THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 14th July, 1955.

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. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*), Hon. Dr. H G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. Cox, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Emergency Powers, Act, 1939.

PRIVATE NOTICE

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss the serious allegations that have been made on the floor of this House against the Reporters and Staff of the House.

The nature of that motion will take the form of a Resolution that a Committee be set up to investigate the allegations which have been made. I consider the matter to be a very important one; I shall not take one side or the other, but I say the allegations are serious allegations made by the Premier, and I feel that in the interest of the persons concerned, their characters should be cleared in one way or the other.

For that reason I am giving this notice that it is my intention to move the adjournment of the House in order to deal with this matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I think it is only right for me to say that I did not attack anybody's character. Some weeks ago the Deputy Speaker drew the attention of the House to the fact that the debates were badly reported. Other members agreed with him by cheering and I entirely agreed with him.

The reason may be that the Reporters have to write down speeches which are not always lucidly expressed; on the other hand, they may not be extremely qualified, because there is not the cream of reporting available to this Chamber because of the salaries which they are paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making a speech?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I merely want to draw it to the attention of the House how I managed to speak in that strain. The honourable member actually called my name when he referred to the Premier. I want it to go on record that the debates of this House are disgracefully reported. I repeat the word "disgraceful".

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Emergency Powers Act, 1939, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to give notice that I intend to ask the leave of the House to deal with this Bill in all its aspects today. It is absolutely essential that this Bill go on the Statute Book as soon as possible.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I take objection to that. This is not the ordinary meeting of the House of Assembly for the honourable member to bring forward this Bill today. The ordinary meeting of the House would be on a Tuesday.

For the honourable member to ask for leave to deal with emergency legislation of this nature is, to say the least, the most reprehensible conduct which one could expect from any Government. Could any one seriously argue that if this Bill is not passed through all its stages today that the progress of the country would be retarded? This House met last Tuesday and the Other Place also met; no notice was given of this Bill on Tuesday,

and we are now asked to deal with this Bill through all its stages today. Earlier today I gave notice of my intention to discuss a matter in order to give honourable members an opportunity of knowing what I am going to do. Now you are asking me to sit in debate without any previous knowledge that something has happened which necessitates the Government to pass an Emergency Powers Bill today, because you say that the island is in such a state that if these Emergency Powers are not passed the island will be imperilled. What is the state of the island today? When you come down to pass emergency legislation in all its stages today without previously telling us what the emergency is or giving us previous notice of this legislation, that is something which only a dictatorship could think of doing.

Is the honourable member asking for leave now?

3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is giving notice of his intention to ask for leave.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is only because he is afraid that they have not got twelve members present. He should be willing to take things as they are.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. What is the honourable member speaking on?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member asked for leave. He now finds that they are not twelve persons in here to support him.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL
Concluded

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to consolidate the Laws of this Island relating to the Representation of the People.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the Bill to consolidate the Laws of this Island relating to the Representation of the People was being discussed Clause 32 was passed.

Clause 33 was called and passed.

Clause 34 *was called. It reads as follows*:—

(1) If a person hires or uses any premises to which this Section applies or any part thereof for a Committee room for the purpose of promoting or procuring the election of a candidate, or lets any premises to which this Section applies or any part thereof knowing that it was intended to use them or that part as a Committee room, he shall be guilty of an illegal hiring.

(2) This Section applies to any premises—

(a) which are licensed for the sale of any intoxicating liquor for consumption on or off the premises or on which refreshment of any kind (whether food or drink) is ordinarily sold for consumption on the premises; or

(b) where any intoxicating liquor is supplied to members of a club, society or association, other than a permanent political club;

Provided that this Section shall not apply to the hiring, using, letting or permitting the use of any part of premises which is ordinarily let for the purposes of chambers, or offices, or the holding of public meetings or of arbitrations, if that part has a separate entrance and no direct communication with any part of the premises on which any intoxicating liquor or refreshment is sold or supplied as aforesaid."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 34 stand part.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to know something as regards the premises not to be used as Committee rooms. It is stated that this Section applies to any premises: "(b) where any intoxicating liquor is supplied to members of a club, society or association, other than a permanent political club."

We have premises which are used as clubs and they are not political clubs; sometimes, refreshments are sold thereon. What I want to know: should someone who is engaged in a political campaign, or his agents, or his supporters, or whatever they might be happen to call a meeting on such premises in order to plan his campaign, is it an offence to use a building like that at any time?

For instance, I know we have members in this Chamber who are associated with things like that; as well as in the organisation of which I am General Secretary, there is a licensed place not only to sell intoxicating drinks but a place as well to hold political meetings. Is it an offence if a political meeting is held on such premises? I really want to know if someone holds such a meeting on such a premises in his own interest if he is guilty of an offence.

