. The Government will soon read and see what we have done in the Trade Union. We do not say that we want the Government to give the people pensions when the sugar industry employs those people. We have the means of having what we want done. We succeed not by talking, but by results.

I hope that the Hon. Minister for Agriculture will bear in mind the suggestions which I have made to him. I feel that it is within his power to examine these funds. No one can tell him that he cannot examine them. It does not necessarily mean that they will get five shillings taken off the Stabilisation Fund and put on to the Labour Welfare Fund. Nevertheless the Stabilisation Fund should be watched carefully. If you want a lot of money for development purposes it is no use letting money lie down idle when you can use it for development purposes. If you have five million dollars I do not see why you cannot use a million. You will not find yourself in such a bad state as to need six million at any one time.

What I say, I say for the good of the country. I am only one person. I am going to live in Barbados, work here and die here.

What I ask the Hon. Minister to do, is to see that an agricultural economist is appointed to his Department. That is something fundamental. Hon. Mr. Cuke is growing old and there are those who feel that the older people get, the more they become immortal; but we know we have to die and I am asking the Hon. Minister to see to it that an agricultural economist is provided for in his Department. I hope that very soon the Hon. Minister of Social Services will be able to give the House some

enlightened view of his Department in connection with the dissemination of information, other than by this method which they have now, because it does not do credit to any Government. You had better use some calypsoes rather than continue with the present method. They could keep some records and play at night and we will listen to them; but do not tell us things which we do not understand. When we realize that this is Barbados, I am surprised to think that in this Barbados with a redundant population, you cannot find a Barbadian who can speak for this Island. If we do not begin to have a nationalistic spirit in this country, then God help us! We talk about Federation,—but Federation with whom? With Mars? You must have a nationalistic spirit when you begin to talk about Federation. I have worked as hard as any man in this country, and when I say anything in this country, I say it as one who has worked and not one who has come along by the way side. We have sufficient Barbadians who are intelligent. We have people from Harrison College, but we find it hard to get somebody to do this job. The Hon. Minister of Social Services is one of those persons to whom you can make a suggestion, and I want to suggest that we work together.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to say a few words. I have a suggestion to make as to whether the Government should change its policy or whether it should pursue its present policy. I am very real in these matters. The Hon. Minister has given a resume of the present situation with regard to the Labour Welfare Fund, and from the figures which have been quoted by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, there are ten thousand applicants for \$4,000,000. There is a suggestion which I would like to make, and I believe that it is the fourth time that I am making it. Inasmuch as the honourable junior member for St. Peter has suggested that we should have an agricultural economist in this island I am suggesting this: you are constructing 10,000 houses for agricultural labourers and this Fund will not go on forever; none of us can tell what will eventually happen in the sugar industry,—but I feel that if you are pursuing a policy in respect of labourers' houses which you are repairing, with our present situation in Barbados, you are faced with a grave situation. Private enterprise did this work; but it takes a lot of money. We have a gift and it is a natural gift. There is no reason why if the Government is pursuing its policy of repairing the houses of 10,000 workers, they should not use the gift of coral stone which we have in this country, instead of building wooden houses which before the children of these workers grow up, will become dilapidated. I suggest that they try and get down some one not necessarily from England or from the United States, but from Italy, and to investigate the policy of erecting cheaper houses in Barbados. You can produce a cheap house by the use of soft stone; but you have a parochial policy which will prevent people from doing anything. You can see remnants of the old slave huts, and the walls are still standing; but the wooden houses which are being erected will not be worth much within the next five years. If I turn my skin into an Englishman's I would be taken to Government House or Sam Lord's Castle; but if I turn into some of the people who get over the radio and corrupt the morals of the people of this country—Somebody has said that if you could turn yourself into an Englishman you can get the Government to do anything. As far as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is concerned I am satisfied that if any suggestion came from anybody in this House he would put it up to the Executive Committee. You are

getting inferior lumber today. Why should you continue to import lumber for constructing these 10,000 houses and you have no control over the termites which destroy the houses?

Why should you attempt to get down cement that was made some place else? I would say this: you may talk what you like about Trinidad, about Mr. Albert Gomes, and about Trinidad "Bu-Bali", but if it were Trinidad, they would have done so already. Now that you have to spend \$3,000.00 or \$4,000.00 this is the time when you want an expert. You want somebody to tell you how you can build cheap houses for the people out of local material. Sometime ago, a business concern got down a rock cutting machine, but it did not prove to be a success. I understood it was the wrong type of machine. I have discussed this matter with some people who know something about the matter, and they told me that there are people in Italy and the United States who have developed machines which can do this type of work. Instead of building concrete blocks you can import one of these machines to hew soft stone blocks, so that you can build with them. If you go on to spend the money which you have to build these houses in the way you are spending it now, at the end of ten years you will find that you will be in the same position as when you started—that is, you will have to rebuild instead of building others. If you look around you will see that some of the slave huts are still standing up, and are in a better position than some houses which you built since the 1939 war. You are only supporting Canada and the United States and other places when you buy lumber to build houses. I have already thrown out that suggestion at a meeting of the Housing Board, but the idea was pooh-poohed; however I hope to live long enough to see some Englishman come here and put up the idea to Government, and Government coming down to this House with a Bill to implement it. I am suggesting to you strongly this is a wonderful idea.

I do hope Government would discontinue its policy of acquiring more land for playing fields. As far as St. Michael is concerned, I think you do not want anymore. Housing is a very important thing, and deserves all the consideration. I have observed that one of the Secretaries answering for the Minister of Trade, said that the Board of Industrial Development will soon be put into operation. What would be nicer than some expert advice for this board to work on. We have here natural gifts of good lime stone and sand, as well as coral stone to manufacture into building lime. I detest the idea of somebody coming here every now and then and putting up some new fangled idea, telling you to start and do it this way, and you are doing it. We have our sand, our coral stone for burning into lime, and we are also blessed with good soft stone,—but that only wants hewing out. Before you get anybody to tell you of statistics, I suggest, that you get down somebody who knows something of developing some sort of machine which would be able to hew out our soft stone. When you build with our lime stone, you are sure that houses are going to last and are going to stand up against termites.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to have some assurance that the Government is getting a survey of the position of the factories. I feel that the Rehabilitation Fund should not go on indefinitely. The meaning of the word rehabilitation is that it is something which will not go on indefinitely. The meaning of this Rehabilitation Fund is, it should be applied in the industry until the industry has got on its feet.

I do not see how you can avoid a surplus if you are working a revolving fund as far as the Labour Welfare Fund is concerned. You cannot avoid it, unless you are going to adopt a policy in the near future that you stop collecting the money. There must be some saturation point, else you cannot avoid having a surplus.

Sir, I have never been told by anybody that these proportions to these various funds, cannot be changed by us. The method of working them out might not give this House any scope to change them; but whoever works them out can change them. If the Rehabilitation Fund does not need any more money, let us put some to the Stabilization Fund for a couple of years. We are rehabilitating factories in such a way that we are eliminating them and putting people out of work. The great difficulties are, the people themselves are providing this money to rehabilitate and eliminate these factories, and putting themselves out of work. 10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like to assure honourable members, more especially the honourable senior member for the City, and the honourable junior member for St. Peter, that their observations, comments and suggestions have been noted, and that full consideration will be given to them. I should mention that the policy of the Government so far as housing is concerned, and which I believe should be well-known to the honourable senior member for the City, is more inclined towards aided self help housing; and the houses which are built under that scheme are all permanent structures. There are built of wall and concrete blocks. That goes to show that a start has been made in the direction which was pointed out by the honourable senior member for the City. I fully realize however, that his suggestion was that it should be done on a bigger scale. Let me repeat that all these observations, comments and suggestions of the honourable members have been noted, and that full consideration will be given to them by the Government. The question of permanent structures instead of temporary structures, as I have said, is already receiving the consideration of the Government.

In so far as the honourable junior member for St. Peter is concerned he spoke with some authority, having been himself a semi-minister as it were, for Agriculture, and handling those portfolios for five years prior to the introduction of the Ministerial System. He therefore spoke with a fair measure of experience. But it is surprising to know how, that having enjoyed that position for five years, he did not think it fit to introduce some of the recommendations or suggestions that he has made here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker.—I do not know if I need read out the state of the Labour Welfare Fund at this stage. The figures that I have given were what I thought were necessary; but if the honourable junior member for St. Peter wants all the figures, I have them here. To the 30th of April, 1954, the monies received totalled \$5,329,256.87; and disbursements were as follows: Playing Fields, \$155,937.33; Housing Loans, \$2,050,000; Rural Amenities \$874.68; purchase of "Garden," Country Road, \$34,164.50; purchase of Knights Tenantry \$50,222; Government loan \$72,200; making a total of \$2,363,398.51.

Then there are the figures of monies allocated, and they are as follows: Playing fields \$300,000; Housing Loans, \$2,100,000; Rural Amenities \$500,000; purchase of "Garden," Country Road, \$34,164.50; Government Loan \$200,000; purchase of Knights Tenantry \$50,222; The balance available for allocation to the 30th of April, 1954, is \$3,144,870.37.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, — I would crave the indulgence of the House for a few seconds to reply to the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, relative to the attack which he made on the Labour Welfare Fund Organisation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I never made any attack on the organisation. I stressed that the officer running it was one of the best that the Government could have got to do the job. Perhaps I was speaking French and I did not know it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I think I understood the honourable member to say that there was some four million dollars for housing loans, while the number of applicants were something like ten thousand. He said that the method of allocation was slow, and that the Government had no policy of providing houses for these workers etc.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not know if the honourable member feels that he must say something; but he had better let the Minister in charge of the measure say it. I said that the amount available was \$4,000,000, there were 10,000 applicants, and the amount expended was \$2,000,000. I made it plain that that was a result of the scheme having started in 1950 and not in 1947.

Hon. M. E. COX: I want to make the position crystal clear, because that Department falls under my control. When I took over on the 1st February from the honourable junior member for St. Peter, the first report that came in indicated that of the number of applicants for loans, only 53% had loans advanced to them. I took up the matter with the manager immediately and discussed with him a possibility of stepping up the tempo of these loans.

The manager explained at the time that it was not a question of having more staff,—because I had suggested to him that if he needed more staff he could get the staff required to facilitate the work. He explained that it was not the question of getting more staff, but that he had to scrutinise every claim that came before him, and sign every cheque. In other words it did not matter how many people went through these claims, he had to check and O.K. everything finally before a loan could be made.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter also suggested that the Aided Self Help Housing Scheme was not fast enough, and therefore we should revert to the schemes which we started at Deacons Road and Belfield.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not say that you should revert to those schemes.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is common knowledge to every interested individual in the community that the Scheme which operates at Belfield is the same which is in operation today throughout the parish of St. Michael. We still have our decanting schemes. Houses are removed to spots with toilet accommodation. We are aiming at building permanent structures today. The houses at Deacons Road for example are approximately eleven years old. There are made of wood, and when they begin to deteriorate it costs almost as much to repair them as it cost to build them originally. So we are aiming at building permanent structures. We feel that many more houses can be built under the Aided Self Help Scheme, and at the same time they will be permanent structures which will last for many many more years than the wooden structures would last.

In addition to that, I think the House is well aware that the Government anticipates undertaking a larger housing scheme which will cover the whole Island. It is hoped that in the near future a statement in this connection will be laid before the House as to the Government's policy.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I understood the honourable senior member for the City to say that he has had certain conversations with me about certain things. We made enquiries from Italy as to this question, and away back in Mr. Campbell's time, we had information given us as to the type of saws to be used in getting the stones; but that somebody would have to be here to see after the particular type of saw and the particular type of stone to be used. I went into that question with the honourable member. The honourable member said that somebody from Italy or England should come out here to see about these matters; but he also got annoyed and said that if he were an Englishman, we would listen to him. I only got up to point out that what the honourable member has said, has some sense in it; but it is not a matter which we have not discussed. It is a question of getting all the help we can. If we can get somebody out here without voting any money to bring him, that would be all the better for us.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE SUGAR INDUSTRY ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:— To move the second reading of this Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Labour Welfare) (Special Levy) Act, 1953.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As set out in the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill,—by the Sugar Industry (Labour Welfare) (Special Levy) Act, 1953, the marginal difference in price per ton of sugar sold for export, which arose in favour of Barbados on the crop of 1952 as a result of the application in 1952 of the Commonwealth Sugar Board formula, was by special levy applied to the Labour Welfare Fund.

This Bill seeks to amend the Sugar Industry (Labour Welfare) (Special Levy) Act, 1953, so as to enable the marginal difference in price similarly arising in respect of the record sugar crop of 1953, to be devoted to the same purpose. On the 3rd September, 1953, an allocation of the Sugar Producers' Association was agreed to, whereby a certain arrangement was made; but that arrangement did not affect the marginal difference in respect of the price of sugar and fancy molasses. The marginal difference per ton of sugar is \$3.67 and in respect of fancy molasses it is \$5.12. The exports in respect of 1953 are 151,000 tons of sugar yielding \$554,000 and 9,700 in the form of fancy molasses which yielded \$49,500, — making a total of \$603,500. It is suggested that the marginal difference on this occasion should be paid to the Labour Welfare Fund as was done last year. The parity figure on this occasion is the old parity figure of 330 wine gallons to a ton of sugar. By adopting this course, the amount of \$603,500 will be added to the Labour Welfare Fund. I hope that honourable members have been given sufficient information which will cover the ground; but if there is any further point on which they would like any information I will try to help them. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should just like to ask if there is any intention of varying the welfare benefit to the people in the Sugar Industry

in respect of these funds which have accrued from this marginal difference in the price of sugar. The Honourable Minister is aware of the rural amenities which are needed, and I would like to know if there is any intention or means of the Government varying the benefit to these people in the Sugar Industry as the result of these funds. The sum of \$300,000 has been allocated to playing-fields. It is expected that the playing-fields have had their run; but what about the other Welfare benefits which should be provided for the people in the sugar industry? There are benefits which could be provided in parishes where you have a large congregation of people. Let us take a place like Bathsheba. It is depressing to find that there are no social amenities like latrines there. This is a wind fall which we are getting by virtue of this marginal difference in the price of sugar. I am sure the Government is not bound so much, that it cannot vary its policy so that the other necessities could be provided. You could improve social amenities which would not incur any capital expenditure.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would like to find out why this old figure of 330 wine gallons is used in this Bill instead of the new figure of 290 wine gallons. The only other comment I would like to make is this: here we have a wind-fall and in my particular parish I have had mooted on several occasions, the question of providing social amenities. I have approached the Honourable Minister of Social Services on several occasions in connection with this matter and, unfortunately, he has thrown me back on the Vestry. I do not see how I could get a latrine and bath built in the parish with the Vestry constituted as it is. The Vestry do whatever they like and I could talk until Doomsday in asking that a latrine and bath be built in the parish; therefore I quite agree with the honourable junior member for St. Peter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to bring to the attention of the honourable member who has just sat down that the parity figures of 330 wine gallons is used because we are dealing with the crop of 1953. The new amendment of 290 wine gallons will come into effect with the crop of 1954. Honourable members will remember that this amendment was the subject matter of a recent Bill which was dealt with by this Chamber. As far as the observations made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, and other honourable members, I certainly have taken note of them, and in consultation with the Minister of Works and Housing, I will see that the suggestions are given due consideration.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called respectively and passed.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN, reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time, and passed.

BILL TO AMEND FISHING INDUSTRY ACT, 1952

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, stands in the name of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries: the Second reading of a Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—As the objects and reasons, set out, under Section 3 of the Fishing Industry Act, 1952, it is required that fishing boats should be registered, but there is no provision for annual registration. In order that a better check may be kept on fishing boats, this Bill seeks to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952 so as to provide for annual registration.

Section 17 of the Fishing Industry Act, 1952, requires that enquiries into incidents happening at sea should be held by the Police Magistrate of the parish in or near where the incident occurred. As this sometimes results in enquiries being held at places some distance from where the crew of the fishing boat normally reside, it is felt that this inconvenience might be better avoided by requiring that the inquiry be held by the Police Magistrate of the parish in which the place of mooring of the fishing boats is concerned. This Bill accordingly seeks to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952 to that effect.

Sir, as set out here, we intend granting bigger loans to fishermen so as to provide them with power driven boats and other things, thus we are insisting on an annual register so as to keep a closer check on those boats. In the case of accidents and incidents out to sea, for the convenience of fishermen, the Bill seeks to suggest that the place of mooring should be the material place for the holding of the enquiry, and not where the accident occurred. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:—

Sections three and four of the principal Act are hereby deleted and the following new sections substituted therefor—

3. (1) From and after the coming into operation of this Act, every owner of a fishing boat shall, before such boat is put to sea be the holder of a valid certificate of registration in respect of such fishing boat.

(2) Application for a certificate of registration shall be made by or on behalf of the owner to the Fishery Officer or an Inspector.

(3) Upon receipt of such application the Fishery Officer or Inspector shall as soon as possible thereafter inspect the fishing boat to which the application refers and if satisfied that the same is seaworthy and fit for the purposes of fishing issue to the owner a certificate of registration in which shall be recorded the place of mooring of such fishing boat and such other particulars as may be prescribed.

(4) Every certificate of registration issued at any time prior to the coming into operation of the Fishing Industry (Amendment) Act, 1954, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be a valid certificate of registration until the thirtieth day of September of the year one thousand nine hundred

and fifty-four or until the issue of a new certificate of registration whichever is the earlier and shall then expire.

(5) Every certificate of registration issued in pursuance of an application made under subsection (1) of this Act, or in accordance with subsection (2) of section five of this Act at any time after the coming into operation of the Fishing Industry (Amendment) Act, 1954, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be a valid certificate of registration until the thirtieth day of September next following or until the issue of a new certificate of registration whichever is the earlier and shall then expire:

Provided that a certificate of registration so issued in the month of September in any year shall continue to be valid until the thirtieth day of September in the following year or until the issue of a new certificate of registration whichever is the earlier and shall then expire.

4. (1) The Director shall keep a Register of every fishing boat in respect of which there is in existence a valid certificate of registration and shall cause to be entered from time to time in the said Register the place of mooring of such fishing boat and such other particulars as may be prescribed in respect of such fishing boats.

(2) The contents of the Register of fishing boats shall be *prima facie* evidence of the accuracy of all facts contained therein in all proceedings under this Act."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I am throwing out a suggestion, and I think it is a good one, so far as I am concerned. Clause 3, sub-clause 4 talks about the annual registration and then Clause 5 talks of certificate of registration. The Fishery Officer is the person who is going to have to operate this Bill. Recently, a lot of stuff has been sent back to this Chamber from the Other Place because of doubtful complications. We are not in Great Britain where there is this complicated set up, and where the officer administering these things has legal training. All that these Sections mean is that on a particular date these boats have to be registered, and that they should be registered before that day with some allowance of a couple of days' grace. As I have said, a person like Mr. Wiles has to administer these things, and we must also take into consideration the fishermen who have to comply to these Acts. These Acts should be drafted in simple layman language. All that should be said, is that there should be annual registration, then that fishermen should go and register and that should be the end of the matter. The drafting of these sub-sections is too complicated.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I really must say, that on reading the original Act, I found so many little things about it, I do not know how we came to pass it with some of the nonsense I saw in it.

This is a novel way of drafting an amendment. In one place you refer "To this Act," meaning the original Act and lower down you refer to the Fishing Industry Act 1954 which means the same Act that we are discussing today. That is a most peculiar method of drafting. I hope that you will not have to have it drafted over again. I hope you will be able to understand it; because it seems to me that when you say this Act, you do not mean this Act, but you refer to the Act which we are discussing now, and we call it by name in the body of the Bill. I hope

that you do not get something worse than you had already.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Fishing Industry Act 1952 is referred to as the principal Act.

Mr. LEWIS: It seems to me that even to the Hon. Minister it presents some difficulty in spite of his legal training. It says sections three and four of the principal Act are hereby deleted etc. Then you get from and after the coming into operation of this Act. It would appear that that does not mean the Act we are dealing with now but the principal Act. Then when you come to sub-section (4) of section 3 you get these words: "Every certificate of registration issued at any time prior to the coming into operation of this Act etc."

When I started to read it I got fairly confused. I hope that the honourable member will be able to say if this Act will make a Fishing boat something like a domicile or not, so that if it is registered in St. Joseph it can still go and possibly beach anywhere during the fishing season. I take it that in case of an accident the jurisdiction will be where the boat is registered.

The question that clause 3 of the Bill stand part was put and agreed to.

Clauses 4—7 inclusive were called and agreed to, and the title of the Bill was read and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER, NO. 9

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — The next Order is a Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1954," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the 15th day of July, 1954, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act 1949.

I will read the Addendum. The Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1954," has been laid in the Legislature.

"The original suggestions relating to the establishment of a Ministerial system of Government envisaged the attachment of an Assistant Secretary for each Ministry—omitting the office of the Premier. Following upon the debate in the Legislature the proposals were re-examined with a view to effecting an economy in staff and the post of Assistant Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture was deleted. Experience during the six months in which the system has been in operation has made it clear that the volume of work in the Ministry of Trade Industry and Labour and the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries is so great that the limited staff of Permanent Secretary and Assistant Secretary will not be able to stand the strain much longer. It is accordingly proposed to provide a separate Assistant Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

The Order also provides for the creation of seven additional posts of Long Grade Clerk to permit of the secondment on serving officers to posts that are established outside the Service and are likely to become permanent. Under the present system Departments are compelled to keep open the post of the seconded officer with the result that the work in certain Government Departments, including the

Audit, Treasury and Income Tax has been forced to fall into serious arrear.

No additional expenditure is entailed by the proposed arrangements as the authority to which the officers are seconded will be required to pay the salaries and pension contributions of the seconded officers."

Honourable members will remember that when we were about to start the Ministerial System the Government originally suggested that there should be an Assistant Secretary for every Ministry, except that of the Premier. But the Legislature, (this House chiefly, and I believe the Other Place also) were so strong about having four Assistant Secretaries rather than five, that purely out of deference we agreed to prune and prune. We tried the experiment of having an Assistant Secretary to serve the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Labour. But it just did not work. You should have a Permanent Secretary for each of the two Ministries. During these six months we have discovered that it would not work.

There seems to be a fashion now to praise the Minister of Agriculture. Of course when I do it, it is with no object of casting aspersions on the other Ministers by implication. He is as hard working as any other Minister; but after all, he is only one human being, and a day is only 24 hours. I repeat that the Legislature was against five Secretaries. We did not feel that the number of Secretaries were enough; but, as I said, we tried to prune as much as possible.

Obviously the Irrigation Board will be of long duration and there are other Departments from which officers have had to be seconded. The Departments are complaining that when you second their good men, the places have to be kept opened and work is likely to fall into arrears. It is proposed under this Order therefore, to provide the services of seven additional Long Grade Clerks. No additional expense will be entailed as the Addendum shows.

I beg to move the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, — The introducer of this motion referred to the Legislature as not wanting to have five Assistant Secretaries. I think he should have said the Other Place. It should be obvious to everyone that when you have five Ministers whose duty it is to frame policy, each Minister must have the necessary efficient staff. The Minister of Social Services has more Departments than any other Ministry. It is a big Ministry with one Permanent Secretary. A Permanent Secretary must be good enough to keep a Minister right up-to-date on all the subjects that come to the Minister's attention.