I do not know what the honourable junior member for St. Michael is going to say in a matter like this, but what should there be to prevent me or any other honourable member from going to him and asking him for the use of part of his premises to hold a meeting to map out a political campaign? That has nothing to do with bribing a person; it is purely a matter of finding a convenient place to use for such a purpose.

I do feel that you should not have the people associated with rumshops but you should be given the democratic privilege of mapping out your campaign wherever you like. There are not many private places available in Barbados for one to hire and use in such a manner. You cannot use a schoolroom for such a purpose. I really want to know how far this Clause goes.

3.35 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is plain English; I am not making any more explanation. The whole object of things of that sort relating to intoxicating drinks being sold on that day is clear. That is all.

The question that Clause 34 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clauses 35 *and* 36 *were called and passed.*

Clause 37 *was called.*

"No person shall during an election call together, hold or address an election meeting in any public place unless notice of an intention to hold such at such place has been given not less than three hours before the commencement of such meeting to the Officer of Police in charge of the parish in which

such place is situated or to the Officer of Police or constable in charge of the police station nearest to such place.

(2) Every notice under sub-section (1) of this section shall specify—

(a) the person in support of whose candidature the meeting is to be held;

(b) the place and approximate time at which such meeting is to commence.

(3) Any person who contravenes any of the provisions of this section shall be liable, on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction, to a fine not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

(4) In this Section "public place" means any street, road, land or highway and any park, garden, field, or sea beach to which the public has access whether as of right or upon payment of any sum of money or otherwise.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 37 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know what is the meaning of the word "election" in this Clause. Here "election" appears to have been given a different definition from any of the other Clauses. Sub-section 1 of Section 37 states this:—

"No person shall during an election, call together, hold or address an election meeting in any public place unless notice of the intention to hold such meeting at such place has been given not less than three hours before the commencement of such meeting."

In the above sub-section (that is sub-section (2) of Section 36) it seems to me that the period falls between the date of issue of a writ and the date on which a return is made because sub-section (2) of Section 36 reads as follows:—

"This Section applies to a political meeting held in any constituency between the date of the issue of a writ for the return of a member or members for the constituency and the date which a return to the writ is made."

However, Section 37 does not state what period it really means. I should like to know if this Section follows Section 36; that is, I should like to know when notice is to be given and what period it relates to.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I did not intend to answer this question again. For the last time I am going to say this: "Election" means the process of electing a person. Election purposes, not only the actual day. It may be according to the wording of the Section, between the date of the issue of a writ and the date at which a return to the writ is made; or it may be between nomination and election day. It may be any time which it is clear that a man is running for election according to the facts of each particular case. In an extreme case it is possible for a court to hold that a candidate is a candidate for a subsequent election on the very day after the last election. But judges have said that before any ruling in connection with each case can be made, they must consider and examine the facts surrounding the political issues to be able to say at what time a man starts out to be a candidate.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that sort of discourtesy may be alright when a person is carrying on his private business; but when it comes to public affairs, no man is to be so discourteous and bad mannered as to give an answer like that.

I am dealing with a democratic fact. Are you suggesting to any man at any time who is going to hold a meeting that he should give a policeman a notice that he is going to hold a meeting. If you say that is to happen during the period of the election that is admissible. I say that you may want the police to be informed because tempers are likely to be high, but you are telling me here that in the calm of everything that you must give a policeman a notice. A man holds a meeting and you may want to hold one immediately behind that. What happens? Where else will you find that in any part of the world today apart from Kenya and Nigeria where you have to go to a policeman and say that you are going to hold a public meeting? Is this to be done even if no election is on? I consider that the next thing you will hear is that you have to go and hold a meeting somewhere else and under other circumstances. That is the sort of democracy we have here.

It plainly shows that you are not really moving up from a Crown colony stage or out of the control of the Colonial Office. I think that where you are aspiring to rule yourself you should remove all the aspects of colonialism. Instead of that, you have here in this Section of the Bill before us that before you can hold the meeting you have to go and notify a policeman that you are going to hold a political meeting. I take it that they must feel that they are dealing with thugs.

The question that Clause 37 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clauses 38 *to* 43 *inclusive were called and passed.*

Clause 44 *was called.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 44 stand part.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw your attention to something in this Section. First I will quote the Section. It reads as follows:—

"The candidate at an election may pay any personal expenses incurred by him on account of or in connection with or incidental to the election.

Provided that the amount which a candidate may pay shall not exceed fifty dollars,, and any further personal expenses so incurred by him shall be paid by his election agent.

(2) The candidate shall send to his election agent within the time limited by this Act for sending in claims a written statement of the amount of personal expenses paid as aforesaid by the candidate.