What is the Premier afraid of saying? If you have five Ministers forming policy, are you trying to run this business like a peddling shop? Are you getting a permanent Secretary to two Ministers? As you begin to sit in administration you can see that this system must break down. You cannot have one Permanent Secretary to two Ministries. I would say that I do not agree with the middle part of the Addendum to this Resolution. I do not know what the honourable introducer means; but a Long Grade Clerk is of no use to the Irrigation Board. Are you bringing in people at a salary of \$50.00 or \$60.00 a month to work on these Boards? If you are starting this Department the Clerk must be a man who can do his job. As soon as you put a \$70.00 or \$80.00 per month boy to do

this job you are playing with fire. I do not know what is the urgency of this matter; but I am convinced in my mind that the Ministers have nothing to do with the Public Service Commission.

All I want to say is this; this is Barbados' money which we are spending, and if the Public Service Commission has the idea that only Englishmen can fill certain posts, they are mistaken. I am not taking Jamaica as an example but I think we have people whom we can use. We have lost a good man because he is not getting as much as what a Permanent Secretary will get. As soon as you get a man who is somebody's cousin, it takes a long time before you can get somebody to do the job. When I come to deal with another aspect of this matter I will really want to know why it is that the Public Service Commission could not find the means of appointing a man who has done a good job for the Government, and why when it comes to promotion, he cannot get it. I hope that these people will see the wisdom of joining a Trade Union. I feel that the Ministry of Agriculture should have a Permanent Secretary. The Ministry of Trade needs two Permanent Secretaries so that when the Minister is doing extra duties one of his Permanent Secretaries can work with him. The Premier is the only person who seems to have a top staff, and he is carrying more than the Minister of Social Services. The Ministers are going to find that at the end of the period that they are not getting off their work and many excuses will be made. You will hear that the Premier carried home about forty files. As soon as you do not employ enough Secretaries you will get one man doing a job in which he does not feel satisfied. People only want to be accustomed to something for about three or four months, and after that time, the quarrel will be over. Where the buses are concerned people quarrelled when they were put in Probyn Street, and now that the buses are to be removed they say that they should not be removed from there. I repeat that there should not be any idea of having one Permanent Secretary to two Ministries. That is not fair to the Ministers themselves. Sometimes the Hon. Minister of Social Services cannot give a reply because the files do not come up. I strongly suggest that there should not be any perpetuity of the system where you have one Permanent Secretary to two important Ministries. Too much work has to be done; I cannot agree with that system. If you give the Minister of Labour two Permanent Secretaries I can understand that. He could more do with one Permanent Secretary, but if you give him two we can appreciate that. If you have an Assistant Secretary for each Ministry I feel that that is in order; but not the other arrangement. If you have a system where you appoint people at \$70.00 and \$80.00 per month and let them go on until they grow beard, that will not work.

You cannot run a Government unless you spend money. When you are running a Government, and you are not spending money, you are running corruption. (A VOICE: That is not true). I do not know of any Government which is running properly, that is not spending money. I feel if you want this the Ministries should be properly staffed. I have been accused of being a wrecker; nevertheless I am showing that I am as progressive as anybody else, and more progressive than some honourable members think of me. Today is the 20th July, and I am sure that the Hon. Premier is bound to come before the 20th December, to this House and say that Ministerial System is breaking down so far as Permanent Secretaries are concerned. It must break down when you have only one Permanent Secretary attached to

the Ministries of Social Services and of Communications Works and Housing. It is impossible to work those Ministries with only one Permanent Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Hon. Premier, other honourable Ministers, and other honourable members have told people that I am a very irresponsible person. Be that as it may, the great Lloyd George has said, that you should keep your ears close to the ground if you want to be a statesman. What I have learnt from official sources, is that the Ministerial System is in danger of breaking down, because the Ministries are understaffed. I know of the frightened way Barbadians have for spending money, and because of that, I was one of those people who criticised the staffing arrangements when the suggestions were first put forward to this House. But on closer examination and by going around and finding out things for myself,—I may say without pimping,—I have found out that the work is really piling up in various Ministries. If one would look at the portfolios of the Minister of Social Services, and the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, one would see that it is impossible to run these Ministries without each one having a Permanent Secretary. I would say that these two Ministries stand in need of a Permanent Secretary to each of them,—far more, than the Ministry of the Hon. Premier, who has a Financial Secretary. The experience of Trinidad, Jamaica and other places which have started a Ministerial Status, is that the work tends to grow rather than to get smaller. There is a similar thing in Barbados.

There is one danger in Barbados to which I would like to draw attention. We are losing many of our under-graduates owing to their accepting appointments in other parts of the West Indies. I was speaking recently to three of the youngest members of Mr. Bustamante's Secretariat, who are all young men of less than five years' service. They told me that they did not hold a substantial post for more than three weeks before they were transferred to a higher post. That is the tempo of things there. They said, because of the Ministerial Status, plus the whole idea of the Public Service Commission of Jamaica being that they were running the government for Jamaicans, they were trying to prevent their young men from seeking positions abroad.

There is no getting away from the fact that the officers in our Ministries are trying hard to catch up with the work; but it is still piling up. It is not good when a system such as this is in danger of breaking down because of lack of staff. I am not blaming the Ministers for not pulling their weight. As regards this matter, I feel it would be much better if we create these posts at once. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Peter when he said that you should make Barbadians feel that they are doing something for their country. Barbados is probably the last place in which its people have any feeling of nationalism. I am going to support this Resolution because I have been keeping my ears close to the ground. I have been making enquiries, and I have understood that there is dire need for these people. It is also going to be realised that in six months time you must create more Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. Speaker. — If you take the portfolios of the Hon. Minister of Social Services you will see that among them he has to administer the new Maude Bill on Local Government, as well as the new Public Assistance Bill and the Public Health Bill. Even though it has been said, that the Lord Mayor will only be a Mayor of dust-bins, it must be visualised

that the Council will be writing you on this and that, and will be wanting a ruling on this and that. Therefore, many papers will be going to and from that Ministry. If one would probably compare Cabinet Government in Great Britain in the twenties, with what it is today, one will see that the working of that Government has expanded. I am not advising you to build up a system out of proportion to your requirements or at a faster pace than necessary. As I have said, I have kept my ears in the ground, and have been in close contact with some of the people and they have told me that the work is tending to grow. For that reason I am going to support this Resolution.

11 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, — I myself am wondering whether this is not getting too big. What I say, I say without any prejudice at all. When I got this Resolution I started to worry. The Resolution seeks to create an additional post of Assistant Secretary. But it also seeks to create seven additional posts in the Long Grade Clerical Service. I am somewhat worried, Sir.

Can the Hon. Premier assure me that the Government has really given this thing sufficient chance? Is it not a fact that it is necessary, with this new service, to give the various Departments time to familiarize themselves with their work and get down to a streamlined basis.

I have never been a Minister, but I do understand something about the business. Ministers must be relieved of such tasks as writing etc. They must be able to sit back and think, and make decisions. They must be able to think clearly in order to make proper decisions.

Mr. Speaker,—I want to make it clear that whatever I may feel about any individual, as soon as the country decides on the policy they want, I respect the office of those who are carrying out that policy. That is how I look at the Ministerial System. I want to repeat that it is a question as to whether the Government has really given this System a chance. Is six months enough? I really do not think so. Now what about the Report of the Organization and Methods expert on the various Departments? I do not think that the Premier was right in bringing this Resolution down now. I am assuming he has the economic welfare of the general public at heart. You have instituted Ministerial Status. A Minister has to give up all. I for one do not think the salaries are too big. But only six months have passed. I think that this Resolution is a little too premature.

When we were discussing the Five Year Plan and the Estimates, we were told that the working hours of the Civil Service would be re-organized, so that you would not have one set of Civil Servants going to work at 8 o'clock another set at nine another set at ten. As a matter of fact there are some who just come to work to take off their jackets, smoke a cigarette and go back home. The House voted money to secure the services of an Efficient Expert. We have heard nothing of his findings. Under those conditions would the Government say that it would be in interest of the people of this country to bring this Resolution in now?

I appreciate the fact that the Premier as Minister of Finance must have a tremendous lot of work to do. Some people complain to me that when they want to see the Premier they cannot see him. I always tell them that if they wanted to see him about a small matter, he probably would not have the time to see them. A Minister like the Premier must have someone to see people for him and discuss routine matters for him.

I am saying Sir, that it is not right to bring down this Resolution before making public the findings of the Efficiency Expert. I am not going to support the Resolution at all, for the reasons that I have given. I am suggesting that this Resolution should be postponed. The Ministerial System is entirely new to Barbados, and it must take the Ministers some time to get really acquainted with their work. It takes them sometime to gain a footing and to gain experience. I certainly feel that the Government should have made a greater effort to get the system working well before bringing down this Resolution.

We must realize that every amount you spend here necessarily, creates a burden on the taxpayer and the working class man in this country. It might be alright to say that you cannot work cheap systems. I do not believe in working a cheap system; but I do not believe in working an extravagant system. You should work a system which suits the community. To my way of thinking, I will not vote for this Resolution and I will record my vote against it if I stand alone; because I feel the Ministers should be willing to give this system a longer trial and not merely say that the experience gained the past six months in which the system has been in operation, has made it clear that the volume of work in the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries is so great, that the limited staff of a Permanent Secretary and an Assistant Secretary will not be able to stand the strain much longer. I too have been hearing things. I do not want to make any accusations here tonight, but I counsel the Hon. Premier that on the face of it, the public of Barbados knows that he should have this matter streamlined. Why saddle the country with more people, and correspondingly with more expense? I cannot vote for this Resolution. I appeal to the honourable member; — but of course it is of no use appealing to him because he has a majority and the Resolution will be passed. These officers really do not know their duties yet. They have not yet been saddled in, and the system should work for at least a year. To say that experience has shown that you cannot get on with a Permanent Secretary and an Assistant Secretary and that you must have an extra Long Grade Clerk and so on, is nothing but extravagance. Just as other Civil Servants are asked to hold on in Departments, it is not too much to ask those who are associated with the Ministries to hold on for a year. Try the system out and see whether you should tighten it up. You should first see whether you have square pegs in round holes, or whether you have suitable people for doing the work. You may have three or four men to do a job, but you may find somebody in one Department who is more suitable for another Department. From the very beginning I suggested that you should examine this matter. While you will have this great volume in the beginning, when things right themselves it will not be so. Is it really necessary to have more Assistant Secretaries, or do you want a higher grade of Secretary-Typist? I do not think it is fair to the people of this colony for the Government to say that after a trial for six months things will not work. I say: let them try it for a year. I cannot vote for this Resolution. You are creating a top-heavy staff. A period of six months I submit, is not long enough for a trial. I think this whole matter bears on selfishness; and to say the least, it is extravagant. I think the Ministers should be prepared to think this matter over and give the most they can give. I agree that Ministers must be given the freedom to make decisions after consultation with the Heads of the Department, and so on; that is necessary, and you want Assistant Secretaries. Quite recently I saw an advertisement calling for

Typists and Secretaries. You will find that some of these people have experience in handling offices therefore you should retain them. That is what you want.

Mr. LEWIS: I believe that each Ministry should have a proper staff, and I believe that there should be an increase in some cases. I believe that the method of conducting the business of this House would cause the Ministers to have more work to do than they should have to do. Weekly meetings of the Barbados Legislature is a joke. The Ministers have no time to think of anything else. You have four to five Orders coming down a month, we have Orders Nos. 8, 9, and 10 to be dealt with tonight and you have amendments to the Custom Tariff Act and so on coming down in the course of a month or two.

There is another branch of the Legislature which is doing all the work it has to do, and the debates of honourable members of that Chamber are far more enlightening to read than others. They do not sit, as long as we do. Added to that, they get all the information they want. They do not have to get up several times and ask for it. I hope the honourable Leader of this House would put up a programme in this House where on one day, say,—there should be first readings of Bills and on another day, the second readings. We should not bring in a Bill and pass it on the same day. These things want planning. One would like to know that on such and such a day, such and such a Legislative programme would be dealt with.

Let us take for example, the number of amendments to Acts which have come in here within recent times. There are one or two Acts which have been amended several times. If your work were planned properly, there would be no need for all these meetings of the House. Barbados is not like Great Britain where you should hold meetings every day.

I must agree with my colleague when he questioned why at this time, you are adding seven people to the Civil Establishment, when you had somebody to go into its organization and methods. Of course, there is a part of the Public Buildings which I believe that expert has not entered. I do not believe Mr. Foster knows where the Income Tax Office is, yet that Department is one of the biggest revenue departments of Government. Neither does he know whether you need 18 more clerks at the Customs department or you have 18 too many. He has never been into those departments. Probably, all that has come out here for, is to sell a couple of machines for use in the Treasury and Audit departments. I do feel that we should have received his report before we think of adding these seven people to the Civil Service.

The Hon. Premier has said, that these additions to the Establishment would mean no additional cost. If the Natural Gas Corporation has seconded to it a Civil Servant, and you are not paying that Civil Servant or replacing him by another, are you not saving that salary? The day you pay somebody to do that work you are increasing the cost. I cannot accept the statement that these additions would mean no additional cost. I do not understand it. If you have sent a clerk from the Post Office to work at the Water Board, and you are not paying that clerk from the Post Office, and you are only retaining his pension rights, and you have not replaced him at the Post Office, it means that you are paying no person. I therefore, cannot accept the statement of the Hon. Premier. This statement has been written by somebody who has a confused way of thinking.

Let us get a report of the organization and method expert first. I do not know if the Executive has that report, but if they have it, they have no

right to change a word in it. They should have it published and then come to the House and talk about it. Every word in it should be made known to us immediately. What is the object of sitting on it without letting the public know something about it. Do you mean that before you hear anything of that report, you are adding these seven people to the establishment? You now have the equivalent of three more clerks in the Income Tax Department because you have made them come to work at 8.30 instead of at ten. If these clerks in the service have to come to work at 8.30 now instead of 10 o'clock, do you mean to tell me that you are feeling the needs of these six people that have been seconded outside? I suppose if these clerks were still coming to work at ten o'clock you would have come down for about fifteen more. You have brought this Resolution down just the day before Prorogation and are saying that you want these people. It is blackmailing this House.

I do not agree with what my colleague said about the Ministries. A period of six months is sufficient time for them to see what is being done. I hope the time would come when hon. members will realise that they had it in their power to appoint a Committee to enquire into the working of these departments. There is sufficient ability amongst hon. members of this House, and with some co-operation from outside, you can investigate into these departments. I think the Ministries should be properly staffed so that Ministers would have no excuse, but they must satisfy themselves that there is need for these people. However, Sir, I am merely saying that there is such a saying as "Little man you have had a busy day."

I know, we had a Colonial Secretary who came to work at ten o'clock, and worked until ten o'clock the night and never got through any work,—because he had no method. He was one of those little men who had a busy day, but did nothing. I hope this is not the case with the Ministers.

I am saying that the need for these seven clerks cannot be justified at this stage, particularly when we are awaiting the report from the expert on organisation and method. If the report should come in and say, we have too many people in our Audit Department, what are we going to do? As I have said, probably this report is in the hands of members of the Government, but they should have some consideration for the rank and file and the taxpayers who have not read the report. How do I know what is in the report? Some people think that this service is top-heavy now. Why should we create these seven posts now, before we see the report of this expert? Let us see it first, to see whether we have people in the service who are doing nothing. This is a very wrong method which you are adopting.

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

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT.—9.

Noes: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—2.
11.50 p.m.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER, NO. 10 OF 1954

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The next Order is a Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1954,"

made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the fifteenth day of July, 1954, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

As hon. members will see, the woman tutor for this new Training Scheme at Erdiston will be on the permanent staff and so will be the Assistant Cook. This order will establish that. I will enquire about the others.

I beg to move sir that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I really intended enquiring what was the reason for bringing the last Order in from the 1st July. The Order we are discussing, is to come into effect from the 1st August. Is that when the new scheme is to start? We were promised some information about the reason for bringing in the Order relative to the Health Centre from the 1st June. It seems to be fashionable now to have an operation date for these Orders. There must be some reason.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The reason is that we have to create the posts before we can advertise for people to fill the posts. We want to start the scheme in September, so we will have to advertise before that time. The fact remains that no officer can draw money from the Treasury before he is appointed. How can it hurt the country, if you put down the 1st of July, the first of August or any other date? You have to have the post established before you can start the scheme. You must have the person appointed a little before the scheme begins.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

REPLY TO MESSAGE NO. 19/1954 Re POLICE TRAINING SCHOOL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The Hon. Leader of the House early this afternoon handed in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to report and consider His Excellency's Message No. 19/1954 relating to the establishment of a Police Training School in Barbados to serve the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados. I think that the honourable member intimated that the Government would like to deal with the matter this evening. The Report sets out that the Committee carefully considered the Message, and begs to recommend the passing of an Address to His Excellency in reply stating that the House of Assembly approved of the scheme contained in His Excellency's Message on the understanding set out in Paragraph 9 of the Message.

Now the word "carefully" used in the Committee's Report is not just put in for the record. The Message was carefully considered. Hon. members will remember the term of His Excellency's Message. It said in part that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has stated that he will be prepared, if the Governments mentioned are prepared to support the scheme, to provide the capital costs of the buildings to house 60 recruits, staff and equipment, amounting to an estimated figure of \$273,600, from the General Allocation under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act.

The estimated annually recurrent costs of the scheme, to be borne by Governments, will range between \$45,242 and \$53,107, of which the Barbados share will be between \$17,232 and \$20,228. This contribution is based on the respective strengths of the Police Forces of the Governments participating and forms the basis of the numbers from each territory that will enter the School.

Other things hon. members will remember from His Excellency's Message. If I remember correctly the number of recruits a year will be Barbados 23, the Leewards 12, and the Windwards 25. Our average wastage is 25 per year, and we are taking in 23 recruits a year, so we are not erring on the side of taking in too many recruits.

It may be somewhat sentimental to add that the more Barbados does this sort of thing, the less will be the justification for some other colony to say that we want to stand out by ourselves, and the less distance we will have to traverse before we become the Federal Capital. In anything of this nature we must be careful to see that we pay our fair share. There is a recent feeling among the Windward and Leeward Islands that they are prepared to work along with Barbados, no matter who else wants to join or does not want to join.

I now beg to move the passing of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge your Excellency's Message No. 19/1954, relating to the establishment of a Police Training School in Barbados, and to inform Your Excellency, that they approve of the said scheme on the understanding set out in Paragraph 9 of the abovementioned Message.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion. The question was put and agreed to.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—That concludes the Business of the Day. We are not arranging the Order Paper for next Tuesday. As you know sir, there was a Message from His Excellency the Governor to-day about the prorogation of the Legislature. I think we should meet a little earlier than usual next Tuesday so as to receive anything like amendments from the Other Place. I therefore beg to move that we adjourn until Tuesday next at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to intimate at this stage, if I am in order to do so, that I would like to proceed even on Tuesday next if possible to discuss a statement laid in this House which I feel is very derogatory to a member of this House. It is the Report purporting to be brought here from the Social Welfare Department about Barbadian girls in the United Kingdom. If I cannot proceed with it next Tuesday I would like to do so early in the next session.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 27th July, 1954, was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly at 12.10 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, 26th July, 1954.

A special meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Honourable M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Messrs. L. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., E. D. MOTTLEY, F. E. MILLER, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY, E. ST. A. HOLDER, Honourable C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. GODDARD and VAUGHAN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 29th June and 6th July respectively have been printed and circulated. Unless there is any objection these Minutes—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, — I did not know that we were going to confirm Minutes today. I thought that today was to be a special meeting for a special purpose. I did not read the Minutes. I expected that these Minutes would have been confirmed tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member raising any objection to the confirmation of these Minutes?

Mr. LEWIS: I cannot say anything about them, because I have not read them.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that event I will have to postpone the confirmation of these Minutes.

PAPER LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.—I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following document:—Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1954.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1954".

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$320 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 15 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, in connection with a visit of a trade union official to the United Kingdom.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$5,870 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 No. 16 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, in connection with a visit to the United Kingdom of a delegation to discuss the Deep Water Harbour project.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with these Resolutions today. I would like to say that these three matters were not known to the Executive Committee until last Thursday. On the question of sending the Trade Union official to the United Kingdom, he is supposed to be there between the 13th and 14th of September. It is also considered advisable that the Delegation should leave this Island during the last week of August and the first week of September for the United Kingdom, in connection with the Deep Water Harbour. The third Resolution is in connection with the Technical School. On the subject of a Principal for the Technical Institute, that is something which costs a lot of money, more than we can afford; and this arrangement is considered to be the most suitable, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies has asked us to expedite matters as he is in touch with somebody who is considered as a suitable person for this post. Those are the reasons for calling this meeting today.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—Before leave is granted the honourable member to move the suspension of these Rules, I must say that I would be failing in my duty if I agreed that the method or the reasons which have been given today, are satisfactory reasons for calling this meeting of the House today.

This question of the Technical Institute involves changing something. It involves going into a matter of great importance in which you will have to allow full discussion to take place. To find an expert on technical education, three committees have been set up to deal with this matter. Exhaustive inquiry had to be made, and now that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has somebody in view, you have to come to the House on a day before it is to be prorogued, to deal with this matter. You are going to make somebody both principal of the Evening Institute and the Technical Institute. You have first to ask the House whether we agree to this matter. In Jamaica you had to pay a man \$2,000 for this job. The reasons which have been given here for calling this meeting could not hold water on the basis of any structure you have. If you are satisfied that this Institute means so much to the training of this island, you have to allow the Legislature to say if they are prepared to pay this salary. Give the Government credit for their reasons by all means; but if these are the Government's reasons we should have an opportunity to be able to deal with them.

I would like to say that prorogation is not done by the Governor or the Secretary of State for the Colonies; it is done by the Premier. If the Premier says "No", no Governor can prorogue. We agreed to give the Ministry an Assistant Secretary last week, and we went further and said we will give them a Permanent Secretary. Are you trying to make nonsense of Parliament? Do not choose any old means, even if the Service which you are doing, is good. I am satisfied that if the Government wants to prorogue the House on the 25th, nobody can tell them when they can prorogue. It is the Premier's prerogative to do that under the new constitution. You prorogue to suit the Government. Nobody can bring up any reason for these matters.

This Evening Institute has caused a lot of trouble already. I want to say that today's procedure is going to make the office of Speaker appear as one, which is reflecting the view, that if you want something done, and it is not done, we the majority, will do something about it. One of these matters deals with the Trade Union which I represent. Because it deals with that matter, I would not ask the House to come at a moment's notice and vote money so as to make something easier for the Trade Union which I have to represent. I feel that we must have enough time if you are discussing any matter.

3.27 p.m.

If you want to deal with Parliament in a sort of *ad hoc*, slipshod, callous manner, you can do so. I protest against this method which we are adopting today. With regard to the question of sending a delegation to enquire into the Deep Water Harbour scheme, I would say that the Resolution for that is necessary. By all means you should send a delegation to England to discuss this matter. I do not think any honourable member would object to dealing with that. As regards the question dealing with the Trade Union matter, that is purely incidental; because in any event the person who would be selected as a delegate, would not be leaving until around the 15th September, and if the Legislature is not willing to provide the money, the Trade Union movement would provide the person who would be sent with the necessary funds. Nobody would be put out of pocket, neither would anyone go to jail if that Resolution is not done today. Sir, it is regrettable that on the eve of prorogation these things have come down to the legislature to be done. With regard to the appointments in the other measure before us, it does appear as if the Government does

not even possess the slightest tittle of courtesy for other people. Some people feel that so long as they can get something done, they must have it done at all costs; but they make the big mistake when they think that those things should be done at their own dictates. Sooner or later, such an attitude will bring forward its own peculiar results.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,— For the last three meetings of this House we have been faced with much the same thing, as we are faced with today. We have had amendments coming back from the Other Place and we have either sat late or got them through by postponement of the Rules of this House, because prorogation was around the corner. I was surprised when notice of this meeting and of what we are about to deal with, arrived on my desk in my office. I did think that the Government had sufficient time to make up their minds about what measures they should deal with before prorogation of this House. It is not fair to members of this House or to the Other Place, to have these short notices to discuss these things, and then come here and make sittings on them. I am not going to discuss the subject matter of what is before us—because that is by the way. I am saying that the business of the Government should be done in a much more business-like way, rather than coming down at the eleventh hour to discuss things, as the Government is doing now. At the last meeting we were told that there would be prorogation of the Legislature as from to-morrow, and the matters which we had before us then, were urgently required and had to be dealt with that day. I wonder what the Government is going to do when this legislature goes into recess for seven weeks, as I understand is the period of prorogation. Would it be able to carry on? I am wondering whether we will not be called back hurriedly to deal with some small resolution. As it appears to me the Government can only conduct its business from Tuesday to Tuesday.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not want the Government to think that when we of the Opposition remain silent on a Resolution, we have not gone through it carefully or that we have just agreed to it off hand. We on this side of the table have always tried to peruse matters which have to be dealt with by this Chamber as best as we possibly can, so as to contribute constructively, or to offer any criticism on them. I am one of those people who believe you will have unforeseen circumstances. I believe the occasion will arise in which you will have matters, which Government or private individuals might not have reckoned with, or might not have been prepared to meet. I am always willing, (and I believe the Leader of the Opposition also) to come here at a moment's notice to do something which is very urgent, or of great importance; but I am afraid that there are two matters before us to-day which I am in duty bound to protest against.

Let us take the first matter before us,— the one which the hon. junior member for St. Peter dealt with. I may say he is in a better position to speak on these matters than any one of us, because for sometime he was a member of the Government.

I am not going to deal with the subject matter of the measures before us now. However one of these matters is of vital importance; I refer to the Resolution dealing with the Principal of the Evening and Technical Institute and the Deputy Principal and Chief Technical Instructor. Only a few nights ago I was reading something on adult education. As the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, this Resolution means much to the development of the country; therefore whatever policy the Government has adopted, it would be well to come to this Chamber with

this matter at a time when hon. members would be able to express their views adequately on it. I do not believe that Government by coming down at this time with it, has done so wilfully. I noticed the Hon. Premier smile when I said so. I do not know what that smile meant. I do know that you are going to prorogue to-morrow and this Resolution deals with a matter which concerns the Evening Institute,—an Institution which in my opinion is worthy of being set up, and one which is long overdue. I do not want to go into the pros and cons, but I do know that it is very necessary to the industrial life of this country. As the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, that Institution would mean a lot to the industrial life of this country. Maybe it has not come at the opportune time for us to discuss this matter and to give our feelings on it; but Government might be surprised to know that the Opposition in this Chamber, views this matter as of very vital importance to the development of the country and to the future welfare of the citizens of this island of Barbados. We have at present certain Committees' Reports on the question of family planning and what not. If Barbadians are so prolific as has been stated, then I think the time will come when all we might have to offer, is manpower. Therefore let us equip that manpower with some sort of technical education. It might surprise the Hon. Premier to learn that there is a section of people in this country who feel—

3.37 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is straying from the subject.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sorry sir that you think so. The hon. Leader of the House should realise that whether we come here to-day or on other occasions before prorogation to go fully into the subject matter before the House, he will find that there is a section of public opinion which feels that the remuneration offered here is very small. Many of us in the Opposition would agree that it is such an important matter, we would support strongly an increased remuneration in this particular field.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will be at liberty to go further into that soon.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I certainly will, sir. I realise that we are only discussing the suspension of the Rules. The Addendum does not make the matter abundantly clear. I cannot see the urgency. If the House must prorogue, I am sure,—the Government at all times boasts of its majority—that whether it is for \$6,000, \$8,000 or \$10,000 they will have a majority to carry it through after prorogation. It would be better to postpone this and give us a good opportunity to discuss it. I suggest that strongly to the Government. We have never shown by action or vote, that we, are attempting to obstruct anything for the progress of this country.

I think that every sane person apart from Government members and those who are bound to follow them, would say that we should be given more opportunity to discuss this matter, to go carefully into it, and to see whether we are in favour of the recommendations made by the Government and the Colonial Office; and to see also whether we would prefer to see someone come on contract for three, four or five years for a higher salary. That would mean more to the future Industrial Development of this country.

I am appealing to the hon. Leader to postpone this, even though it is true that the Government can sit and count on its majority. I know that it is true that some hon. members are so blindly loyal, that they will ignorantly vote for this. Some will vote for it even if the paper on which the Resolution is printed, was blank.

The arguments used by the hon. Leader might be reasonably used, as regards the question of the delegation. It might be an after thought. You cannot blame a person if he has forgotten. That is something which it might be better to do now. As far as this item is concerned, whether one agrees with it or not, we have to take it that it came suddenly from the Colonial Office and the Government knew nothing about it until last Thursday; therefore they have brought it in to-day.

Let me say here now, the honourable Leader and the Premier must have consciences. The Government have had the opportunity of discussing this matter for months and months; but they expect to bring it down on the eve of prorogation, and get it through the House. That is not fair to this Chamber, nor is it fair to this country. With the majority that the Government have in this Chamber, they can afford to postpone this, and let the Secretary of State wait a while. They should not try to railroad it through. Last week I heard an hon. member saying that they have their dogs to bark, but the dogs do not bite. That applies to those who, if they attempted to bite, would lose all their teeth. They are those of us who can bark and bite, and who are prepared to stand in our own kennel.

I feel that as far as the suspension of the Rules is concerned, it may be alright in respect of the other two items, but in respect of the other item, this Chamber should have an opportunity to go further into it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting to leave being granted?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am Sir.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Before you put the question sir, I want to say that I expect that some people must oppose for the sake of opposition. There are some people whose nature it is to oppose. I have never been to Heaven as far as I know, but I am told you will get opposition even there. There are some people who by nature are suspicious, and they cannot give anyone credit for honesty and truth. The hon. senior member for the City made all sorts of remarks about railroading this, that, and the other. As I have said, it was on Thursday last at an Executive Committee meeting, that this question of the Unionist came before us for the first time. That is less than a week ago. We are told that the conference should be about the 15th Sept. If we did not call the House today and the House was prorogued tomorrow, when would we have a chance of doing it?

I am not speaking about the \$320. I am speaking of the principle of the thing. We are not trying to railroad anything through the House. As far as the delegation to the U.K. is concerned we have to wait until the Colonial Office says they can come. Only on Thursday last we were told that they could come around the last week in August or the first week in September. As far as the other matter is concerned, I cannot deal with all the merits of it. The Hon. Premier is in charge of that and he will deal with it in detail.

I want the House to remember that the Government has got just as much interest or more, in the Evening Institute and in the public, as the horn-blowers on the other side. We try to give the best service we can. I am sorry that I cannot say all now because it is not before us; but the question of getting a high-powered man was on the tapis for some time. The Government felt that they could not afford what a high-powered man would cost and that this was the best we could do.

3.47 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister will not go into all that now.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I want hon. members to realise that the three matters came before us in Executive Committee on Thursday last.

Mr. ALLDER rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection having been taken, I must put the question instantly.

Mr. ALLDER: Every member spoke since the objection was raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was allowing the Hon. Minister to reply. Objection having been taken I will put the question.

The question that leave be granted the Hon. Minister to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, LEWIS, MILLER, WILLIAMS, F. L. WALCOTT, J. C. MOTTLEY, and VAUGHN—14.

Noes: Messrs. ALLDER, HAYNES, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—4.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I refrained from saying anything just now. I will refrain from making any criticism which would be a criticism of Your Honour. It is for you to say whether it is in the public's interest that the House should meet or not; but the Government must have adduced better argument to you than they did adduce in the House today. What I heard in the House today, is just playing politics. I cannot believe that the people in England do not know that we are proroguing this House tomorrow, and have not sent you something urgent, just at the right time. At some times it suits some members of the Government to have some of these matters considered, for their own personal reasons.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "*Aye*", those against will please say "*No*" I think the Ayes have it.

Mr. ALLDER: I have called for a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I will allow that division.

Mr. ALLDER: That is new to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. ALLDER: I have risen to a point of order. I have asked for a division. I do not want to challenge Your Honour's ruling, but I want consideration given to the Rules of this House and the position of hon. members. I have always observed that whenever a division is called for, you permit that division to be given, and therefore I expect Your Honour to conduct things similarly as in the past. The first division was taken and I recorded my vote against it. I was desirous of having my vote recorded the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whenever Mr. Speaker thinks that the call for division is unnecessary, he has it within his power to disallow that division.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of the matter.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 11

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Amendment) Order, No. 11, of 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Although some hon. members were mindful of the necessity of not dealing with the merits of this question — (Mr. LEWIS: What are you dealing with?) I gave notice of the Civil

Establishment General Amendment No. 11 Order 1954, and then I gave notice of the Resolution to approve that Order — (Mr. LEWIS: That does not mean that you are considering that Order first).— The Order has been laid and the Resolution is to approve that Order. Although hon. members to a certain extent have refrained from discussing the merits of this matter, and although the Leader of the House has explained why he had to get this meeting summoned, I will refer to it because certain hon. members have come in here with their minds made up. I do not know of more difficulty in anything than in respect of trying to get somebody to apply for this post. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: At this salary?) The Government of Jamaica and of British Honduras when it came to \$2,000 plus quarters, they more or less called a halt. I have discovered that as far as Trinidad is concerned, when they offered £1,200, not a single person was interested. Jamaica, British Honduras, Trinidad and Barbados were put in great difficulty because this type of man is extremely difficult to get. He is not normally leaving England, unless you can offer him a salary which only three people in the Senior posts get.

4.00 p.m.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies knows of the date of the prorogation, and knows of the dates of the Executive meetings; and in spite of his being urged to get this through before prorogation, he sent a cable on the 20th July to say that it was impossible to get a technical man for the salary we were suggesting. Also that we should aim at the type of man who would not be the big administrator, who would have exceedingly high qualifications, and who would only come for a salary in the category of the Chief Justice. They sent a telegram on the 20th July, and it was impossible to send an answer before the 22nd July, which was last Thursday's meeting of the Executive Committee. I would use the words which have been used by the hon. senior member for the City,—what honest Government with a patriotic view to the good of the community, would not on such an occasion as this, approach the Speaker to have this special meeting to put this matter before the House. Bear in mind, you have to establish this post before you can offer the likely person a salary. The Secretary of State for the Colonies was only tentatively asked. British Honduras, Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados have been waiting for a long time to get someone to fill the post of Principal of a Technical Institute. All four of these colonies have found it extremely difficult to get anybody even to bite. I believe Jamaica got somebody about six weeks ago. British Honduras is not so sure, although somebody has been tentatively selected. It is extremely difficult to get someone to fill the post of Principal of a Technical Institute. I repeat, we have found ourselves in the same position as when we tried to get someone to fill the post of Labour Officer on its inception. We had to scour the world before we got Mr. Perrin; I have never found it so difficult to get anybody for any post since that time, as it is to get somebody to fill this post.

If Government had come down here and said that, hon. members would get up and say that you are going to start another salary revision. As soon as you do that the Director of Education, the Head Master of Harrison College, and the Headmaster of Combermere School are going to ask for more money. Sir, we are not coming to this House for any salary revision, unless another war comes along. Let me repeat, we could not get an answer before the last Executive Committee meeting. The position is that we could not establish an office and make any

approach to the gentleman envisaged by the Secretary of State, until we had come here. All these things would have to be prepared in advance.

Let me repeat, the principals of the Technical Institutes are highly paid because they are highly technical people. Of course they do more training than administration. However, instead of Government getting this higher paid man, Government is saying we are not bound to have one who is an administrator, because we have somebody who has shown the ability for administering the Evening Institute. Everybody knows the success of Dr. Hamilton in administering the Evening Institute. Everybody will say, why not pay him and work him as a head in a purely administrative capacity and pay somebody a smaller salary to fill the position of the technical man? That is exactly what Government has done. I think the Opposition would have levelled much criticism at the Government if we had done the other thing. The important thing even now,—and hon. members can throw this at me—is that the demand for these technical officers is so great, that if somebody in the interval comes along and offers the person whom the Secretary of State has hinted for this appointment another job, we may find ourselves in the same position as we were at first,—that is looking for somebody else for this job.

Mr. Speaker,—I hope the House will agree that however inconvenient and unpleasant it may be to summons hon. members to come out today instead of tomorrow, plus tomorrow too, that it was necessary, and for the reason which we have intimated already. We of the Executive Committee were uncertain as to what may happen tomorrow. The Other Place may sit through tomorrow, and may not be able to get through with this matter along with other matters before 4 o'clock. Or if we had discussed it tomorrow we might not have got it up in time. Therefore, we came with it today with the hope that the legislature would be able to pass it before prorogation takes place. We considered it is better to do it today, than to wait until tomorrow. Let me also remind hon. members that the Other Place has to sit tomorrow and do all the things we did last week.

Mr. Speaker,—I suggest to hon. members if they read the addendum to this Resolution, they will see that it was impossible for anybody with any thought or who wanted to get something done before the House comes back at the end of September, to do otherwise than to ask this House to proceed with this matter to-day. I need hardly repeat what I have just said and what the hon. senior member for the City said,—that the Evening Institute has been a success under the direction of Dr. Hamilton.

I would like to pay the Opposition this tribute. Although they complain that we do not take any notice of them, they will be surprised to know that at every meeting of the Executive Committee, (not the collective views of the Opposition because there is no such thing,) the individual views of the various members of the Opposition are put to every member of the Executive. We anticipate what they will say. We have never yet made a mistake in anticipating objections that would come from the Opposition. I know what the hon. member from St. John will say when I sit down. (A MEMBER: Which member for St. John?) There is only one member for St. John who would make the sort of criticism which I expect to hear.

I do not think there is anything more I can add. The holder of the post will be purely a Technical Headmaster and will be expected to advise the Principal on technical matters and to assist generally in the administration of the Institute. In addition there

will be an Advisory Board. The Principal would be expected to take advice from him on technical matters.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second the motion. I do not support all this squabbling about having to meet today. I feel indeed that the members of this Assembly should be given proper notice of such important matters; but I cannot agree with these objections to having to come here today to deal with so vitally important a matter.

I am saying Sir, that the House of Assembly should meet more often, and for longer periods, and have longer periods for holiday. The House of Assembly of Puerto Rico meets for months on end, and they have longer holidays. There seems to be a feeling in this island that the words a "Professional Politician" should be used as a kind of epithet. In my view, politics is the highest profession. If we do not make it a profession, it becomes nothing but petty personal squabbling. The sooner we look at politics as an honourable profession, the higher would be our politics in this island.

I do not see any objection to having the House meet more than once a week. I am stressing to the Government that there should be a fundamental change in our method of meeting. We would do much for the island. At times it seems that the Government has no legislation to discuss; but it is not that there is no legislation, but rather that there is a lack of sufficiently deep thought of the social issues of the country. If there was that deep thought, the legislation that we would have to come to discuss would be overwhelming.

I do not object to having to meet occasionally when it is not expected that we would have to meet.

I rose chiefly to say that there should be a change in the method of meeting, and that you should be prepared to meet more often.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to say that those who objected, did so on the basis that the mere fact that two of the matters we are to deal with were considered so important that they necessitated the calling of a special meeting, makes it plain that more notice should have been given. There are some of us who advocate being professional politicians. Those who do not advocate that might still be prepared to give more sincere service when they do meet. They have no desire to trade their seats.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—I would ask Your Honour to ask the hon. member to explain what he means.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Those of us who do not advocate being professional politicians would be prepared to meet every day if the Rules of the House were changed to that effect. But we would still object to being called out on Sundays.

I have listened to the hon. introducer of this Resolution, and he made one of those statements that have become famous when he is on his feet. He suggested that the Government would not come down with a revision of salaries except a war comes along. I regard that as a bit of extravagance. No man in his senses should say that, unless he can precipitate a war. In normal circumstances you sometimes have to face a revision of salaries as this Government was forced to do some time ago. British Guiana and Trinidad are at present revising their salaries. If we are faced with the same difficulty in recruitment that we were faced with some time ago, the Minister of Social Services will soon be telling you that you must either pay more for Doctors at the General Hospital or go without them. Let us get it clear that the question of a war coming along is not the only reason for having to revise salaries.

The hon. introducer of the Resolution also said that we would not get a man agreeing to take the job unless you have established the post. That is true. But the Government is now asking the House to agree to the establishment of the post and still the Addendum says that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has advised that he has a possible candidate in view for selection. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has been advised by the Government that the Government intends to create this post, and they have asked the Secretary of State if he could find someone to fill it. No Secretary of State could have the impertinence under Ministerial Government, and even before Ministerial Government, to send a Message to Barbados of all Colonies, telling us that we must take the Principal of the Evening Institute and make him Principal of the Evening and Technical Institutes, and appoint another man. This has been done by the five Ministers. They sent and told the Secretary of State to find a man to fit in with this. This is something that was done before last Thursday. The Government must not forget that they are dealing with men who have analytical brains.

Look at the Addendum. The Premier always insists that before an Addendum is printed the person in charge of the Resolution must see it. The Addendum says that "the original intention was to recruit a Principal with Engineering or Technological qualifications of University Graduate or Professional status. Exhaustive enquiries however revealed that the engagement of such an officer would only be possible at a pensionable salary far in excess of those paid to equivalent technical officers in Barbados; in addition other concessions not previously granted to pensionable officers would have to be conceded."

That was the Government's original intention; but they decided that it would upset the salary scale, so they changed their policy about the type of man they would recruit. Instead of recruiting a man of high technical degrees they decided to follow the policy outlined in this Resolution; that is, amalgamating the post of Principal of the Evening Institute and that of Principal of the Technical Institute, at \$6,000 a year and appointing this man at a salary of \$4,800 a year rising to \$5,760 a year.

I am told that this decision was made only last Thursday. Sitting in Executive Committee for the last five years, I know that this would be a momentous decision to be arrived at last Thursday and to ask the House to agree with it today.

4.20 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Neither the honourable Leader of the House nor I, have said that this decision was taken last Thursday. The decision was taken to get this matter before the House today. The decision to change from appointing a high-power Board at the top and amalgamating these two offices was taken sometime ago. Enquiries were made to see whether we could get a man for this new job. The suggestion that the decision took place last Thursday in contrary to what the honourable Leader of the House has said and to what I have said.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sometimes the vehicle of expediency plays too much an important part when you are delivering a speech and you are likely to say something which you did not mean. The honourable Leader of the House said—sometimes in undertones and sometimes quite clear—the reason for this meeting was because the decision was reached on these matters last Thursday. The measures for which we have come here today could have been brought here before. We are not interested in whom the Secretary of States for the Colonies has in view. We are interested in establishing a post of

£1,000 rising to £1,200 and you want to change the Vice Principal. Now that you are proroguing the Legislature, it may be that the Minister of Communications wants something to be proceeded with while he is away, and therefore, he says he wants a principal. I am not a little child. I am a man and I have sense. If it had been a question of taking the decision to bring down this change in the establishment, the Honourable Premier could have come down here, the establishment could have been changed, and if he could not get a man to fit in with the salary in the establishment, he would have had the support of the House in making a change. Look through the establishment Orders today and see how many posts we have established! We established a post of Surgeon Specialist at a £1,000 a year, and and we came back here and said, that we could not get a Surgeon Specialist here to take the post without fees. Did we not have to give fees to the Surgeon Specialist and also give fees to other posts as well? But I say, that this issue with which we are dealing is a very important one. I would like to be able to point out certain things. If the Government waits until the last minute to do things, because they are in a position to say we can waive any proposition we have made, such is regrettable. Mr. Hamilton may be a very good man in himself. There are things which I could read, but I did not have the time to read the second report of the Evening Institute. There was a publication nearly 7 years ago. A Committee went into the report, and I have not had the opportunity of reading that report. It has to be borne in mind that the original institute was a semi-adult educational school but not a technical school, and that is why you wanted a pure academic Dean. The boys who did not do so well at Secondary or Elementary schools could further their education, not only along technical lines, but also along academic lines. This technical school is not an academic institute. To say that because the Dean who has done good work should necessarily be the principal for this school, in order to fill in the name of instructor—I do not agree with that. Dr. Hamilton may be very good in his academic field—No matter how you work an amalgamation for convenience, it produces anomalies. Whoever is the principal in charge of the Technical School, he must be the man to be fully in charge of what you discover at Richmond or wherever it is. Dr. Hamilton cannot be of any use to this man. All over the world where you have Technical Schools, where you have Boards of that nature, you set up people who have interest in it. Apprenticeship gives a fundamental influence to deal with labour problems, and I hope not only employers' representatives but also workers representatives will be placed on these Boards, so that the workmen who work on the various institutions can have some say in the things which are dealt with in the trades.

I am convinced in my mind that this salary is too low. Why I say so is, that £1,000 per year amounts to roughly to £20 per week. What type of man is there in Great Britain today who would be looking for a £20 job in any of the Colonies. It is true to say that you could not get anybody to come out to these colonies from Great Britain for this salary unless he is a 'bus driver. The argument that has been used by Government—if you pay a higher salary you may upset the present scale,—is one with which I am not in agreement. Honestly I am not a believer in paying salaries which are likely to upset the salary scale but this Government would not have to do that. Has this Government not paid people on contract, salaries that are higher than corresponding positions in the salary scale and yet have not upset the salary scale or caused any dissatisfaction? What you are paying to this office of Deputy Princi-

pal and Chief Technical Instructor is the equivalent of what you now pay your Permanent Secretaries. I repeat, if you get a proper man and pay him on contract, that would not make the Headmasters of your First and Second Grade Schools come along and ask for similar salaries. You will be doing something similar to what you have done with Mr. Garrod.

Sir, you have evolved a way of getting people on contract to fill technical posts. How can you now say that you are not making this a contract post when you have made other technical posts on contract. Your Radiologist is on contract. Your Surgeon Specialist is on contract as well as your officers down the scale. Your Anaesthetist is also on contract.

Sir, because this post is different to what you thought at first, Government has changed the name and is calling the person who fills it Deputy Principal and Chief Technical Instructor. I do not know if Government has any belief in the worth of this school. If Government has any belief in the worth of this school it should make the salary of the person who is to fill this important job worthwhile. It was for that reason that I raised objection with dealing with this matter today. I do feel it needs more consideration.

Sir, today you will appoint a man who is a senior clerk to a senior post which goes up to £900 a year. What is happening in the Civil Service today is, because the scale is higher, the officer whom you have appointed to that senior post has to wait nine years or thereabouts before he reaches the top of that salary. I just mentioned that at this time, because when the legislature is prorogued, the Government will have time to go into these things. With the appointment of Deputy Principal and Chief Technical Instructor the Secretary of State is responsible for so doing; but I would like to let the Public Service Commission know that it has to answer for a lot. It is true to say that Civil Servants are a people who are afraid to voice their feelings. As a matter of fact even some members of this honourable House of Assembly are afraid to voice theirs, because they came in here and act as though they were people holding a job in here. There is no job in here for me. I finished working with a boss ever since.

I want to make it quite clear that in this Order you have anomalies. I finally state that I am not impressed with the arguments of the Government. Let me repeat that we do not want any bottom man for this job. If we cannot get a top man we do not want any at all. If we want a foreman let us employ a man like Mr. Applewithe or Mr. Leon Alleyne. I contend we do not want a foreman. That is not good enough. I would say if you bring down a man who is only a qualified foreman, as soon as he gets here he will wish to start and live in an atmosphere quite different from the position he lived in while in England. It is known that a man in England with a family working for £20 a week cannot employ any servants; but you will find that as soon as he gets here and sees servants is the order of the day for people in his category, he is going to employ servants and then he will be coming back to you and telling you that the money you are paying him is not big enough. Sir, we do not want any glorified foreman to fill this position at the Institute.

I do feel that now that a delegation is going from here to England on the question of a Deep Water Harbour, that the sensible thing to do would be to wait until you get there and discuss this matter of Principal for the Technical Institute with the Colonial Office. I see nothing wrong with postponing this matter and allowing members of the Delegation

who will be visiting England shortly on the question of the Deep Water Harbour, to discuss this matter with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I feel that it would be much better than allowing ourselves to be subjected to some glorified foreman from some workshop, and to solace ourselves with the view that the person was the best man we could get at the salary scale set down here.

I know why it is felt that this would upset the salary scale. This is because there are a certain amount of professional snobbers who are still existing. The hierarchy of educational people have not yet reached the stage of realising what a post like this would mean to the colony. If it were something to do with the humanities or the arts, you would not hear this excuse. You do not hear it when you come to appoint doctors at the Hospital. We pay salaries at the Hospital today of which we have nothing to be ashamed of as a small colony. As far as the legal profession is concerned, there are people in other colonies who will be glad to come here. Even some Barbadians outside would like to come. So there is no excuse for using the argument about upsetting the salary scale, when it comes to this matter of the Technical Institute.

This does not deal with something that is only for a term. It will be forever and forever so to speak. Therefore, I do not see that it would have made any difference if the Government had allowed it to remain until after prorogation.

4.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: If hon. members will give me a chance, I will make an explanation. Much is being made of the fact that negotiations were going on for sometime with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and that this matter only reached the House today. That is quite true. But on the last occasion on which this matter was discussed in Executive Committee, the Premier was not present. He was ill. We decided to come to the House with it only when we were sure that you could get someone for the post at that salary. It is quite obvious that you could not put the Principal of the Evening Institute and the Technical Institute at one salary, and then discover that you had to appoint a person to the post of Deputy Principal at a higher salary than what you had intended to give the Principal. That is why the Executive Committee decided to wait until we were sure we could get someone for the salary set out in the Resolution. On Thursday last we were told that there was someone who was interested in the post. It was not known how long he would wait. Hence the urgency of this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I voted against the suspension of the Rules because I agreed with those members who felt that this matter is too important a one to be rushed through the House. There is a great deal of importance attached to a technical education, and it has been discussed for quite a long time. We are starting a new institution in Barbados. It is very fitting that such an Institution should get off to a good start, because it would be of great importance not merely to Barbados but to the West Indies as a whole. We are going to have to export technically qualified men; not only carpenters and masons, but university graduates; people with Science degrees. Whether or not we find money to industrialise Barbados, we will turn out more people than we can find jobs for.

After listening to the Hon. Premier it struck me that the decision to incorporate both the Institutes must have been taken two or three months ago, if you were finding difficulty in getting a man. The Government felt that they could not afford a £2,000 a year man. The Government of Trinidad has just got

a man for the San Fernando Institute with a B.Sc., in engineering for £1,500 a year to teach up to the Higher National Certificate. I am as strong on this as the hon. junior member for St. Peter, because I feel that a new institution starting off from scratch, should start off on a good footing.

Knowing the Technical Institutes in London as I do, I doubt very much whether you can get a good man for this salary. I agree that the Government should get a good man who would work along with a team of suitable West Indians to teach metallurgy, bench lathe work, and that kind of thing. He should naturally have some ability as an administrator. He should be the Dean of technical subjects. I do not think it will be a good thing to incorporate the technical with the academic side.

I doubt whether Barbados can get a man with a Higher National Certificate, and at least twelve years experience for this salary. That is the type of man we should have. As the hon. junior member for St. Peter reminded us so forcibly, we do not want a man to start off in such an Institution, unless he has got the qualification and the ability to do the job. I was not impressed when I read in the *Advocate* on Sunday that if you pay this man £2,000 a year it would upset our local salary structure. We have Mr. Garrod at the Waterworks, who, according to the hon. senior member for the City, is a blessing to Barbados. We also have Mr. Garrett; and I am at a loss as to what he does. The salaries we pay those two have not upset our structure.

I think it would do us well to have a really qualified man at this Technical Institute. A gentleman from the shirt factory told me recently that if we could develop real technical skill in this island, Venezuela even with its nationalist tendencies, might take in some of our people. In my view this money would be spent as a worthwhile investment as far as Barbados and the West Indies as a whole are concerned. We all know that today there is still the tendency to concentrate more on scholarships for the white collar professions. But it may be, that in the next ten or fifteen years, those who control the Government and who are responsible for the development of the island, will have to advise people against going into white collar professions. That is not said from a selfish point of view. From the time that we emerged from slavery our people had it ingrained into them, that they must get into the white collar professions if they wanted to gain respect. In ten or fifteen years from now we will have to change that idea, because the world seems to be becoming a place to be controlled by high powered machines. Those people who are still thinking along the old lines of professional snobbery will have to change their ideas.

Before I sit, I would like to know if the Leader of the House could give some information as to the qualifications of this man who will be Deputy Principal. I say that you may get a good foreman getting £18 a week; and a man of that calibre does not seem to be the right type for this job.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—When I opposed the suspension of the Rules I did not go into the subject matter of this Resolution, because I was not allowed to do so. I listened very carefully to the Premier, and before I start to reply to him, I am going to say that it does seem unfortunate that the official Opposition must speak after the back-benchers. It is unfortunate, because it might be thought that we are taking our views from back-benchers. The fact is that we are slow in expressing our views at times. That is why I asked that the matter be postponed. While we have not had sufficient time to discuss the recommendation put up, we feel in

many ways similar to how the hon. junior member for St. Peter feels about this matter.

Now as I understand it, there is a bit of jealousy between the academic side of education and the technical side of it. I hope the Premier will listen to this. There is some jealousy between the academic people and the technical people. That jealousy has been going on for sometime and you cannot help hearing these things. I have always heard that in the matter of education you always begin at the top somehow. The Hon. Premier has anticipated the Opposition wrongly this time. What I am saying is this: I objected to this Addendum purely because we did not have time, and mainly because I feel that their policy is wrong. The Addendum says this:—

“The original intention was to recruit a Principal with Engineering or Technical qualification of University Graduate or Professional status. Exhaustive enquiries however revealed that the engagement of such an officer would only be possible at a pensionable salary far in excess of those paid to equivalent technical officers in Barbados; in addition other concessions not previously granted to pensionable officers would have to be conceded.”

The Premier has said that if he had come down here for anybody with a salary of £2,000 per year, you would have heard what the Opposition would say. We view quite seriously this matter of the Technical Institute. We heard at one time that the Headmaster of a School was masquerading himself or was trying to ease himself in, and we are smiling and hoping that the Government would play into our hands and make this mistake. The Hon. Premier is now hearing that for the first time; but every other members of the House, and every member of the public have heard that. I have never been to England, but I read. In the United States of America, you get a diploma, not necessarily a degree. Here you are going to bring out a person for £20 a week and the Hon. Premier knows that such a man would have to come out here for more or less and he would hardly be the type of man you need. The Addendum says that the original intention was to do these things and it says that exhaustive enquiries have been made. We feel it would have been much more polite to ask the House for an expression of opinion on this matter. They could have got our view. I say that it would have been much more polite to have our views on the matter, rather than come to the conclusion that the Opposition will oppose the idea of a man coming out here on contract for three or four years to start a matter of vital importance in this country. Mark well, in the future years we would have people here despite reports of family planning and the like. We will train our people in the art of industries and mechanism and we will have to export them when other countries are developing. If the Government had said that it was not possible to get an officer of this status for this salary, speaking for myself I would say this:—if you bring somebody here whether he is an Englishman, an Irishman or what, if he is a good man doing his job, just as we supported the Government in a matter of the Head of the Water Works Department, we would support this measure. I would like to say in passing that some of the officials whom we have here could be shipped away before they land; but if you have a good man, pay him. I am saying that you bring people down here and then you find that young men here will laugh at them. I say start with a good man at the top. If you had decided to come to this House and ask for an expression of opinion, having exhausted all the efforts to get the type of man you wanted—you have succeeded in getting one of the finest engineers in the Public Works Department.

This is not a question of not discussing anything with the Director of Education. I would ask what is the position of your Director of Public Works today? No good man of University status can be had down here for less than £1,200 a year.

He can make more than that in any firm. Dr. Hamilton is a fine administrator, but if you brought out a man on contract for three or four years eventually he would have left his position and Dr. Hamilton would have had more experience. To bring down a third rate man at a £1,000 a year—he would not be above Mr. Sayers, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Applewhaite or any of the like. That has been proved right here in this country. We do not try to belittle the effort; we feel that this matter is of great importance to this colony. The reason why we voted against the suspension of the Rules is, that you have changed your view without having on record the possibility that the members of this Chamber could have contributed anything to this matter. This is one time that the Government has missed the Bus. I do not think that it is fair to say that we would have quibbled over a salary of £1,800 or £2,000 a year for a contract period. If you were to start a luxurious hotel in the West Indies you would get a chef from Switzerland, so that when he is finished after three years, there will be people who would have been trained to take over. It is common knowledge that jealousy exists between the education heads of this country relative to this technical post. This state of affairs was to be expected for a long time. I feel this way about it:—I am not voting for this Resolution today purely because I disagree with bringing in the type of person whom you are bringing in. If you are bringing in a man at all, you must bring a man of status which is far above the practical men whom we have in Barbados. You are bringing in a man of the foreman type. The Addendum to this Resolution says:—

"It is therefore proposed to amalgamate the Technical and Evening Institutes under the present head of the latter Institute and to establish the post of Deputy Principal and Chief Technical Instructor with the following qualifications."

The qualifications are set out. Still I maintain that if you had a man with the Graduate status, (that is practical experience plus theoretical experience), on contract for three or four years with administrative ability, Dr. Hamilton would be in a much better position to administer the Institute. To bring a man of a third rate type at this salary, I do not think that could do the Institution the desired good which this Chamber would have done to it.

5.10 p.m.

The honourable Leader of the House when I rose to oppose the motion for the suspension of the Rules referred to us as only horn-blowers. It is infinitely better to be a horn-blower than a bell-ringer, because you can only ring the bell when they tell you to ring it.

Sometimes the best turns out to be the worst. I am sure the honourable Leader of this House has heard of that existing jealousy and rivalry which have been going on about the education head and this technical head. This jealousy and rivalry have been touched off to such an extent that articles were written in the Press to support each side.

I am therefore suggesting that this motion be postponed, and this is because of the indictment which the Government has thrown at the Opposition. I think it is a most unfair one. It would go out to the taxpayers and the world, that the back-benchers and the Opposition of this colony are very disinterested in a Technological Institute for the future training of the youth of this colony who are not fitted for academic careers. That means the majority of youth in this colony. How many pupils

in Barbados are Barbados Scholars? How many get certificates? This is of vital importance. The greatest indictment against the Opposition, is that we are so disinterested in this Institution that Government had to change its plans and therefore had to apply for a fourth rate Englishman to come down here to fill the position. When we get a fourth rate Englishman, he will not know anything more than Mr. Denton Sayers or Mr. Leon Alleyne. You are saying that the reason why you changed your views was because you felt that the Opposition would not have supported you in getting a £2,000 a year person to fill the post. Of course, if you said that you would have to bring a man at that salary and then give him pension rights and so forth we would say "no"; but if you brought him on contract, that would be a different thing. Most of these technical graduates prefer to go some place on a three-year contract. They gain experience by so doing. As a matter of fact, not one of them who is worth his salt would want to go somewhere for more than three years; therefore, the indictment that we of the Opposition are disinterested in this Institute, is untrue.

The Honourable Premier said, that if Government had come down here with that sort of Resolution the Opposition would have criticised him, and would have said "No". I would say if that is your attitude, if that is in your heart, and if it is a wish of the Government to be parsimonious about this Institute, and you are refusing to get the best man, we of the Opposition will ask you to take another chance at trying to get some permanent person for the salary we are offering. If that is not possible, try to get some qualified person on a three-year contract. It is my belief that if you get a qualified man on a three-year contract, at the end of that term, he would carry some Barbadians to such a high standard, that it would be unnecessary to have another man at that salary. Dr. Hamilton would then be in a position to see after this Institute. I am therefore counselling the Government to postpone this Resolution. Let me repeat, it is untrue to say that the Opposition would be unwilling to support you if you had brought down a Resolution to get a qualified man along the lines you have suggested. Let me also say, that every other local chap who is qualified in some way to fill this post, is trying to pat members of the Government on their backs to see if he can get the job. Don't tell me, sir, that if you have to get a qualified engineer with a B.Sc. degree to fill this post, and because you have to pay him a suitable salary, somebody who has a School Certificate or a third class B.A. degree would scruple about it. Please tell me the reason why you cannot get a suitable person and pay him between £1,500 and £2,000 to teach the people here something. Bring in a man at £2,000 a year,—one who is a University graduate, a man of Captain Tomlin's type. Do not get a wishy-washy man. The Hon. Premier knows that we had some wishy-washy people at this Waterworks for many years, and they did the island no good. This same type of argument that you cannot pay somebody a greater salary than your Colonial Secretary was put forward when you came in here and said that you could not get a certain specialist at the salary you were offering. These people do not work for a salary by sitting down in wheel-chairs. To get up and say that if you came down here with a Resolution to pay a qualified person more money, the Opposition would have opposed it, is a dishonest view. You should come first and get an expression of opinion from this House. You are embarking on a new scheme in this country. You said what you wanted before; but you have changed it at a meeting of the Executive, and now, at the last minute you are saying, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot find the type of man you wanted. You are coming down

today, the day before prorogation, with this changed scheme. I will not vote for it.

Sir, for every thousand boys who come out of Secondary and Elementary schools, ten might qualify for higher education and go to a University. Therefore, it is very important that you think of getting a qualified man to take charge of this Technical Institute. To my mind it is of as much importance to pay £1,500 a year to get a suitable person for your Technical Institute as it is to pay £1,500 to the person who is Director of Education; because the person in charge of a Technical Institute would be of more importance to this Community. I am saying that you should try your very best to get a good man at the beginning. If you get a good man the people will be able to absorb something which will be useful to them. I am not saying anything against Dr. Hamilton. He is a very good administrator. He is doing a lovely job at the Evening Institute. He would be like an idiot at the Technical Institute if you brought a third-rate man to be associated with him. It would be better to bring a suitable man and put Dr. Hamilton to work under him. I am sure that if you put Dr. Hamilton to work with him, after four or five years when this man would have ended his contract, Dr. Hamilton would have something on him.

I am not voting for this Resolution. I counsel the Government to postpone it, and to come back with the Resolution for more money to get a qualified man on contract. Do not come here with this "wishy-washy" scheme and expect that I am going to vote for it. Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this Resolution be now postponed.

5.20 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second that motion. At this stage, Sir, at the request of honourable members, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour. But I am seconding the motion made by the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. He cannot second a motion and at the same time make a motion for the adjournment of the House. Therefore, the hon. member has not really moved the adjournment.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I understand that the idea of the hon. senior member for the City is that we postpone this Resolution now and come back afterwards with a Resolution for more money. I do not think that he would persist in that idea after I have read two telegrams which we received after the meeting of the Executive. I am speaking on the motion that the Resolution be postponed. In January this year the Executive Committee decided to advertise in the Caribbean area for a candidate for this post, subject to the approval of salary by the Legislature, the salary was £1,000 a year. We asked the Colonial Office in the meanwhile about the possibility of recruiting someone on secondment from a U.K. technical school at a higher salary. We sent a telegram off a few days after asking what were the prospects of securing such an officer. The telegram also stated that the matter had been discussed in Executive Committee, which, in view of the advice available locally, stressed that the Principal should be first and foremost a good administrator. We also expressed interest in securing the services of a youngish man on a three-year secondment until a local successor had been trained. Back came a telegram saying: "There are no, (repeat no) reasonable prospects of securing a good officer as you propose." Is the hon. member still blaming the Government?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I just want to say this—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. The question is that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. Hon. members in favour will please say "aye", and those against will please say "no". I think the "Noes" have it.

On a division being called for, the question was decided in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD.—(8).

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, MILLER, BRANCKER and J. C. MOTTLEY.—(11).

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, a division being taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, MILLER, BRANCKER and J. C. MOTTLEY.—(11).

Noes: Messrs. WILLIAMS, F. L. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD, VAUGHAN, ALLDER, HAYNES, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD.—(8).

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative eleven hon. members voting "Aye" and eight hon. members voting "No." I declare the "Ayes" have it.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.35 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee, to deal with the two Money Resolutions of which notice was given earlier this afternoon.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

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

Resolution for Trade Union Delegate

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for \$320 in respect of a visit of a Trade Union Official to the United Kingdom. This is a simple matter. From time to time the United Kingdom Government has asked the Colonies to send out people to see how things are done in England so that they can go back home and make use of the knowledge which they have gained. These invitations started during the War when journalists from the West Indies were invited to visit the United Kingdom. Hon. members will remember the delegates who went up to the United Kingdom. You, Mr. Chairman, and the Hon. Minister of Communications went up in connection with Parliamentary matters; and what we have before

us now is something similar to that. We have not been asked to send up a teacher, but the rest of the West Indies have been asked to send up a teacher. This is a question of sending up a Trade Union official or a journalist. This is a general invitation extended to the West Indies and it has been decided to send up a Trade Union Official. It was felt by the Trinidad Government that Trade Union officials were hardly able to pay their daily expenses and that their Government felt that the amount of \$10.00 per day should be paid for personal expenses, and it has sent on the information to us. The expenses for transportation, meals and accommodation will be paid by the Trinidad Government, but the Trade Union official will have to pay for his laundry expenses. The expenses for meals do not include all the drinks which one takes at the bar (Laughter). This Government, like the Trinidad Government, feels that the amount of \$10.00 a day should be paid for personal expenses, and this Resolution is for the purpose of providing that money. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am not against giving local people the opportunity of furthering their knowledge along their particular lines; but it is good at times, if the whole world starts to come your way, to refuse it, I am wondering what is in this new idea of the British Government and the Governments of these West Indian Islands, in offering trips abroad so regularly to Colonials. It has been said that if your treatment towards people has been treatment which cannot be considered as good, and you start over-night to shower on these people all the necessities of life, such does more harm than good.

6.15 p.m.

I do not believe in what the Government is saying. I do not believe that everytime somebody from overseas extends an invitation to somebody through our Government, it should be accepted. It is not at all times necessary to accept these invitations. This is one of the invitations which I feel the Government would be right in not accepting. If I were the Government I would make an excuse. I would say that I find it inconvenient or inexpedient to send a Trade Union Official to the Mother Country, because already this year several Trade Unionists and other people have been sent overseas on the same basis as has been proposed for the present invitee.

I certainly cannot see the benefit which accrues to this colony through the visits of these individuals to the Mother Country. I am also wondering if these invitations to under-privileged people from the colonies by the Mother Country, is not a new technique in diplomacy. I am wondering if it is a means of rallying new supporters to the cause of the Mother Country, or if it is a means of fighting the international difficulties which Britain is encountering with foreign nations. There is some reason and something underlying these invitations, I would say, speaking as one of those who belong to under-privileged people, that our struggles must always be before us. No attempt at palliatives or compromises by the British Government, or any other Government for that matter, should turn our views away from the right course of our fighting for the emancipation of the under-privileged of these colonies. The reason why I say that, is because I think these visits are an attempt to change the minds of the defenders of the common cause. It is noticeable that when many of them come back from visits such as this, they sing in a tone different from that in which they sang before they went on these trips. Because of that, the masses have to be

continually throwing in new blood and finding new defenders of their cause, to take the place of those who have allowed themselves to be coerced by the Imperial Government into becoming defenders of Imperialism instead of defenders of freedom.

While the amount set out for this purpose does appear to be small, it is not so much the amount at issue, but the principle. The question is whether every other week, or every other month, we should be sending people overseas on these sort of trips. While the amount appears to be very trifling in this case, at the end of the financial year, when everything is added up, you will find that you have thrown away much on these trips, which could have enabled you to make some substantial improvement to your social services.

The next thing is, one does not even know which Trade Union is going to be asked to supply this invitee. It will be remembered that on the last occasion when a Resolution was before this hon. Chamber for a similar measure, there was some confusion over the question as to whether one Trade Union should benefit or whether another Trade Union, (which existed but which was said by the Government to be non-existing) should be asked to nominate a member to go on a course which was being offered at the time. I am sure, reading from recent registrations of Trade Unions, that there are more than one or two Trade Unions in the area. I am sure that when the Secretary of State suggests that a Trade Union Official should be invited to the Mother Country, he certainly would not like to know that partiality is carried to its extreme, and that only one organization is asked to nominate one of its members. The reason why the Secretary of State sends out these invitations, in my humble opinion, is because he wants to get as many individuals as he can from a particular colony, whether those individuals are in the same organization or of various organizations, to come to England to see what the British want them to see, and to hear, what they want them to hear, with the hope that the knowledge which is imparted is not limited to one group, but is dispersed among all groups. This is the means which would better serve the cause for which the British are sending out these invitations. (A VOICE: We are not dealing with that.)

The next thing which is wrong with this matter, is that on the last occasion even the august body of the Barbados Workers' Union failed to find two truly and worth-while Trade Unionists to send on the Trade Union courses. The council of that Union had to go outside of its ranks and select one who to my knowledge,— (and I believe it is correct knowledge) was none other than a person who is sympathetic to the Trade Union cause. The selection caused a little misunderstanding, and I am wondering what is going to happen in the selection of the Trade Union official on this occasion. Is the Government extending the invitation or making sure that all the registered Trade Unions in this island, have had the opportunity of nominating a suitable choice from their Union? As I have said before, I know for a certainty that there is a Trade Union registered some time last year. Its headquarters are situated in the Belle Gully area. The last time that an invitation was sent here for two Trade Union officials to go on a course, there was some argument as to whether one of them should not come from the Barbados Workers' Union and the other from the Barbados Clerks' Union.

I repeat sir, that it is not always right to accept all these invitations. It is not right that we should select people to go on these trips from one particular

group, and disregard the claims of members from other groups which might be in existence. As I have said, I cannot see much benefit coming from this invitation. What I have noticed is, that West Indian leaders have allowed themselves to become so "Englishised" that they have allowed themselves to be turned away from the right and proper way as regards defending the rights and privileges of the masses; — so much so, that one has become very scared of them.

6.25 p.m.

These trips have resulted in the creation of a lot of "hatchet men." By that I mean people, who because of these trips and because of their short association with English officials, have come back here, and instead of showing the way and enlightening the others who have been left here, and who they know must continue to fight for the advancement of the masses, have been acting differently. The fact is, that as soon as some Trade Unionists go to England on a trip and come back, they start to accuse those whom they left here of being Communists. Next we find them advocating their destruction even although there is no proof that they have Communist connections. It is purely that these people are merely repeating the same progressive slogans which the trade unionists used to use, before these invitations were extended.

I am not limiting my remarks to any particular individual. We have seen repeatedly throughout these colonies, statements made by trade unionists or politicians who have gone to England at the invitation of the British Government, in an effort to damage the cause for which they had once set themselves up to fight. Every now and again you see a statement in some West Indian newspaper that some individual, who overnight has become very related to the Imperialists of London, starts to accuse his companions in the colonies of being related to the Communists. The only means they can find to fight their local companions now is to accuse them of being related to international Communism.

If that system is permitted to continue, it will do a great deal of harm to the masses of these colonies. Even though we have started to enjoy some of the fruits of progress, it does not mean that the battle must not go on. It is only by a continuation of the struggle that the masses will continue to enjoy what they should have enjoyed several hundred years ago. If these trade unionists who have become so related to the Home Office and to the British Conservatives are allowed to continue to make such false accusations against their companions in these colonies, you are going to make it very difficult for others to take courage and to fight publicly on behalf of the masses.

As I said sir, I hope that if these invitations continue to come to us so often, the Government in its wisdom will make an excuse and say "we cannot accept the invitation at the present time." It would be a good thing if the government refused some of these invitations occasionally. I opened my remarks by saying, it is not good to accept the world if the world comes your way.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I did not want to enter this debate because it is something to do with the organisation which I represent. It is true that the hon. member who has just spoken does not pretend to know anything about the principles of trade unionism; so when he begins to lay down a dictum, it is the normal manner in which some politicians act. What should be brought to his attention is the fact that as far as the Barbados Workers Union is concerned, it is not sectional in char-

acter. What I mean is, that the Barbados Workers Union is not a sectional union like the Clerks Union. It is what is regarded locally as a Trade Secretariat or a Trades Union Council, in that the Barbados Workers' Union represents a collection of trades and types of workers. Any other Union is purely sectional in character.

There is no doubt about it that the B. W. U. has more collective agreements with employers throughout the island than any other trade union. There are no trade unions in Barbados with which the B. W. U. is in competition. The Clerks' Union deals with shop assistants and clerical people employed around Bridgetown; but there are clerks in the Barbados Workers' Union. The B.W.U. has made representations on behalf of clerks on more than one occasion. It is like the case in Trinidad where the Trinidad and Tobago Federation of Trade Unions is a collection of unions.

What I would like to tell the hon. senior member for St. John is that as far as we Trade Unionists are concerned, we do not beg the Government for money to go anywhere. We pull our pockets. I have gone abroad on several occasions without asking the Government for any assistance. In this case, other West Indian Governments are doing what this Resolution seeks that the Government of Barbados should do, and therefore I do not object to it. This is an invitation from the Colonial Office to send Trade Unionists to the U.K., just as you sent Journalists on another occasion.

When you come to comparing the Clerks' Union with the Barbados Workers' Union of which I am the General Secretary, I want to make it plain that no member of the mercantile community has got to give me permission to attend a meeting. I attend meetings as a representative of workers. On one occasion I was offered a scholarship to England, I did not accept it, because I did not appreciate being the subject of the type of remarks which one hears in this House where things of that nature are concerned. I do not want anything from this House as an individual. I am not the sort of person who is going to get around hon. members asking them to vote to send me anywhere. I do not want to ask a member to support me. Anything that I get must be the result of merit.

Now what this Resolution deals with is not just a trip to England. The Colonial Office is inviting Trade Unionists to see the working of industrial organisations in the U.K. If the hon. senior member for St. John thinks that all the wisdom in the world resides in Broad Street or in Barbados, he can continue to live in that fool's paradise.

If I were a Communist I would not be afraid to say I am one. There are some people who associate themselves with a term, and who, as soon as that term becomes objectionable, drop it quickly. Some people call me a Communist. As soon as you do not fit into the pattern that some people would like you to fit into, you are called a Communist. Some people will say that you are a Communist, some will say you are a Conservative and others will say that you are bombastic or a rebel. The English language has provided words which one can use as it suits one to use.

In so far as the Barbados Workers Union is concerned all that is being paid to the individual would be, during his stay away from Barbados, his passage would be paid, his expenses will be paid. I do not mean his out-of-pocket expenses. The Barbados Workers Union is——

6.35 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the matter has not been explained, it is not for me to explain it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—The Hon. Premier in his opening remarks has said that from time to time invitations have been received in this colony and in other colonies from the British Government for people in various walks of life to visit the United Kingdom,—some of them taking courses and other extending their knowledge in the industrial area. Apparently, this is one of those invitations in which the opportunity is given to a Trade Union official to visit the United Kingdom to expand his knowledge. I do agree that if you are a member of Trade Union in the West Indies and you find that your knowledge and experience under local conditions are limited, it would be a very good thing for you to go to the United Kingdom and expand your knowledge. The Addendum to this Resolution states: "As it is considered desirable that the invitation should be accepted, the purpose of this Resolution is to provide incidental and personal expenses for the nominee at the rate of \$10.00 per day."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to other hon. members to let me hear what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We, on this side of the table, always insist on getting more details than we are given when we are dealing with Resolutions of this nature. I would be the last person to oppose a Trade Unionist going abroad to further his knowledge, because I am in a country where we are associated with Trade Unions. But I am bound to ask a simple question. This amount here is to pay the out-of-pocket expenses and I should like to know who is the official. As I understand the position, he will be an official from the Barbados Workers' Union, and there are some of the officials at this Union who are drawing big salaries. If this money is in respect of a person who is drawing a big salary, I will not vote it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the honourable member—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want the hon. member to answer other things as well. I believe that when you come to the question of the out-of-pocket expenses for a Trade Unionist from a humble walk of life, it is my duty to put my hand in my pocket and subscribe to the payment of these expenses. If you have a Trade Unionist who has had education from abroad, that spells harmony in this Island. If a Trade Unionist goes abroad and gets further knowledge and experience, the better it will be for the harmonious working in this colony. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that. I am only asking the Hon. Premier to say who is the Official to be selected. If that Official's position is such that he can afford to pay his out-of-pocket expenses. I will not vote for this Resolution. Will the Hon. Premier now tell us who is the Official so selected.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: No Official has been selected as yet. The Labour Commissioner has asked the opinion of the Union. I should like to say that it is not likely that the Official who will be chosen will be able to find two cents of his private income to pay these expenses.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Public opinion is that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is still an official of the Union. The statement was made in here by the hon. senior member for St. George that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is still an official of the Union.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has never been an official of the Union.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Well, the hon. member is not a member of the Union. I am saying that

if you are asking for \$10 a day to pay the out-of-pocket expenses of this Trade Union Official, I will readily give it. If the type of person chosen is that type of person who can absorb experience outside, as I have always done, I will put my hands into my pocket and contribute to these expenses, because that will be something good for the harmony and good-working in this colony. The Hon. Premier has said that no selection has been made as yet, but that the person who will be selected will not be able to pay two cents of these expenses. I accept that; but I should like to know who is the person who has been named. By next Sunday the Official of this Trade Union may be a man of a thousand pounds a year. I am serious about this matter. You come for this amount of \$10 a day, and you tell me that the official has not been selected. If you are selecting an Official who can afford to pay his expenses, do you expect that the House will burden the taxpayers with this expenditure? When the journalists were invited to the United Kingdom nobody came down for out-of-pocket expenses. If a Trade Unionist goes to a big country and he obtains knowledge and comes back here and is better suited for handling Trade Union matters, that is all right. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is in a much better position to-day than when he started. That is not flattery; that is knowledge. Even the Hon. Premier will tell you that.

6.45 p.m.

As I have said, I am very serious about this. The Hon. Premier is asking us to pass this Resolution today. He cannot name the person, but he says that the person who has been selected is unable to pay. Maybe the Trade Union will select an official who has a £12,000 a year job. The Hon. Premier is not an official of the Barbados Workers' Union now. The Hon. Premier who was once President of that Union has no say now in the working of that Union. Therefore, he cannot say who should go to England on this occasion. He is also saying that if we pass this Resolution and the Other Place agrees to it, and if the selection is not made to the satisfaction of the Government, the money which we vote would not be paid out. I would like to hear from the hon. junior member for St. Peter, if any selection has been made yet. (A VOICE: The selection has been made.) If that is so, can I know who has been selected? I would like to know.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The differences of opinion with regard to the finances of this matter, have brought me to my feet. Sir, the Addendum says, "The Secretary of State for the Colonies has invited 'a nomination of a trade union official to visit the 'United Kingdom from the 15th September, to the '17th October to obtain a further understanding of 'the achievements and problems of that country 'with special reference to trade unionism. A similar 'invitation has been sent to the other British West 'Indian Colonies. The Central Office of Information 'will be meeting all the normal expenses of the visitors and the escorting officer, in the United Kingdom, including accommodation, meals and transport, but excluding incidental and personal expenses. Her Majesty's Government will be meeting 'passage expenses.'"

In other words, the person for whom we are voting this money is going to Britain to get some understanding of the achievements and problems of Great Britain, with special reference to trade unionism. What I want to ask is this, in return for the expenditure of \$320 of the taxpayers' money, what benefit will anybody in this country get when the Barbados Trade Union official goes to England merely to understand some of the problems of trade unionism

in Great Britain. He may benefit from going abroad, and I am always willing to see that people go abroad to derive benefits, but in this matter he is not going there to be able to learn anything which would be of any special benefit to Barbados. He is going there to get some further understanding of the achievements and problems of trade unionism in Great Britain.

These West Indian Colonies, in common with the other colonies of the British Empire, are pushing on towards self Government. It is an accepted fact that the United Kingdom feels that here and there selections must be made of people of all walks of life in the various colonies, who should be able to carry on the mantle of Great Britain,—people who can become indoctrinated with the British way of life, so that finally when these colonies do achieve self Government, they would be a small but powerful body of progressive people in these self-governing colonies to remain as links with Great Britain. On principle you cannot blame the British Government for striving to pursue that policy. No Imperial Government which finds itself being forced to sever the ties which exist between itself and former colonies, would pursue a different policy. It does seem to me that Great Britain stands to benefit from this invitation which it has sent to these West Indian colonies on this occasion. If she wants these small but powerful groups to maintain the links with herself, then she should foot the Bill. There can be no claim in this case that the Barbados Workers' Union, as a body, or Barbados as a whole, stands to benefit to any extent by the invitations extended to this official to visit Great Britain. Even the Addendum as it is worded, states that the man who is going there is going to obtain a further understanding of the achievements and the problems of that country, with special reference to trade unionism. If my understanding of that part is correct, well then, it follows as a matter of fact that the British Government should foot the Bill. If my interpretation is wrong, then the only interpretation that can be put to it is the one put by the hon. senior member for St. John,—that is, in the struggle for the support of colonial trade unions towards the I.C.F.T.U., this sort of policy is being pursued. In other words, it is an attempt to win the ideological battle of the I.C.F.T.U. against the W.F.T.U. If it is the case that colonial Trade Unionists are to be taken to Great Britain to become indoctrinated with the British way of life, and trade union methods to tow the line of the I.C.F.T.U., then the I.C.F.T.U. should pay this Bill, and not the taxpayers of this colony. That is my submission. Either it is a case for the British Government itself to undertake this expenditure or it is the case for the I.C.F.T.U. to undertake it from its well-filled lying coffers. It is a well known fact that the democratic governments well and truly support this organisation. Therefore, this organisation should be willing to underwrite this expenditure rather than to inflict it upon these poverty-stricken West Indian Colonies and the colonial workers, who so far as we can see from what we have been told in this Addendum, can in no way directly or indirectly, benefit from this expenditure.

It is a matter for some comment. Even the Government does not pretend to suggest that the taxpayers of this Colony who have to foot this bill, stand to benefit in any way. That being the case, I submit very strongly that there is no justification for financing this expenditure from local Government funds. There is no reason why we should pay three cents to financing this matter. Either the British Government or the I.C.F.T.U. should be called upon to foot this Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Philip made some errors in his speech, and I should like to correct him. Let me say at once that the Barbados Workers' Union never asked this Government to do anything in this matter. As a matter of fact, I will go further and say that what this Government is doing in this matter is what I believe the other Governments of the West Indies are doing. So far as the I.C.F.T.U. is concerned, as a member of the Executive Board, I must state that it is incorrect for the hon. member to say that the I.C.F.T.U. gets funds from the democratic Governments. Not one single penny of its funds comes from the democratic Governments. All trade unions affiliated to the I.C.F.T.U. are required to pay so much per thousand members, and that is how this association gets funds. The British Trade Union movement, the American Federation of Labour, all European trade union movements which are members of the I.L.O. which is a federation of all trade unions, and even in India where recently unions have become affiliated with the I.C.F.T.U., not one of them subscribes a single penny from Government funds to the I.C.F.T.U. I challenge the hon. senior member for St. Philip to prove what he said, or to bring in any statement in support of the challenge he made. I can show him the balance sheet of the I.C.F.T.U. which was presented at the last meeting of the Executive.

6.55 p.m.

What the honourable members does not understand is that they protest strongly against Government interfering with any trade union policy. They have insisted that in all colonial territories they should have independence and self government. At the last meeting of the I.L.O. they protested against the idea of metropolitan governments sitting in at I.L.O. meetings and dealing with matters concerning the non-self-governing territories. It was precisely for that reason that I, along with a representative from Northern Rhodesia, went there.

Let the honourable member get it quite clear that the Trade Union movement in Great Britain is an independent organisation. They do not have to support any British Governmental policy. On many occasions the T.U.C. in Britain has opposed even the Labour Government on certain matters. The position of the British T.U.C. is that it is a member of the I.C.F.T.U.

Where matters like this course are concerned, it is now regarded in Trade Union circles that where you have Trade Unionists in certain territories who are unable to do certain things for themselves, it is permissible to help them. There is going to be a Trade Union Seminar in Calcutta, and the General Secretary of the Trinidad and Tobago Seaman's and Waterfront Workers' Union has been selected as our representative.

I do not go around asking for anything. Those who do that, are often disillusioned when they are turned down. I prefer to be called up than to be told to go back down. When the honourable member talks about being indoctrinated in England, I would like him to realise that people try to indoctrinate you even in Barbados, and here, you need strength of character to pursue an independent course.

As far as this Resolution is concerned, it is merely that Barbados is doing something that other colonies are doing. As the General Secretary of my Union it is difficult to appreciate the level of the usual type of speeches against my organisation which are made, when this kind of Resolution comes up. Such speeches do not do an organisation any good. As far as the B.W.U. is concerned, when any representative

goes away on a course or anything like that, it costs the Union infinitely more. We have to pay the man a salary and provide him with some allowance before he leaves. We adopt a humane approach to these matters. No one can deny that the B.W.U. has done more for the economic stability of this island, than has been done for any other colony by any other union in the area. We have taken a responsible approach to things.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip should not get the idea that because the W.F.T.U. and the I.C.F.T.U. are two rival organisations with two different ideologies, the democratic governments feel that they must indoctrinate members of the I.C.F.T.U. When the honourable member refers to unions affiliated with the I.C.F.T.U. getting financial support from the democratic governments, it is just like the vulgarity which is coming from both factions which exist in this community, — that I, as an individual, am being paid a salary from O.R.I.T. There are certain people who cannot imagine that anyone could do anything altruistically. They cannot imagine that a man can act in a cause with energy and sincerity without there being anything sinister behind it.

I do say, and I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Philip would be the first to admit it, that at I.C.F.T.U. meetings I have criticised them on policy. I have been nominated by the British T.U.C. and I have been to Geneva and to Havana; and not one single member of the British delegation had the idea of telling me what to say or what to do.

The trade union movement has been going on in England for nearly 200 years. You can learn something by seeing how things are conducted in the U.K. If other Governments in the area were not going to give this assistance, I would say that the Barbados Government should not. I hate to think that the organisation which I represent is subjected to this type of criticism. As I have said, it does the organisation no good.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that the Committee is more or less satisfied that the honourable junior member for St. Peter has really not answered anything that I have said, except with regard to the furnishing of finance by western governments for the I.C.F.T.U. Let us concede, sir, that the W.F.T.U. does not get one cent from Moscow and does not follow Russian policy, and that the I.C.F.T.U. does not get one cent from the British and American Governments, and does not follow the policy of the western democracies. Let us assume all of that. I am sure that the honourable member on more sober reflection will admit that if the Western Democracies on the one hand and Russia on the other hand, did not inspire the formation of these two rival organisations, they would not have done it themselves. I would further tell the honourable member that he knows that it is just as much a part of the foreign policy of the democracies to maintain the I.C.F.T.U. as it is a part of the foreign policy of Russia to maintain the W.F.T.U. And when he gets a little older and has a little more experience he will realise that because you did not take up a lump vote of £5,000 and say put that to your credit it does not mean that you are not advancing it. The honourable member knows how it works; there is no question about that. Those who appreciate the Western way of life and freedom and independence, are willing to support and aid the I.C.F.T.U. They will give it all the support they can. We could not say a single word about this vote if we were behind the iron curtain tonight. Do not let it be felt that we do not know whether we are being taken for a ride or whether we

will be attacked for spending money, when it should not be spent.

7.05 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is just possible that if the honourable member who has just spoken had been in the House when I introduced this Resolution, he would not have said what he has said. The honourable member is not unique in this matter, but he is probably the worst offender. Sometimes some of us do not take the time or the trouble to read what is before us and we say something that is wrong. If the Union were wealthy or if the Trinidad Union were wealthy, this would not have happened. In 1941 or 1942 when the journalists went to the United Kingdom, the honourable senior member for St. Philip did not go, or rather he expressed the opinion that he did not care to go. No W.F.T.U. or I.C.F.T.U. was in existence in those days. This matter is a continuation of the habit of the British Government long before anybody else started. It was the habit of the British Government to invite officials who would be able to further their knowledge with the assistance which they got in the United Kingdom. Colonial Journalists have been invited there too and also members of the Trade Unions. In 1948 Colonial Journalists were invited to the United Kingdom.

As far as this matter is concerned, when it was put to Trinidad, because the unions from which anybody could be chosen were too poor, it was agreed to pay this \$10 a day. The Government agreed that there should not be any variation. A Trade Unionist is bound to be a man who cannot afford to pay money from his private income to go to the United Kingdom. The practice has been to send out to Colonial Governments for persons to be sent up to England, who normally would not otherwise, have had a chance of visiting the United Kingdom. That is why I assured the honourable member that no Official has yet been chosen. The press did not choose anybody; the Union has been asked for its views. If an invitation comes from the United Kingdom Government to the Colonial Governments to send up Journalists, obviously if you have a Press Association, you ask the opinion of the Press Association. If the honourable member could have got a majority of votes he would have gone to the United Kingdom, and he would have been indoctrinated with the English practice. The honourable member allowed his name to be put up, and now he is talking about indoctrination. Does the honourable member think that only nit-wits belong to the Government? I really believe that such operated in the mind of the honourable member who has just spoken. That is why he does not give us credit for doing anything. One of these days we may be a dominion; we are now only a part of the British Empire. The British Government has been as guilty of as many crimes as almost any other nation; but the fact that we can say all these things about the British Government is an indication of the freedom which we have, and which other people cannot get. (Hear, hear). I repeat, — What is more natural? We claim that we are a neglected colony, and as soon as an invitation comes to you, you say: 'Don't go, you will be indoctrinated.' A man would be pretty weak to land in America or in France tomorrow and instantly become an American or a Frenchman. I only got up to point out that these visits are designed for persons in their own communities who are qualified — journalists, teachers, Trade Union officials, etc. It is felt that people like them seeing things for themselves, will have influence in their own communities. I should like to say that one of these days we may be asked to send out somebody; I may be asked what are my views, and I will say that

the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. John have not got any chance to accept the invitation, because they are afraid of being indoctrinated in Great Britain.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In this debate, there is a lot of reference made of previous occasions on which Barbadians have been invited to Great Britain. Reference was made to journalists who visited Great Britain during the War from here, for this specific reason of seeing at first hand the British effort, and returning to Barbados to see what could be done to influence their communities to further their efforts in support of the British cause. Similarly, in 1948 journalists were invited from the colonies to visit Great Britain, and the Governor of Barbados hand-picked the leader-writer of the Government's organ and sent him on the trip. Well now, there is no question of this sort of thing coming before this House all the time, because on none of the occasions which I have mentioned, was one single penny of the taxpayers' money utilised to finance those trips. In 1941 the legislature did not vote one single cent. In 1948 when the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was sent, a similar thing occurred. This matter is here for discussion purely because we are utilising the taxpayers' money for the purpose. The Hon. Premier himself said that these invitations are issued to the colony purely because they want you to come and see for yourself what is happening in Great Britain. If when you get there you allow yourself to become indoctrinated, that is a matter for you. Let us make it clear. Some people have to go to Great Britain to get indoctrinated but others do not have to go to Great Britain to become indoctrinated. They remain in Barbados and get indoctrinated and when they get to Great Britain, they only go there for the purpose of putting their indoctrination to the benefit of themselves. When the Hon. Premier found himself in 1948 before the United Nations speaking for Great Britain, not for the colonies, because at an earlier session they had actually turned down a petition on behalf of the struggling people of Kenya, he was a completely indoctrinated man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying. If I do not stop him at this juncture this debate will go on until morning. I am not allowing you to stray any further.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think at the time when it was suggested by a previous speaker that some people want the chance to go to Great Britain to get indoctrinated—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to keep to the Resolution. I am not allowing any more talk about indoctrination or anything else.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not heard of that talk yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Regardless of what you have heard, keep to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In a debating Chamber such as this or in any parliamentary Chamber, a member is allowed the opportunity to reply to previous debating points. I merely was saying that inasmuch as we are called upon today, to utilise the taxpayers' money to finance this trip when on no previous occasion has this Government spent one single cent on matters similar to this, this is certainly not a comparable situation. By citing these occasions as a reference to this situation, shows that one at times can only be completely forgetful of history. To get up and suggest that anybody, least of all myself, would be willing to become specially indoctrinated with the British way of life, or with the British Imperialism, or as the Hon. Premier has put

it,—for people to go there to see for themselves,—is to speak with a complete forgetfulness of the history of the past.

Let us be completely frank about this matter. While it may be planned as an invitation to people in these parts specifically to go to Britain for the purpose of seeing the British way of life, and how they do things, the United Kingdom Government itself is continuing its policy of selecting colonials in a certain position to see things in the light of the United Kingdom itself, or the I.C.F.T.U. Therefore, none of the red-herrings which were thrown across the way, or none of the side issues in which this Resolution has been drawn, can drown the fundamental points which I have put forward.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I just want to say this little thing, before the question is put. I do not believe the hon. member meant this side of the Opposition when he made certain references. I am among those people who feel very proud of my position in here. That has been possible by the British way of life. Whatever criticism I may offer in this Chamber against the British people, I make it quite clear publicly that I certainly appreciate the British way of life and would not want to change it for any other. I want to say this for the benefit of the Hon. Premier. I do not feel this is a question of indoctrination. As far as I am concerned, I believe I can go behind the Iron Curtain and be not indoctrinated. I still feel with my experience of the British people that they have a higher and greater sense of the administration of justice to people like myself, than any other nation in the world. I realised that many years ago, from the time when I was in the United States of America. I realised that it was the British press which taught the American community to see things from the British point of view. What I do not admire about this sort of thing is the lock, stock and barrel way the hon. Minister is saying, "it is the Opposition that is anti-British." It is a matter of indifference to me what he says. I curse those who deserve to be cursed on public platforms, and praise those who deserve praise. It is the British way of life to offer criticism. They are those of us who sit back and reflect when we read books like "Inside or Outside of Russia" or "Behind the Iron Curtain," as to whether we could do what we are doing in this Chamber in those places. We could not.

With regard to this Resolution, I do not think that the sending of people to Great Britain is the only place where we should send them. I think we should send them sometimes to America or to Canada, the countries which are becoming ruling nations of the world. It is not good enough to go to England alone. Some people feel that if you go to England for a month or two you would become indoctrinated with the British way of life, but I do not think so; unless you are in the position to live a way up the ladder.

A lady once said to us that the type of person we wanted to teach to play tennis in this country,—people in my walk of life—could not play tennis in England. The present Social Welfare Officer told us so when we were discussing the question of playing fields. Mind you, sir,—there are some low-minded warped type of individuals who come here from England; people who should be tarred, feathered and burnt; people of the South African type. Those are the things which I feel it is well for the Hon. Premier and the hon. junior member for St. Peter to know.

Where Canada and the U.S.A. are concerned, we have many things in common. For many years

our people have been going there; and it would be well if, when some of these courses are offered, some of our delegates could go to those two countries. I say that because it is a fact that the Barbadian in my walk of life has more in common with his counterpart in the U.S.A., than with his counterpart in Great Britain. I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. Peter who has had an opportunity to travel in Europe, England and America will appreciate what I mean. I want to say, however, that I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Philip appreciates the British way of life just as much as the Premier appreciates it. When you land in the U.S.A., you can begin to make comparisons. We like to criticise the British; but believe it or not, we like this way of life. We like this vaunted liberty or death.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

7.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION *Re* SENDING OF DEEP WATER HARBOUR DELEGATION TO U.K.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution reads as follows: "Resolved that the sum of \$5,870 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954—55. Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954—55, No. 16 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution."

Hon. members will remember that on the 1st of June this year we passed an Address approving the proposals for the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. It is felt that a delegation should go to England sometime between August and September to discuss the question of financing this scheme. As hon. members know, Government hopes to get one million dollars from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation as a free grant, and to raise approximately 3.75 million pounds by way of a loan. I hardly think it is necessary to say anything more, sir. Hon. members of this House have already agreed to the proposals contained in the Address passed by the House. The Resolution asks for \$5,870 to send three delegates on this trip.

I beg to move, sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, — I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us how it is proposed to spend this \$5,870.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This is a very important matter. I happened to have been in the fortunate position of being Chairman of the Deep Water Harbour Committee, although the Government tries to discredit, through pettiness, some people who really try to do some work. However, sir, the financing of this scheme was set out clearly in the Report of the committee. The last time that the Premier went to the U.K., he said that he had a discussion with the Colonial Office on this matter. I have travelled with the Premier and I know the atmosphere at the Colonial Office. This Resolution looks to me as if its purpose is to carry someone on a 'joy ride.'

I challenge the hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution to say that the Premier is not going on this delegation. I know that he is going, and I know who else is going. What is the use of wasting time? If the Premier is to go, let him go and discuss it. You cannot carry the Premier and a small boy and believe that the small boy can achieve anything. There are occasions when you need Churchill, Eden and Eisenhower and all the advisers. There are other occasions

when it is appropriate that Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin should discuss matters alone.

The Premier was in London some time in March. Before he left, a Press statement was issued to the effect that one of the things which the Premier intended doing, was having discussions at the Colonial Office about raising a loan for the deep water harbour. I want to be frank. The financing of the deep water harbour is not on the basis now of any big financial negotiations. It is on the broad policy of how the Government proposes to pay and how they intend to finance the scheme.

On all sides of the House we have agreed to that. This Government will have no difficulty in getting a loan of four or five million pounds to build this harbour. You are not going in for any fancy scheme in the air, but for a deep water harbour which has been mooted so long ago. If you want someone not connected with the Government to assist in these discussions in London, there is a Barbadian Socialist there who can give the Government much assistance. I am referring to Mr. C. W. Greenidge who is one of the best friends that this Government has in England. I am sure he will have more weight there than some of the small boys here.

The hon. Minister in charge has given us no information. The Government must not get the idea that they can come with these Resolutions for large sums of money, without giving any information as to how the money is to be spent. It cannot be said that they do not know. The Government could not set about to spend \$5,000 without knowing how they are going to spend it. I know that the Premier is going. The two others will be a waste of money. One is the Financial Secretary,—a waste of time! (Mr. CHAIRMAN: Who is the other one?) (Laughter). This is no reflection on the Financial Secretary. The hon. senior member for the City is a member of the Committee. So were the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the Hon. Minister of Communications also members of the Committee. The Hon. Premier too was a member of the Committee, but he did not find it possible to attend any of the meetings. The Financial Secretary did everything to throw cold water on this matter. Now that a trip is coming off you have an interested Financial Secretary, in which you did not believe. The person who acted as Financial Secretary, Captain Bryant, was a tower of strength to the Committee. If I were not a strong Chairman and believed that an Official could tell you how to do something—Some people can get certain jobs with certain qualifications. It is surprising to me to find what you are getting in the Government. The Government had better travel about with somebody who means something. These people might stay in some tea-room. They are not travelling with the Premier as an equal. The Premier would do the talking and they will have to remain there quiet. If the Financial Secretary has the Minister of Finance to advise, who else do you need to carry? You may carry the Minister of Finance for the sake of making it appear as if you are carrying a delegation. I do not know if the Minister of Communications is being carried so that you can see how it is to be broken down. The Minister of Communications will say just what the Premier says. (Laughter). If the Minister of Communications went alone, he would express his view as to how he feels this matter should be financed. The Minister of Communications is one of those persons who feel that it is sacrilegious to disagree with the Premier, and the Premier knows that too. Sometimes it is not good to know these things. I personally would say that the Premier is Premier over all. He is Pope over all the Canons. The idea is, that the Hon. Minister of Communications should go although it is

a matter of finance. It makes very little difference at this stage, but it is surprising to me. The Premier will see that the Financial Secretary is a member of the delegation. The Premier had so many pre-occupations that he could not attend any meetings of the Committee. The hon. senior member for St. Philip would turn up at these meetings; and I have had the experience that if the members of the Committee had gone along with the Financial Secretary, we would have had an adverse Report. I do not know if he wanted the Deep Water Harbour higher up. I did not have any instructions not to proceed with the matter, and I went along with it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have nothing against anybody. If I express a view, whether it is in connection with an Official or not, I have always said I respect the office. I have said that whether you have Ministerial Status or not. I should like to say that the Hon. Minister of Communications should tell us how the money would be spent. I should just like the hon. Minister to tell us that.

7.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: The breakdown is as follows: Hotel Bills, including meals, \$20.00 a day, \$900.00; subsistence allowance, \$15.00 a day, \$675.00; traveling expenses, \$200.00; Air passages, \$1,364.70 each, (it is proposed to send three delegates, \$4,094.00) making a total of \$5,869.10, say \$5,870.00.

I want to assure hon. members that I will not be a member of the delegation. I want to say further in reply to a point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who said in the course of his remarks that I would consider it sacrilegious to disagree with the Premier, that I am sure he knows that I differed with the Premier on many occasions. This is what I will promise the hon. member: I shall never get up in public and besmirch his good name. I will not say anything which I know is not true, or which is dishonest about the Premier, either in public or in private. I am fully conscious of the fact that he, and he alone, is responsible for the position in which the working class people of this island have found themselves. I am positively sure that if it had not been for the Premier's courage, his foresight and his sympathy towards the people who look like me, we would be just where we were ten years ago.

Again I say, if I differ from him, I am going to differ when I am inside. When it comes to outside in the public, I am going to show a united front just as proper people do.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am very glad that the honourable member is beginning to learn that it is better to give us the facts, than it is to beat around the bush. I would like to know the names of the members of this delegation. Is it not possible for the Hon. Premier to give us the names? When we wanted a delegation of West Indians to visit England on behalf of a Sugar Agreement, although the Hon. Premier was out of the country at the time, we said that it would be no sense in sending a delegation without him. We know that his prestige with the Colonial Office was far ahead of any other colonial representative. I said then, that he must be one of its members. I said so then, and I feel so now. As a matter of fact, his prestige with the Colonial Office now is still far above that of any other West Indian politician. Is there any thing to hide? Who are the other members of the delegation? I know the Hon. Premier is going. Mr. Chairman, this money which we are voting is not my money, not your money, but the taxpayers' money. We have to satisfy the 200,000 people of this island as to the reason why we are spending this money. I am saying that the Hon. Minister of Communications should certainly let us know now who are the members of this delegation. (A VOICE: Delegation has not been selected yet.) That is not true. This House

is being prorogued tomorrow. I consider that it is your duty to tell us who are the members of the delegation. This is the better means of telling us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would sit now, he would get the reply.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not think that the money is too much. As a matter of fact, if \$10 a day is all the money you are giving to the Hon. Premier for out-of-pocket expenses, I think that this is a meagre amount. As Premier, he has to represent Barbados, and he should represent Barbados in glorious style, Mr. Chairman, — I am asking the Hon. Minister of Communications again, to tell us the names of the delegates. We know that the Hon. Premier is one, but we would like to know who are the others. It would be foolishness and stupidity to carry another Minister if you are sending the Hon. Premier. There are other persons who are interested in finance, and who should go. I feel a member of the Opposition should go. (A VOICE: No, no. I cannot agree with that). As a matter of fact, I feel the Leader of the Opposition should go. (A VOICE: No, no, this is a Government issue.) I hope that the honourable Minister, would tell us the names of the three members who will comprise the delegation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I cannot agree with the honourable senior member for the City that the Leader of the Opposition should go, or a member of the Opposition. I think we all agree with the British Constitutional practice. I do agree with him, when he says that the Hon. Minister of Communications should tell us the names of the three persons who are to form the delegation. In Great Britain it would be unlikely to get a Resolution like this, without the Minister dealing with it being prepared to tell the House who are the members who would comprise the delegation. In a small issue it may not be necessary to state the names of the advisers, to the members.

I would like to say to the Hon. Minister of Communications that I too realise that the Hon. Premier has done a lot of good work for this island. You will never hear me get on any platform to say anything against that. I do not agree with what the honourable Minister said on that matter; I have never done what he said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I never mentioned the name of the honourable member.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, — The honourable Minister was replying to what I said. While I would say that the Hon. Premier has done a lot of good work for this island, and the people, yet he is a human being with all the frailties of human nature. Mr. Chairman, — I must be given the freedom to be able to say what I think of other persons, just as other persons should be given the freedom to say what they think of me, even though at times all that they may say may not be true.

I would say to the Hon. Minister of Communications that you cannot run a Government in the way it should be run, if there is any question of fright in your letting the members of Parliament, and the public, know at first hand what information you have on matters. Is it not better, if you have the information to give it than to publish it in the newspapers? If it were a question where it was unnecessary for you to come to the Legislature with a resolution because money was already voted for the purpose, that would be a different thing. You have a vote in the Estimates for emigration, and on account of that, you need not come to this House and tell us on every occasion who you are sending to make enquiries into the matter of emigration. You have brought this issue dealing with the Deep Water Harbour inside here and discussed it. A Committee was then set up to deal with it and that Com-

mittee has reported. You then brought it back in here to get the approval of the House, and have decided to send a delegation to London to make enquiries into the matter, what is wrong with your telling the House how many members comprise the delegation, and what sort of delegation it is: unless you are prepared to say that you have not chosen the delegation finally yet.

I am quite prepared to say that this Resolution is in order. But I want to say that if you have not decided on the delegation, you should say so. If you have decided on the personnel, you should give us the information. That is but fair to Parliament. I have a burning indignation over the attitude which you are trying to perpetuate with a certain amount of vanity, pride and arrogance, when you sit back in your chairs and feel that because you are in power you are dispensing small mercies to the underlings.

This is a Parliament. Make no mistake about it. Do not think that you are supreme. Any information we ask you for in here, and you have it, you should give it. Ministers are part of this Parliament. If they were independent members of this Parliament, the Constitution would not be what it is.

If the Government has information and withholds it, I regard it as a travesty of justice. It cannot be said that it is being withheld on the grounds of secrecy, because there is no secrecy in this matter. If the required information is not given I will vote against the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable senior member for the City does not know me as well as the honourable junior member for St. Peter. The latter has been associated with me for five years as a member of the Executive Committee, and we have been associated for a longer period in the Labour Party and Trade Union. I think that he knows me well enough to be aware that where misleading people and telling lies are concerned, such is no part of my nature.

No delegation, Mr. Chairman, has been appointed as yet. I agree with the two honourable members that it is taken for granted that the Hon. Premier will be one of the delegates. To tell the House who the other two will be, would be misleading, because they have not yet been selected. All I know is that we are providing for a delegation of three. I have always felt big enough and strong enough, not to indulge in lies and in misleading people. That is for children and for cheap and weak people, who are afraid that they may be flogged.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I accept the honourable Minister's answer because I have worked with him on the Executive for five years. During that time I have found him to be a man who would stand up for the truth. But I will say that although I have never found him to be a man who would indulge in lying, it may be that he has so much love for an individual, although he would not lie, he would prefer to be what is known as "neutral".

This is just like the question of the Premier not going to Geneva last time. If you know that you are going some place, say so. No one can do you anything. Do not use legal words. When the Minister says no one has been "appointed," he means that they have not sat in Executive Committee and named the three delegates. That may be true. But before doing that, they must discuss it and decide who are the people that will be going. Do not tell me that the Premier is going and he does not know who are the other two going with him. If the Financial Secretary is not going on this delegation, I will resign my seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It does sound remarkable that the reasonable and sensible body of men who comprise the Executive Committee, and the five Ministers who formulate policy, know that it is imperative that a delegation of three are going, but do not know who the three will be. How did they arrive at the figure three? If they do not know who is going, why did they not arrive at the figure four or five? Everyone knows that the three who are going have already been selected in the minds of those who are to select them. I feel that sending three is a waste of government money. We rushed the Estimates through in March. The Hon. Premier left the colony although we were told that he was not leaving. We rushed the Estimates through and hurried through important government measures, committing ourselves to enormous expenditure, without sufficient scrutiny.

When it was confirmed that the Premier was going away, the Press was told that he would discuss the deep water project with the Colonial Office. Was that purely propaganda? We had a committee that went thoroughly into this matter, and they submitted a report. Do we want a top heavy delegation of three to go to the Colonial Office to discuss what we were told in April that the Premier would discuss with the Colonial Office? Do you really feel that with the Premier occupying the position that he occupies in the constitutional set up,—Finance Minister, Premier etc.—that he could not handle this matter alone? If he wants an adviser, the choice is an obvious one. There is no one in the political life of the colony who has his finger more closely in the economic situation of the colony than the Hon. H. A. Cuke. I would agree that in matters of finance it would be appropriate that the Financial Secretary should go, and in a matter of this sort, it might be appropriate for the Minister of Communications to go. He has told us that he is not going. Although I say that in normal circumstances he should go, I still feel that it would be superfluous for him to accompany this particular delegation. With conditions as they are there is no reason why this matter could not be settled without all this expense. There is nothing which will transpire at the Colonial Office that two men could not handle. This Resolution is a demonstration either of an extravagant desire to throw away public funds, or of absolute irresponsibility.

I do not see any earthly need for more than two people on this delegation,—the Premier and Hon. Mr. Cuke as an adviser. I do not see that anyone else will make any worthwhile contribution. I think that the public will feel the same way I feel about it. To make it appear constitutional you should send the Premier and the Hon. Mr. Cuke. Why send three people when you have an excellent report on the project, and when the Premier has already talked it over with the Colonial Office. What are the three going there to do? If you feel that the financial credit of the country is so low, you may as well make the delegation 10 or 12.

Do not expect anyone in this Chamber or outside, to believe that the supposedly sensible men on the Executive came to the decision to send a delegation of three and still they do not know of whom the delegation will be composed—; or the special characteristics of the three men who will be sent. Why decide arbitrarily that three must go without knowing who are the three? Whoever came to the decision that three were necessary, must have had in their minds who the three will be. The House is right in asking who will be the three, because we feel that three are superfluous and that two would more fill the bill.

8.15 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It would be impossible for me to pass through England and not visit the Colonial Office and speak generally on what is happening relative to important matters. There is no politician in my position who could go to England and not do that. It was not a matter of propaganda at all; I made it clear that the conversation on the Deep Water Harbour was of a general nature. Mr. Philip Rogers was himself out here, and the person acting for him was only beginning to read the history of it. Further we got a cable saying that the matter had not got around to all the Departments yet. This date has been fixed because it was hinted that by that time, it would be all ready. I think I have already stated, it has not struck me in the past that the Colonial Office is frightfully keen about the matter because of the expense; that is why I say that whenever I have an opportunity of having some discussion about the matter, I would have that discussion. The old opposition to this matter is practically dead; both the planters and the merchants want it. The Committee, which has recently reported, was very representative indeed. There were on that Committee, people who would say that things are too dear and so on. We had on that Committee members of all the different parties.

I should like to say that every loan which is made to the Government is backed by the United Kingdom Treasury. The United Kingdom Government has the last word in this matter. The position of Barbados has to be investigated, therefore any part that I might have had in the matter, meant nothing until that was done. We are approaching the Colonial Development and Welfare Department for some portion of this money. We are hoping to get a loan without interest, and we are hoping to get assistance in devious ways. Actually this is the proper head under which to bring a vote, and under which we can ask about a Conference in connection with the development of Barbados. I want to say that not a single discussion has taken place as regards to the personnel, officially or unofficially, who are to form this delegation. Naturally since it was said that the Minister of Finance would go, it was assumed that the Financial Secretary would be going. I repeat, it has not been discussed either officially or unofficially. I might have in mind who the third party is, but I have not discussed the personnel with the Governor; therefore it is just literally true to say that having discovered last Thursday that the Colonial Office was coming nearer the time they could tell us that the best period would be at the end of August and the beginning of September. I have not discussed this matter of the personnel either with the Ministers or the Governor, let alone the Executive in full. This matter had to be brought down to-day, because it was only on Thursday that we heard the best time to come. If they had said not to come until later on in the year, we would have waited until after the prorogation of the Legislature to come down with this matter. It is the literal truth to say that we have not discussed anything. We have seen the possibility of having a third person.

Mr. BRANCKER: I accept the Hon. Premier's assurance that the personnel of this delegation has not been selected in the minds of the Cabinet; but it should be clear to the hon. member now from this discussion, that the feeling of this Committee of the House is very strongly opposed to the selection of the Financial Secretary. (Cheers). I do not think that there is any member of this Committee who would welcome the thought that on so important a delegation should be one whom, we have been public-

ly told in this Chamber, was one of the stumbling stones and who almost caused the construction of the Deep Water Harbour to be put off indefinitely, if not given up altogether. It would not be good for such a person to be a member of this delegation, even if his name has flashed through the minds of some members. The Hon. Premier did not have the time to attend any meetings of this Deep Water Harbour Committee, and therefore he is not aware of the attitude of the Financial Secretary on this Committee. Now that the Hon. Premier knows that that member of the Committee was averse to this scheme, and also that the feeling of this Committee is very much against the inclusion of that individual on this delegation, I hope that nothing would be done when this House is prorogued which would be contrary to the feeling and the wishes of this Committee of the House.

If we pass this Resolution, we will be giving *carte blanche* to whomsoever you select to be a member of this delegation, to be a member of the delegation. (Voices from the Opposition.) One can only imagine what the meetings of the Vestry of St. Michael are like! (Mr. CRAWFORD: Like those in St. Lucy!) (Laughter). Now it is clear that we are giving complete latitude to the Government to select this delegation, with the reservation that the Financial Secretary or anybody who held the views which he held, should not be entitled to this trip. If you have an important person at the head of the delegation, the others are only the make up. So far as any official is concerned, (and it has been mooted that this Official was considering himself as a member of the delegation), let him understand that a Committee of this House would be very much displeased with his inclusion on the delegation; and that he should be able to make a proper arrangement to pay a visit to any of his relatives who happen to be in the United Kingdom at this time. As to this delegation, we would like his place to be very worthily filled. He knows a considerable amount about finance; and there is a wide range of persons from whom a choice can be made other than this gentleman, who has done his best to prevent the Deep Water Harbour from being brought into effect.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I only rise to say that I agree with what the hon. member has said. Now that we have listened to the Hon. Premier, we have to vote for this Resolution. It has been agreed that the Hon. Premier will be going as a member of the delegation, and I see the reason for the suggestion that there is a possibility of making the third selection from a member of C.D. & W. I can see that in the argument, and I would say that it is quite a sound suggestion. If you are making an application like this, you must carry with you the powers that be. If you want to have the best delegation possible to put your case to the U.K. and to discuss with the Colonial Office the prospects of obtaining a loan, you must select the most suitable persons. Without making any disparaging remarks, I would say that your present Financial Secretary would be incapable and irresponsible if he went on the delegation. There is nobody who knows that better than the Hon. Premier. Your Financial Secretary is in your confidence. The Hon. Mr. Cuke is the competent and suitable person to be adviser to the Hon. Premier on financial matters. Everybody in this country knows that the greatest injury Sir William Savage ever did to this country, was that of the appointment of Mr. Burrowes to the post of Financial Secretary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to keep to the resolution. I have not seen the Financial Secretary mentioned in this resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Have you now heard that? What I am saying is this,— those who know something of finance knows very well, that when we had men like the former Income Tax Commissioner, Mr. Finch; like the former Customs Comptroller, Mr. Belt, we had A1 men. Mr. Bryant a former acting Financial Secretary was a tip-top man, and so much so, that we had to put on record the services which he had done for this island. You know that you now have a "wishy-washy" man on the job, a man who has come in through the back door. Mr. Chairman, when you sit around a Committee with people whom you hear with nothing else but ignorant talk, you wonder if you are still in primer standard. I know that the Hon. Premier is aware that the appointment of Mr. Burrowes as Financial Secretary of this island, is one of the worse things Sir William Savage ever did in this country. As I have said before, the Hon. Mr. Cuke, should be the Premier's right hand man. He would be the man to give you the data of Barbados from 1760. When you are dealing with foreign money, the people with whom we are dealing want to know how they would get it back. There are certain things which are governed by the laws of averages. I agree with what the hon. senior member for St. Lucy said, and such is the real feeling of hon. members on this side of the table and many of your back-benchers too.

Mr. Chairman,— I have listened to the Hon. Premier very carefully, and I do not want to hear anything more on this matter. You must face the issue in the light that you want on the spot, people who can back you up strongly. This side of the House feels that you should not get Mr. Burrowes to accompany you, because he is incompetent. He does not understand anything about this matter at all. We were told in this Chamber when we were amending the Act, that you wanted a Financial Secretary. Now the next thing which you have done, is to take somebody from out of the Labour Department and make him Financial Secretary!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. sen. member for the City again. I am asking you to stop mentioning the name of the Financial Secretary, and to stick to this Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If you ask me to stop, I will sit down.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have sent for this Deep Water Harbour report in order to refer to how we propose to repay this loan. If hon. members were paying enough attention to this particular measure, they would see that the British Government at this stage cannot afford to turn down granting us a loan. Let us bear in mind what the British Government has put into the British Columbia plan. Let us bear in mind the amount of money which the British Government is now spending in Kenya and Malaya. The British Government cannot afford to turn us down at this stage. If you look at the Deep Water Harbour report, you will see that it shows you from the first year, how the Government proposes to finance this scheme. It shows you that in the first year Government proposes to repay £151,000; in the second year £764,000, in the third year £1,230,000, in the fourth year, £1,373,000, and in the last year, £680,000. All that shows that you have planned your financing of this scheme.

I have nothing against the Financial Secretary as an individual. I consider that he is one of the best Labour Commissioners we have had in this country. You either know something about money or you do

not know. The Hon. Premier went to England to discuss a bigger issue than this alone. That was the time when he went to discuss the Constitutional issues of this island and what changes should take place. No other honourable member went with him. Later, when he came back, the Attorney General was called by the Colonial Office to discuss the local issues and the ex-Governor of the island was there at that time. Let me again say, the question of borrowing money is not going to be the most important thing to be discussed at this talk on the Deep Water Harbour, because we have put up a plan to show how we are going to finance the scheme, even if we do not get a free grant from C.D. & W. I am saying that you have the whole country behind you in undertaking this scheme. When I was in London, I heard that the shipping people are also in agreement with your getting a Deep Water Harbour. I can also say that Trade Unions here, are sympathetic to the view.

There is no getting away from the fact that the people of Barbados are behind this scheme. I do not agree that you should send this huge delegation. If the Premier is briefed properly at home on the broad line of your economic policy, he as Minister of Finance, can go alone. It is not for me, or for this Chamber to name the delegation. If the Premier says that he has not discussed with the other Ministers the persons whom he will carry with him, I have no fault to find with that. It is not the prerogative of the Cabinet of Great Britain to know whom the Prime Minister is going to carry to Washington for discussions with Eisenhower. It is purely a matter of courtesy when you tell the other Ministers. I feel that some of us should give more thought to constitutional matters. Those of us who read, realise that there are certain constitutional practices to be followed. I wish that many of us would read "As It Happened" by Attlee. They would learn more about administration.

The Premier did not deny what I said about the Financial Secretary. If the Premier is Minister of Finance and he is going, and if, as I have said, the people of Barbados are behind this scheme, a delegation of three is certainly unnecessary. I hope that we do not fall into the same error as Jamaica, who likes to send delegations of nine to London. It is a waste of public funds. Living at the Dorchester Hotel and getting pictures taken and flashed back home is all right in its place. If the Premier goes, that is about as much as you need.

The Colonial Office does not have any respect for small boys. I agree that Hon. Mr. Cuke can help a lot; but we are trying to carve out a constitutional system. That is why we say that this Government needs an economic adviser of its own. When the sugar people are going to London they take Mr. Cuke; when B.W.I.A. wants something they take him; now we are told that the Government must take him. If some members of the Government do not try to get acquainted with some of these things as Mr. Cuke got acquainted with them over the years, that is their business. I like to go to the roots of things. Those who can only come here and vote, are in a poor way. The Premier and the other Ministers are not immortal; and the day that they die, those others to whom I have just referred will be the laughing stock of the community when it is seen that they cannot make any contribution to the government of this country.

There is no reason to be afraid of these financial discussions in London. No British Government in 1954 can refuse to assist this Government in floating a loan on the London market. International organisations all over the world today are clamouring that metropolitan governments should do all they can to assist the non-self-governing territories with finan-

cial assistance. The British Government knows that we have to sell them sugar. We know the conservative policy on the question of bulk buying; but have they refused to buy our sugar in bulk? Where this question of the deep water financing is concerned, I am not impressed for one second, that the Government will meet with any difficulty.

What is our public debt? If you are a Socialist, show that you are one. There will not be a Conservative Government in England all the time. The British Government cannot afford to face world criticism that will be levelled against Governments who are not prepared to help non-self governing and dependent territories. This delegation will succeed, but not by carrying three people. The Premier is a lawyer, and by nature he is an advocate. He can put the case to the Colonial Office, and with the prestige which he holds, I do not see that he can fail. If you feel that he will be lonely in London and will need others to keep his company, that is a different matter.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I consider this debate useless, but the remarks of the junior member for St. Peter have drawn me to my feet. The hon. member seems to be labouring under the delusion that he has a monopoly of brains, and arrogates to himself to be the sole mouth piece of this House. There was a time when everything that the Government did was right and everything that anyone else said, was wrong. That was when the honourable member was a member of the Government. But Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has now undergone a complete transformation. Now no matter how right the Government is, it is wrong as far as the hon. member is concerned.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Reference has been made to the Colonial Office. No one at the Colonial Office has expressed to me that they are opposed to the Deep Water Harbour project. It is normal for any official to point out to you the implication of the cost of such a scheme. If we have a drought in Barbados, the British taxpayers would have to find the cost of the scheme for a year. I am not saying that the Colonial Office cold-shouldered the scheme.

I suppose the same thing applies to the Financial Secretary. Today is the first time that I have heard that the Financial Secretary was throwing cold water on this scheme. He cannot formulate policy for the Government. I am surprised to hear that he gave the impression to anyone, that this is a scheme which we should not go in for. This is a matter for the Executive Committee, and in the last analysis for the five Ministers. What may have happened was, that the Financial Secretary might have pointed out financial implications seriously, and might have given the wrong impression.

It is my duty, and even if it were not my duty, I would still suggest that the hon. senior member for the City who brings a very acute mind to bear on these things, should not spoil the speeches which he makes, by doing what in his less rabid moments he will realise is completely wrong. One of these days some litigious Civil Servant might bring a case for slander in respect to some of the things which are said in this House. The hon. member has accused the Financial Secretary of being utterly incompetent. Nothing can be more slanderous than that. The day that a litigious Civil Servant asks the Governor for permission to bring an action, I would say that he should be given permission. It is unfair to make such accusations against the Civil Servants, especially when you know that he cannot reply and that he

cannot write a letter to the Press. Yet he is accused in the most outrageous language of not being fit for his job,—a thing for which any jury would award thousands of pounds.

The Financial Secretary has not had previous experience as a Financial Secretary, but dealing with figures in the way in which he is dealing with them now, is nothing new to him. He was on the Legislative Council of British Guiana. I repeat, nothing could be more slanderous than to say that he is utterly incompetent and unfit for his job. If a lawyer wanted to write the kind of slander which is bound to win a case, he could write what the hon. member said. It is a disgraceful thing for any of us to let our feelings go so far as to make us hit a man who cannot hit back. It is a dangerous thing for hon. members to get here and make slanderous attacks on people. We have no privilege here. This is not the House of Commons.

We must follow constitutional practice. The Minister of Agriculture in Great Britain resigned recently, not because of something that he did, but because the House criticised the way in which he treated a particular farmer. The Minister of Agriculture here or any other Minister might have to resign in similar circumstances. If it is felt that the policy of the Government has caused a Civil Servant to do something wrong, it is the duty of the members of the House to do something about that. It is for the Administration to say whether that particular Civil Servant is to be removed, or whether according to the circumstances, the Minister must resign. When we revise our Rules, I hope we shall establish that for a member of the House to get up and say that a Civil Servant is incompetent and unfit to hold his job, and should not be drawing the taxpayers' money, is slanderous. I hope that time would be found to deal with the proposed new Rules and that hon. members will make it a Rule that any accusation against the character of Civil Servants will be out of order. It is a vastly different thing if we find that something has been done wrongly and is worthy of criticism to criticise it, as against making such accusations against Civil Servants. I should like to remind hon. members that there is no privilege attached to the House of Assembly as there is in the House of Commons. There is no privilege attached to a newspaper because it accurately reports what is said in the House. I am not suggesting that the right to free speech should be curtailed, but at the same time you should not cuff away at a man who has his hands tied behind his back.

8.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member cannot frighten me. When I reach the stage when I cannot come into this House and say that a Civil Servant is incompetent, then I will resign my membership of this House. I have sat in this House and the only thing that has not been said about the former Director of Highways and Transport was that he did not steal, take and carry away. If there is one dishonest reference it is the one which has just been made. I remember when the Report in connection with Mr. Crowe was made. I should like to say that I am one man whom the hon. member cannot frighten. If a man is incompetent, I say he is incompetent. The Government said they wanted a Financial Expert to advise us on financial matters. I say that he is incompetent because when we come to the estimates, we cannot get any information at all. As long ago as when Mr. Wilkinson was a member of this House, the Hon. Premier knew that we have had Financial Experts down here, and when they were

finished it was asked 'Who is the Financial Secretary?' I repeat, if you are competent, you are competent; and if you are not competent then you are not competent. Then there is the wilful misstatement that this man was a member of the Legislative Council in Demerara. As far as I am concerned, when I come in here I will say that a man is incompetent if he is incompetent. As far as the hon. senior member for St. Michael is concerned, if he had used the word "incompetent" in respect of Mr. Skinner, that would have been a nice thing. It is the Premier's duty to say "I have to defend the Civil Servants"; but you should not go so far as to say that the Civil Servants can bring a case. It was said that you wanted a qualified man, and then suddenly you have a man who was Labour Commissioner as a Financial Secretary. I never trusted the man who was responsible for that, because you had people infinitely much better in the local Civil Service. I do not want anybody to tell me what I must say. I will always say when you are incompetent, never mind anybody else. I was a member of this Deep Water Harbour Committee, and if the honourable junior member for St. Peter did not have somebody to back up in this matter, the Hon. Premier would not have realised the position. You had people on the Committee who could contribute something to the matter. I want to say that anybody can call himself a Finan-

cial Expert; but he must understand something about figures, and need not have gone to a University. If I happened to be in the fortunate position of getting my wife to work out things for me, I could boast that I could run the financial position too. If I did not have courage in the matter in respect of Mr. Crowe — There was a bunch of gangsters who thought they could do me something, but I just laughed at them. I say that when people are good you praise them; but if they are incompetent then they are incompetent.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER : That concludes the business of this meeting. This House now stands adjourned.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954-55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21st September, 1954

Pursuant to resolution, the 1954-55 Legislative Session was opened by His Excellency the Governor, Brigadier Sir Robert Duncan Harris Arundell, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., in the Council Chamber, Public Buildings, at 2.30 o'clock p.m. today.

The following Members of the House were present in their chamber:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, senior member for St. Peter (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., senior member for St. Joseph (*Premier*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, senior member for St. Lucy; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., junior member for St. Thomas (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, junior member for the City; Hon. M. E. COX, senior member for St. Michael (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., junior member for St. Joseph; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., junior member for St. Peter; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, senior member for the City; Hon. R. G. MAPP, senior member for St. Thomas (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Q.C., junior member for St. James; Mr. T. O. BRYAN, junior member for St. Michael; Mr. F. C. GODDARD, junior

member for Christ Church (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. G. T. ALLDER, senior member for St. John; Mr. F. E. MILLER, junior member for St. George; Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., junior member for St. Andrew; Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, junior member for St. Philip; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, senior member for St. James; Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, junior member for St. John; Hon. C. E. TALMA, senior member for Christ Church (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, senior member for St. Andrew and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., senior member for St. George.

HOUSE SUMMONED TO OTHER PLACE

Honourable members being in their places, the Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber and informed Mr. SPEAKER that His Excellency the Governor was in the Council and was ready to receive the House.

Mr. SPEAKER preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace, cradlewise and followed by other honourable members in pairs according to seniority, proceeded to the Council Chamber and waited on His Excellency the Governor.

His Excellency then addressed the two Houses of the Legislature as follows:—

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

You will wish me, on this occasion, to say a few words about the progress made during the last session of the Legislature, which opened just before my arrival in the Island, in addition to touching on the future policy of my Government.

The Honourable Mrs. N. G. Daysh was appointed to the Legislative Council in the room of Mrs. Muriel Hanschell, M.B.E., who retired. There was no change in the Membership of the General Assembly.

The President of the Legislative Council received a Knighthood in recognition of his public services and one Member of the House of Assembly received an O.B.E. in recognition of his services to the Trade Union movement.

On the 1st February, 1954, a Ministerial System of Government was ushered in with fitting ceremonial.

Firm steps towards another far-reaching change were taken with the enactment of the Local Government, Public Health and Public Assistance

Acts. My Government is now giving attention to the town and country planning legislation, which will also be required in connection with the new system of local government and a Bill will be introduced at an early date.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly :

The financial year 1953/54 ended with a surplus on current account of over \$2,000,000. There was, indeed, a net surplus of \$1,000,000, after providing \$1,000,000 for capital expenditure. Half the surplus on current account was transferred to the Revenue Equalisation Fund so that the General Revenue Balance on 1st April, 1954, was the same as at the beginning of the previous financial year.

The current Budget also provides for a surplus on current account of \$750,000, but nearly \$2,000,000 of our General Revenue Balance are to be spent on capital works.

Expenditure of grants from Development and Welfare Funds on capital works during the financial year is now estimated at about \$500,000.

\$1,500,000 were raised locally during the first quarter of this financial year, completing the loan of \$2,000,000, which was authorised by the Local Loan Act of 1953. My Government will seek your approval to provide further opportunities in the future for local investment in Government securities.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council :

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly :

The sugar crop was a good one and thanks to the excellent labour relations and to the overall efficiency of the industry it was taken off and processed in a most satisfactory manner. The sugar crop is the mainstay of our national economy and we must never forget that there are imponderables, quite outside our control, which may affect the crop at any time.

The paramount problem of the Island is one of population and it must be abundantly clear that if the prosperity and happiness of a population that is still rising are to be increased, and this is the constant aim of my Government, something more than a good sugar crop will be needed. Where can we look for the necessary expansion of our economy which, alone, can enable us to raise the standards of our Social Services and to provide full employment? My Government believes that the over-population problem must be approached not only through the development of local resources and the encouragement of emigration, but also through the promotion of planned parenthood among the people.

In the field of natural resources the search for oil continues. The first well sunk by the Barbados Gulf Oil Company Limited proved to be dry and a second well is now being drilled. A Prospecting Licence covering the parts of the Island not included in the Gulf Corporation's licence, operative from the 1st August, 1954, has been issued to the British Union Oil Company.

In the field of agriculture there is hardly any arable land that is not already under cultivation, but there is still scope for increasing the production from each and every acre of land, whether under sugar cane or under food crops; there is room for an expansion of our dairy industry and for more small stock. In the related field of Fisheries there is room for a large expansion.

It is in these terms that my Government has been thinking. Consideration is being given by my Ministers to means of improving the agricultural extension services, to the financing of a central milk factory, to the encouragement of pig-breeders, to the improvement of our internal marketing arrangements, which will include a new abattoir in Bridgetown, to the re-equipment of the fishing industry and to the provision of adequate cold storage accommodation for fish, meat, fruit and vegetables.

An experimental scheme to assist in the mechanical cultivation of peasant holdings has already begun. Both large and small scale irrigation experiments are in progress. Cane breeding research on a regional basis continues with assistance from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds. The artificial insemination of cattle has been adopted in order to improve the strain and to reduce the incidence of disease. A propaganda campaign was carried out in order to reduce the incidence of cane fires, which, in our conditions, do much harm. The search for the cause and cure of the recent infestation of mealy bugs has been intensified.

I should also refer here to the difficult soil erosion problems presented by the Scotland district of the Island. My Government awaits the help promised by the Foreign Operations Administration of the United States of America before making plans for the area.

Legislation to provide greater security of tenure for agricultural small holders and tenants of house-spots has been under consideration by my Government and is now being drafted.

In the field of industry, enterprise is severely handicapped by the lack of industrial power. This problem has been given anxious consideration by my Ministers. It is hoped that plans to overcome the shortage of electric power will soon be formulated and implemented. Natural gas offers the only source of power to be found locally. The extent of the supply of natural gas, which was recently discovered, has yet to be determined.

So far as Public Utilities in general are concerned, it is expected that the Public Utilities Act will shortly be in operation and the Public Utilities Board appointed and functioning.

Legislation will be placed before you relating to the establishment of a Development Board for the encouragement of industry.

My Ministers are fully alive to the value of the tourist trade to our economy. They wish to see a further expansion of this industry, but are mindful of the problems which in the Caribbean area accompany such an expansion.

You have already voted funds to cover the cost of a survey of employment and unemployment, which is to begin next January. My Government believes that an authoritative appraisal of development possibilities should also be undertaken and an approach has been made to the International Bank in the hope that they will be prepared to send a Mission to the Eastern Caribbean. If the approach is successful proposals will be laid before you.

My Government will continue to do everything possible to facilitate emigration, whether permanent or temporary.

Turning now to Social Services: the first Government Health Centre was opened in Speightstown in August, 1953. The St. Michael's Health Centre at Enmore has been completed and is already in partial use. The buildings thus freed in the Hospital compound are now under conversion and will provide in the next few months forty new hospital beds. A new Nurses' Home and a mechanical laundry are under construction at Stockton.

This work is part of a comprehensive plan, financed mainly from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds, which you have approved. The provision it makes for the diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis will, it is hoped, enable the Island to qualify for a grant from the World Health Organisation and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund towards the cost of a B.C.G. campaign. A scheme for the eradication of the yellow fever carrying mosquito financed from the same sources, is well under way and consideration is being given to a further grant towards the development of our maternal and child welfare services. Steps have been taken to meet the possible danger to the Island of the spread of poliomyelitis in the Caribbean.

New schools have been built at Half Moon Fort, Selah and the Pine, the last named having been a gift from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds. Blackman's House has been bought for conversion into a Secondary Modern School to serve the western part of the parish of St. Joseph. It is proposed that the new School at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip should also be constructed as a Secondary Modern School.

The classroom block of a Technical Institute has been built and the first stage of the rehabilitation of Combermere is complete.

Grants from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds have made it possible to enlarge Erdiston Training College so as to extend the course from one to two years and to take in additional students from the Windward and Leeward Islands.

Plans will be laid before you for the reconstruction of the Christ Church Foundation Schools as a single combined School, with separate departments for Boys and Girls, and a central block which would be common to both.

Much continues to be done in the field of social welfare and we should recognise and be grateful for the increasing endeavours by so many mem-

bers of the public. New legislation relating to Children and Young Persons will be laid before you and also a law of Adoption based on modern legislation on this subject.

The question of Social Security has been the subject of a special study by Professor Richardson whose Report is now under consideration by my Government.

Assistance from the International Labour Organisation in the preparation of a new Labour Code has been granted us.

As already announced, my Government believes that the provision of better houses for the people needs to be greatly speeded up and legislation will be laid before you which seeks to provide for a new and expanding programme of construction and repair for all workers.

Before the scheme of Housing Loans for Civil Servants can be put into operation it is considered advisable to make certain amendments to the Public Officers' Housing Loan Act, 1952. This legislation will shortly be presented for your consideration.

A large programme of capital works is called for and is in progress. Some items have already been mentioned under Medical and Education and I should now add under completed works the Eagle Hall market, the post offices and libraries at Oistins, and Six Cross Roads, the St. John's post office, the pavilion at Friendship, and numerous minor works which I cannot mention here. Additions, which include a new post office, are being made at Holetown Police Station, and a central fire station is under construction in Bridgetown. The Secretary of State has approved a grant from the Central allocation of Colonial Development and Welfare Funds to cover the capital costs of a regional Police Training School near Seawell.

The Judiciary and the Ministries, besides some Government Departments, are in urgent need of additional accommodation. A phased programme of work has been prepared and I am addressing you separately on the subject.

Grants from the Labour Welfare Fund — and in the case of St. James a very generous gift from Mr. Ronald Tree — have recognised the need for playing fields and community centres in the country parishes. The provision of other amenities in rural areas is under consideration.

Many improvements have been made to roads and bridges, and flood prevention is receiving attention for the first time. The runway at the Airport is being strengthened to take heavier planes.

The rehabilitation and expansion of water supplies is progressing very satisfactorily.

By far the largest item of capital works is the proposed Deep Water Harbour. The steps necessary to implement this proposal are being actively pursued by my Government. The finance required amounts to more than half the Island's total estimated requirements (about \$41,000,000) for development finance over the 1955/60 period. It is our hope that assistance from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds will reduce the burden on the Island's resources but most of the cost of the harbour will have to be met by external borrowing.

In addition to the legislation to which I have already referred, it is proposed to lay again the Bill to Consolidate the Laws of the Island relating to the Representation of the People and the Bill to make provision for the determination of wages and conditions of work by means of Wage Councils, where adequate negotiating machinery does not exist. Among other new legislation to be laid before you there will be Bills to bring up to date the law relating to Weights and Measures; to regulate and improve the conditions of work in Factories; and to remedy deficiencies in the law relating to the sale and supply of Intoxicating Liquor.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council :

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly :

I now declare the Legislative Session open and I pray that the blessing of Almighty God will rest upon your counsels.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
21st September, 1954.

At the close of His Excellency's Address, His Excellency presented Mr. Speaker with a copy of it.

HOUSE RETURNS TO ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

Mr. Speaker and the other honourable members, preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace, returned to the Assembly Chamber.

Prayers were read.

3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that on the last occasion when the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver a Speech, a copy of which he presented to me.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that His Excellency's Speech be taken as read.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Speech.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I have the honour to appoint the following honourable members to serve as such Select Committee:—The Hon. Minister for Social Services (Hon. Dr. Cummins), the Hon. Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries (Hon. C. E. Talma), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan) the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. Vaughan), the hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. Goddard), the hon. senior member for the City (Mr. E. D. Mottley) and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker).

DEPUTY SPEAKER APPOINTED

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the honourable junior member for the City, my colleague, be appointed Deputy Speaker for the ensuing session.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second the motion. The motion was agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Rules of the House for the last session be the Rules of the House for this session.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion. The motion was agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES APPOINTED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker.—I beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph, be Chairman of Committees for the session.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion. The motion was agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO RECOMMEND PERSONNEL FOR PUBLIC BOARDS

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: With regard to the appointment of Boards, I think the usual custom should prevail; that is to say, a Select Committee comprised of the senior members for the various constituencies

should recommend who should be the personnel of these Boards. I therefore beg to make a motion to that effect.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That procedure might have been alright when we did not have a ministerial set-up; but now that we have a Ministerial set-up, that procedure would not serve any useful purpose. I suggest, if we must follow the system of the Ministerial Government in England, then we must see that at least one member of the Opposition is placed on every Board. The Government can control the majority of members on Boards. Under the old system, you will see that the members were not merely nominated by the Government, but the Government did not give a single voice to the Opposition. I repeat, if you adhere to the principle of the Ministerial system and the party system, then the party in Opposition must have a voice on these Boards. If you are going to be democratic, the Opposition must have a voice on these Boards.

3.15 p.m.

I have the honour to be one of the only two honourable members outside of the Government who will serve on that Committee. That means, there are ten out of twelve members on that Committee who are members of the Government. Let me sight for instance, one of these Boards, the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. It is comprised of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, the honourable senior member for St. George, the honourable junior member for St. Michael. I strongly contend that there should be one member of the Opposition on that Board. (A VOICE: We agree!) If a change is made on these Boards it would mean that the Opposition would be in a position to know what is going on within these Boards. There is no point either, of only allowing the honourable senior member for St. John and myself from the Opposition to sit on this Committee. That would be a waste of time. I most respectfully suggest to the Government to withdraw that motion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am going to make a suggestion Mr. Speaker, and I am doing so now, because we have not met on it. There should be a Select Committee following the established precedent, of all the senior members of this honourable House appointed to go into this matter; and the principle enunciated by the hon. senior member for the City should be borne in mind by that Select Committee in making the suggestions for this Board. This Select Committee should also bear in mind that on certain Boards like the Peasants Loan Bank, there can be no other member but a member of the Government's Party who should be appointed to that Board; because, members who are appointed on that Board from this House, are there to carry out the policy of the Government. (A Voice: I do not agree with you). How can Government, for instance, have it a policy for lending money, and then have somebody else carrying out its policy.

Hon. members can know everything by asking questions, and getting replies. It is obvious, there are certain things which you cannot have a member of the Opposition deliberating on. I refer to questions of Government's policy. Of course, in other matters which affect the community at large, there should be a member from the Opposition. I think we all should agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a motion that the Select Committee which should comprise of the senior members of this House, the Committee which normally is appointed to make selections to these Boards, should meet and make selections; and that this Committee should bear in mind that on making

selections from this House, on Boards which affect the community at large, and do not specifically involve Government policy, there should suggest members to serve from all parties of the House. I do agree with the hon. senior member for the City with Ministerial System, you cannot reasonably follow a 300 year-old system which existed I therefore move an amendment along these lines: 'that this Committee in its deliberations, should bear in mind when it makes recommendations for membership on these Boards from all sides of the House that such should be the recommendations other than on those Boards which are merely carrying out the policy of the House.'

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I do not know what kind of amendment that is. I do not know if that can be an amendment to a substantive motion. What should be made clear, I think, is that there is the impression that at this stage, you appoint a Committee to go into these matters; but that is not so. Such a Committee is only appointed after a general election, that is, at the first Session of the House; but this is not the first Session of this House. What has been the practice in the past, and it was done to save time, is that you took the names of the persons who are serving on the present Boards and put their names to the House. I do not know, it because of Ministerial Government, some of the members who are at present on those Boards want to come off. I remember on the last occasion when appointments were being made by this House to the Printing and Debates Committee, there was a little juggling for certain positions; but bear in mind, that was not done by the Committee of the twelve senior members.

I have no desire for argument, but it is a fact that the two members who are at present members of the Peasants' Loan Bank, were appointed to that Board when this Government was in power and everybody agreed with their appointments. I cannot say if they were appointed before they were made members of the Government. We cannot say either that the functions of the Board have changed since those members were appointed. Because of this, I cannot see any reason why you should lay it down as something solemn, something which this House must adopt, that now and afterwards, you must see to it that members appointed to these Boards must be members of the Government. As a matter of fact, you will have to change the Act. Our Act says that a member of the Executive Committee shall be a member of certain Boards. As soon as you put the matter to the House for the House to elect a member to that Board, you are not following the Act. My suggestion to this House, and I think it would save time, would be, that we deal with each of these Boards separately. When we are dealing with a Board on which there is a member who is no longer a member of this House, or a case where a member of that Board does not want to serve any longer, we can appoint another member. Let us put these Boards separately to this House and take a vote on them. If a member does not want to serve on the particular Board he can say so now. Mr. Speaker, I therefore make a motion that the members to be appointed to these Boards, be the same as the last session.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I am speaking on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House. I am sorry that he is not in his seat at the moment for this reason; he made a motion which promised that the practice has always been to appoint Committees of the senior members of the House. So far as my recollection goes—and I speak subject to correction—the practice of appointing senior members

has always been followed at the beginning of the Session. After that has been done and appointments are being made by the House after prorogation, the Committees have not always had re-appointed to them all the former personnel; but there have been changes occasionally, while sometimes, the same personnel has been re-appointed.

If the motion of the hon. member were made on the assumption that it was always a practice after prorogation to appoint the senior members to Committees, and it turns out that he is right—although I do not think so,—we will have to follow in the tradition; but if the motion were made on the wrong assumption, and if it is a fact that the practice of appointing senior members is only followed at the beginning of a Session, I would be disposed to second the motion of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I believe in following regular practice when it comes to matters such as these. I must say that this is a new Session. We have changed the Rules and Regulations and we have agreed that the Session should be broken. I take it therefore, that this can be considered a new Session. If that is the case, I would like to stick to the usual practice of having these Committees composed of senior members only. But I must question the basis of the argument of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph as regards to Peasants Loan Bank. That bank is no different from the other Administrative Boards to which we appoint members; therefore, I do not see why if members outside the Government can be appointed to other Boards, why they cannot be also appointed to the Peasants Loan Bank. Unless, and the hon. member has not stated his reason, unless there is something very secretive which the Government would not like other members of the House to know with regards to the Peasants Loan Bank. But surely the business transacted by the Peasants Loan Bank is public business, and I do not see why there should be any exclusion of members from that Board because they are not Government members.

What I would like to say is, if the Government is as smart and tactful as they think it is, it should make use of all the possible brains in the House, instead of merely depending on the contribution of the Government's Members who on many occasions, have not shown themselves to be possessed of enough brain. I take it that if the Opposition offers its assistance, it would be tactful on the part of the Government to accept that assistance.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I am speaking on the motion made by the hon. jun. member for St. Peter, and seconded by the hon. sen. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's motion was not seconded.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I will second it for the sake of discussion. I am only saying this; I am taking the opportunity to reply to the Hon. Premier who said that with the exception of the Peasants Loan Bank, he would agree with the suggestion I have made. When he looks and sees on that Board the Minister of Agriculture, does he not realise that when that Minister makes an investigation, he will be investigating himself?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I did not specify who should be there. I said the Board should be composed only of persons on the Government's side. If there is a directive and a policy saying that the Bank should not lend money on more than five acres—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would not be allowed to make another speech.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If Your Honour would take it that I am not trying to correct the hon. member I will sit down, and then speak on the new motion. I was merely trying to correct the impression, that I was saying that only Ministers should be on the Board. What I mean is, if Government had a certain policy as regards to the Peasants Loan Bank, you should not have on that Board, members of the Opposition whose policy may be the exact opposite.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member's argument would apply to all Boards. What I cannot agree with, is the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Peter, to let these Boards continue as they are.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member seconded the motion made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did Your Honour. If I seconded the motion for the purpose of expediency, I can criticise him on it now. The Hon. Premier has agreed that you should appoint a Committee of senior members; but he has also suggested that it should be an instruction that the Opposition should be given an opportunity to serve on these Boards, with the exception of the Peasants Loan Bank. I am asking him to withdraw that proviso. If the Board is comprised of say, five members, and two are from the Opposition, what is wrong with that? All that we are asking is that the Government should allow the Opposition to see how the Board is working. When the Government says "No" to that, it must create suspicion in the mind of the hon. senior member for St. John and in my own mind.

I have sat in the gallery of the House and have heard the Hon. Premier use the same argument, with the political complexion of this House was once different from what it is to-day. Now that all of that is changed, and we even have Ministerial status, why should we say that this Board should be in a water-tight compartment. We must have democracy. Let the Opposition see what you are doing, so that they can come out and say what is happening. I now withdraw my seconding of the hon. member's motion. 3.35 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I did not intend to enter this debate; but for the purpose of clarification, having served as a member of the Peasants' Loan Bank for many years, I would like to bring the attention of the hon. member who has just sat down, the matter of the composition of that Board. As the hon. member will recall, the Board is comprised of five members only; two members are nominated by the House of Assembly, one by the Agricultural Society, one is the Governor's nominee, and the last one is the Director of Agriculture. That in itself goes to prove that the Conservative class or that section which represents the views of the Opposition, is already properly represented on that Board. The hon. member is suggesting that one member should be nominated from the Opposition; that would be strengthening the Opposition to such an extent that the Government's policy would not be carried out.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I have not suggested any such thing; the hon. member is only accusing people of expressing the views of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I should like to say that some hon. members have questioned what has been the habit in connection with this matter of the appointment of members to Boards. A motion is usually made to have the same personnel re-appointed, who has served in the past; but where there is a contrary motion, the matter is

decided by a vote of the House. The question is that the senior members of the various constituencies be appointed as a Select Committee to recommend the personnel of these Boards. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The Committee is as follows:—

His Honour the Speaker, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. ALLDER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HOLDER and Hon. C. E. TALMA.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE DEATH OF MR. ALFRED GITTENS, MESSENGER AND LIBRARY ATTENDANT OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, — Before we get on with our usual business, I should like to remind the House that since we last met, our Messenger, and Library Attendant Mr. Alfred Gittens, has passed to the Great Beyond. An honourable member has said that it is the Little Beyond, and he may be right. However, there is hardly anything which I can say on behalf of Mr. Gittens which is now already known by honourable members. For the few years during which he served us, we can all say that he served us well. Mr. Gittens was intelligent, courteous, co-operative and loyal; and all of these qualities when combined, made him a man, and a very useful adjunct to this House. I am not saying anything which is not known to all honourable members. I am making a motion that this House place on record their appreciation of the services which Mr. Gittens has rendered this House, and express its sympathy on his passing, and that a copy of this Resolution be sent to his relatives.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—In seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution as an expression of sympathy on the passing of Mr. Gittens, the late Messenger and Library Attendant of this House, I do so with a full sense of responsibility. From the time I became a member of this House, Mr. Gittens has always been of the same temper and good manners; as a matter of fact, he treated all members with the same respect, and he did so at all times. One of the greatest tributes that could have been paid to Mr. Gittens, was paid to him by several members of this House when a Resolution came down for an increase of his salary. On that occasion every member of this House spoke very highly of Mr. Gittens, and of the manner in which he filled that office. All honourable members at all times felt that Mr. Gittens paid them the respect which was due to them, and he did things for them willingly and without being asked to do anything twice. The manner in which he death took place was very sudden. He died while he was on his work, and we were shocked at the passing of Mr. Gittens at such an early stage of his service.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—I could not feel right, if I allowed this occasion to pass without paying a short tribute in connection with the very regrettable death of our Messenger and Library Attendant. If I were to say that he was one of Nature's gentlemen, I do not think I could pay him any higher compliment than that. Every member of this House must feel his loss in one way or another, because on no occasion do I remember having heard any one of the twenty-four members of this House speak about Mr. Gittens in any way but the most flattering terms. His was an humble office; but in these days when humility is such a rare quality, humility was immediately observable in Mr. Gittens. His was the

humility of a fine man, and not the humility of servility.

Mr. Gittens felt it was his duty while carrying out his work here, to be entirely impartial and obliging on all and every occasion. Although his office was humble, in this twentieth century when good manners are all too rare, every one of us should feel that the Assembly in its loss of its Messenger and Library Attendant, had indeed lost a great and a good friend of this Chamber.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: On behalf of my absent colleague and myself, I feel that I am in duty bound to associate myself with the remarks made by the previous speakers, on behalf of the passing of the late Mr. Gittens, one of our most loved Officers. Mr. Gittens was a young man of outstanding and rare qualities, which cannot be so regularly found among the humble elements of my people. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that Mr. Gittens' passing has opened to us in our humble capacity and sphere, qualities that have been latent in the minds of many of our people in this island. Irrespective of how humble may be your position in life, the late Mr. Gittens has shown that there are people in our community who can still do in their humble position, a noble task. I again associate myself with the kind remarks which have been voiced by previous speakers.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, on occasions like these, normally, it is enough for the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, and leaders of the other Parties, to pay tribute without anybody-else speaking; but I do feel that the late Mr. Gittens, our Messenger and Library Attendant was so exceptional, so outstanding, that I should also add my tribute to the things which have been so well fittingly said.

I think the greatest tribute to the late Mr. Gittens, is the fact that of the twenty-four members of this House, not one knew what political views Mr. Gittens had. He was true, faithful and willing,—nay, anxious and eager to help every member of the House as he possibly could, no matter what was a member's political views. I think there can be no greater tribute than that. I wish I could say the same thing for other Civil Servants and of every servant of this House, since their lot is a duty to the community, no matter what Government is in power.

Let us hope and pray that his successor may do likewise. Let us hope that his successor may be as impartial, honest, hardworking and as worthy of commendation as the late Mr. Gittens was.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, the Hon. Premier has said that it is only for the Leaders of the various Parties to express sympathy on occasions such as these. While that is so, what comes readily to my mind are words of a great Jurist. He said, "Justice delayed is justice denied" Sir everything that has been said of the late Mr. Gittens is true; but we must yet bear in mind that he has passed to the Great Beyond. Never mind though to some of us it would appear unkindly. Providence knows best. What I should like to bring to the mind's eye is, the late Mr. Gittens has left behind four young children, and I hope this paying of tribute to him will not be the end of Mr. Gittens. However willing, eager and decent the late Mr. Gittens might have been, let us think of those whom he has left behind. Let us think of the mother with those four young children of his. I am confident, after looking into the faces of members of the Government, especially those who were the Pall Bearers at his funeral, that they will be willing, even if the statutes of this coun-

try say that those children are not qualified for anything, that members of the Government will find a way to make it so. This must come along with the sentiments which were expressed that he was a decent or a jolly good fellow.

I recall that at the death of one of our Reporters which followed soon after that of his wife, as he did not qualify for a pension or gratuity, honourable members made the promise that they would give something to keep starvation from the door of his large family. Up to this day, all that I have got from some honourable members is, mere promises. It is very nice of us to express our sympathy with nice words; but I would like us to do at times as Mr. Lloyd George has said, that is, to do it with the silver rod. I hope that honourable members in this Chamber will show their appreciation greater than by mere words. I do want honourable members to think of the four children whom Mr. Gittens has left behind with absolutely nothing to provide for them. To dispense local charity to them is something which no human would like to do. When it comes to the appreciation, not only of Mr. Gittens' service and of his gentle demeanour and manner in the carrying out of his duties, I know that you can hardly fill his place.

In addressing my final remarks to the honourable Minister of Social Services, I hope that this will not be the last which we shall hear of the late Mr. Gittens. I do hope that in the not too distant future I shall have the pleasure of seconding a Resolution for compensation for Mr. Gittens' services, so as not to allow his four children whom he has left behind to entirely depend on charity.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House place on record its sympathy over the passing of the late Mr. Alfred Gittens, Messenger and Library attendant, and that a copy of the Resolution be sent to the relatives of the deceased.

I will ask honourable members to stand in their places while the question is being put.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, honourable members standing in their places on the passing of the motion, as requested by Mr. Speaker.

3.55 p.m.

MR. L. A. WILLIAMS VACATES SEAT IN THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Honourable the Chief Secretary:—

Sir,
I am directed to inform you that Mr. L. A. Williams Member of the General Assembly of this Island, proceeded to Grenada on the 31st August to take up an appointment in the Service of the Crown as Legal Assistant, Grenada. Mr. Williams has been in receipt of emoluments from the Government of Grenada with effect from the 1st September, 1954.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

G. BARTON

Acting Chief Secretary

His Honour,

The Speaker of the House of Assembly.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor the following Papers were laid:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Statement showing the 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 31st March, 1954, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am commanded to present from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:

Message No. 22/1954.

*His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to Sir Grattan Bushe's Message No. 19/1942 on the subject of the voluntary liquidation of the Barbados Settlement Company, Limited, and to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that the liquidation has been concluded and the final accounts rendered.

2. These accounts show that the loan to the Company of \$45,600 was repaid with interest of \$6,139.20 to date of repayment, and that a first dividend on the capital invested of 19/- in the £ and a final dividend of 8d. in the £ (amounting to \$273,760) were paid into the Treasury.

3. In the Five Year Plan it was indicated that these funds would be available to meet the cost of Agricultural Schemes included in the Plan. Most of the Schemes have already been undertaken, and it is proposed to credit General Revenue with the balance now standing in the books of the Treasury.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.

18th September, 1954.
(M.P. 2756 Vol. II)

Message No. 23/1954.

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that his Government has had under consideration the capital works that are immediately necessary in order to provide adequate accommodation for the Judicature, the new Ministries and the Departments of Government. The proposals set out below will meet the most pressing needs.

2. Whatever form the proposed re-organization of the Judiciary ultimately takes, the foreseeable requirements will be four Court Rooms for the work now done by the Superior Courts and the Assistant Court of Appeal in addition to the Court Room for matters that now go to the Petty Debt Court. It is considered to be in the public interest that the Registrar and other Court Officials should be housed in the same building as the Courts. It is accordingly proposed that additions should be made to the Town Hall to provide these requirements.

3. The proposals in paragraph 2 are estimated to cost \$215,000 of which \$135,000 have been provided in this year's Capital Estimates.

4. Turning to the needs of Government Headquarters it is proposed to reserve a sufficient area of Government land on the Esplanade frontage of the Bay Estate for the construction over a period of years of a Civic Centre to include, eventually, new

Parliamentary Buildings, Ministerial Offices and possibly a Civic Hall or Theatre. The first phase of construction would consist of the erection of new ministerial offices and the conversion for office purposes of the Bay Street Boys' School, which would be removed to available land by the Bay Estate Playing Field. As the new offices come into use the present Public Buildings will become available for the much needed expansion of the Treasury and other Departments.

5. The new Ministerial Offices are estimated to cost \$350,000 of which \$140,000 have already been voted. The rebuilding of the School, so as to provide the increased accommodation required, is estimated to cost \$75,000.

6. The offices of the Department of Highways and Transport are most unsatisfactory and must be replaced. Rather than rebuild on the present site it is proposed to erect new offices and workshops on the Pine Estate for this Department and for the Public Works Department. This will free the old Railway Yard behind the Bus Station for the construction of a Central Market and will permit the expansion of the Income Tax Department.

7. The new offices, workshops and stores are estimated to cost \$300,000 and the estimate for the Central Market is \$75,000.

8. In due course the Legislature will be invited to vote the additional funds required to give effect to the proposals in paragraphs 3, 5 and 7. It is estimated that provision in the Supplementary Estimates of \$100,000 will be needed in the current financial year to begin work on the new Works Departments' buildings.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.

20th September, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the three months ended 30th June, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the four months ended 31st July, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Report of the Income Tax and Death Duties Department for the year 1952-53.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Annual Report on the Organisation and Administration of the Barbados Police Force for the year 1953.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS : Report on the Organisation and Methods Survey 1953-54 by Mr. J. W. Foster of H.M. Treasury.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS : Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1952-53.

Hon. M. E. COX : Statement of Post Office advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th June, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX :—Statement of Post Office advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st May, 1954.

Hon. R. G. MAPP : Third Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Natural Gas Corporation for the period 1st April, 1953, to 31st March, 1954.

Hon. R. G. MAPP : Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to the 30th June, 1954.

Hon. C. E. TALMA : Annual Report on the Peasants' Loan Bank for the period 1st June, 1952, to 31st May, 1953.

Hon. C. E. TALMA : Report of the Governing Body of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute for the years 1952 and 1953.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Interim Report of the Committee set up to examine ways and means of improving the marketing organisation and storage facilities for green vegetables, fish and meat and to make recommendations.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to give notice of the Resolution to place the sum of \$138,629 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimate 1954-55 Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954-55, No. 17 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members will study this resolution between now and next Tuesday. They will see one of the Items is to provide for an increase under Conferences. An unforeseen liability has arisen in the past week as regards the necessity of attending another Conference, and it would be a good thing if we could consider these Estimates and pass them next Tuesday.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$106,866 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1954-55 No. 18 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to make provision for the use of existing registers of voters at election of members to serve in the General Assembly.

I would just like to say, putting it very mildly, (some lawyers would put it stronger) it is very doubtful whether it is possible to hold the coming bye-election under the state of the existing law unless we pass this Bill. According to the existing law, the Register of Electors must be revised every month by the Revising Officer, and no such revision has taken place since the introduction of Adult Suffrage. The object of this Bill is to remedy that situation. We hope that honourable members will come early next Tuesday, so as to get this Bill through.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Interpleader Act, 1891, with reference to claims in respect of goods and chattels taken in execution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904 (in respect of the law relating to property taken in execution and incidental matters).

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, 1904, in respect of distraint or levy on personal estate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Chattel Buildings Security Act, 1913, by making provision for claims in respect of buildings mortgaged in accordance with that Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to authorise the payment of a gratuity and pension to Mortimer Hall.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Bill to make provision for the adoption of children.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1911, and to provide for increases in the concession allowed on literature for the blind and in the maximum amount of indemnity for loss or damage to uninsured postal parcels.

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to provide for the establishment of Wages Councils.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor and the supply thereof in clubs.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

A Private member's notice was given as follows:—

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly desire that as a means to satisfying the needs of a rapidly growing population, the Government adopt immediately a system of Land Reform in the Colony, along the following lines:—

(1) The taking over of all Estates in the island owned by absentee proprietors, to be run by Government on a co-operative basis and on behalf of the people of the Colony.

(2) That in those parishes where there are no Estates owned by absentee proprietors, the Government acquire a portion of not less than five (5) hundred acres in each of such parishes to be redistributed to peasants on easy payment terms and for long lease.

(3) That wealthy House-holders be not allowed to utilise more than one quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) of an acre of arable land for Ornamental Gardens purposes. Any additional land over one quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) of an acre owned by such House-holders be utilised in the production of food.

(4) The House recommend an increase of the Staff of Peasant Agricultural Instructors. Also a substantial allocation of funds for the production of food thereby reducing considerably the cost of imported food stuff and providing employment for the population.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS in each case the following Bills were read a first time:—

Bill to make special provision for the use of existing registers of voters at election of members to serve in the General Assembly.

Bill to amend the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Bill to amend the Interpleader Act, 1891, reference to claims in respect of goods and chattels taken in execution.

Bill to amend the Provost Marshal's Act, 1904 in respect of the law relating to property taken in execution and incidental matters.

Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, 1904, in respect of distraint of levy on personal estate.

Bill to amend the Chattel Buildings Security Act, 1913, by making provision for claims in respect of buildings mortgaged in accordance with that Act.

Bill to authorise the payment of gratuity and pension to Mortimer Hall.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to make provision for the adoption of children, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Post Office Act, 1911, and to provide for increases in the concession allowed on literature for the blind and in the maximum amount of indemnity for lost or damage to uninsured postal parcels.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

Bill to provide for the establishment of Wages Councils.

Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor and the supply thereof in clubs.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—
In fixing the Order Paper, I want to take this opportunity to say, in respect of the Bill to make special provision for the use of existing registers of voters at election of members to serve in the General Assembly, I understand that the Other Place is quite willing to meet on Tuesday next to consider this Bill, if we would meet earlier and consider it. The point is, unless this Bill is passed, we cannot

proceed with the bye-election in St. Lucy. Therefore honourable members will see the urgency of dealing with this Bill. In the circumstances, I am asking honourable members to meet at 12 o'clock noon next Tuesday instead of at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, so that members of the Other Place can deal with this Bill on the same day. If that is agreeable to honourable members, I will fix that Bill as the first Order of the Day, and the money Resolutions will follow next in the order in which they were given notice of to-day. For the reasons I have given, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

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