(3) Any person may, if so authorised in writing by the election agent of the candidate, pay any necessary expenses for stationery, postage and other petty expenses, to a total amount not exceeding that named in the authority, but any excess above the total amount so named shall be paid by the election agent.

(4) A statement of the particulars of payments made by any person so authorised shall be sent to the election agent within the time limited by this Act for sending in claims, and shall be couched for by a Bill containing the receipt of that person."

The amount of $50 has been stated; I would like to know why any amount has been stated; and if an amount has been stated why is it that $50 is regarded as a reasonable amount. What do you regard as incidental expenses which a candidate incur which the agent has not incurred? If the candidate should not have any expenses then there is no reason for putting that in; if it is reasonable for him to meet expenses why is it not more than $50? That remains to be answered; why $50 has been

put down and on what basis do you expend; I have looked up the amount which should be spent but what is not clear, is whether it is based on any sort of expenses which the candidate is likely to have incurred when his election takes place. Are you giving a free vote of $50?

I have asked a question and I am not allowing the vote to go through unless an answer is given. If it is the intention of the Government not to answer questions we will see how long we will go on like this. The easiest thing you can get is for people to incite others to violence. I asked about this amount of $50 and nobody says anything. People will sit down dumb and when the election comes up they will say: "We asked no question because we were members of a Party" You are passing something which we do not understand; you put down $50 here; why is it not 50 cents? Imagine that you are proposing something in a Bill and you do not say why this amount of $50 has been put down! Why is it not $30 or $20? Some reason must be stated.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Shouting at me means absolutely nothing to me. This Act has been in operation for four years and not one single word was said about it; that was the law agreed to four years ago. This is a consolidating Bill; we added a few new sections to the existing law. That is all I have to say about that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Four years ago you pleaded with people not to debate the Bill. It was on the eve of the Election and you did not want any debate on it; that is why nobody discussed it. The day will come when you will have to debate a lot more things besides this.

The question that Clause 44 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 45 to 70 were called and passed.

3.55 p.m.

The First Schedule was called and passed.
The Second Schedule was called and passed.
The Third Schedule was called and passed.
The Fourth Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking leave to recommit Clause 62 dealing with the disqualification for conviction for bribery. The honourable senior member for the City suggested that a person making a false statement should be punished more severely than by merely being fined and I promised the honourable member that I would do something about it; but I forgot to move the amendment for it when Clause 62 was called. I am asking leave to recommit that Clause in order to do that.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 62 be recommitted.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Clause 62 reads as follows:—

"Every person who is convicted of bribery, treating or undue influence, shall (in addition to any other punishment) be incapable during a period of five years from the date of his conviction—

(a) of being registered as a voter or voting at any election of a member or members of the General Assembly;

(b) of being elected a member of the General Assembly, or, if elected before his conviction, of retaining his seat as such member;

Provided that in the event of any appeal the incapacity shall continue until the appeal is determined and thereafter unless the conviction is quashed, remain in force for a period of five years from the determination of the appeal except the court hearing the appeal shall direct that the period of five years shall remain from the date of conviction."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking sir, that Clause 62 be amended by deleting the word "or" in line 2 and inserting after the word "influence", the following words: "or making a false statement of fact against the character or conduct of a candidate."

A VOICE: What about Section 50?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Section 50, Subsection 1 says in effect that if you are guilty of an illegal practice you cannot come forward for election under five years and this Clause repeats that. Although it is a repetition I think we had better leave it in. You cannot register to vote nor can you be a member of the General Assembly for five years. I beg to move that the Clause as amended stand part.

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

The question that Clause 62 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.05 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN left the Chair, and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Bill of which I have already given notice of today in all its stages.

This is a Bill which we have had on what I might call cold storage for a considerable time; a couple of years I believe. The Act that we propose to amend (The Emergency Powers Act, 1939) makes provision for investing the Governor-in-Executive Committee with power to make orders in an emergency such as a hurricane, or in times of distress, or where the life of the community may be upset as was the case with the recent Dock Strike in England. For the benefit of the community, power is given in this Bill to make provision for the essentials of life; and it specifically refers to water, light, fuel and locomotion. It is just possible that some law Courts may hold that locomotion is only in respect of certain things. To remove the doubt as to what that means, it is felt that the Act should be made clear; and in this Bill, if honourable members will read it, they will see that its provisions specifically refer to anything that may prevent the public life of the community from continuing.

Attention is drawn to the fact that you can make a proclamation for a month; but any order made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee lasts only five days and has to be brought to the Legislature for their approval. At the end of five days if the Legislature does not grant its continuance, that order ceases to have effect. The Legislature is completely in control.

I do not suppose that what has happened in England would happen here, because English Trade Unions do not function quite in the same way as they

do in Barbados; inasmuch as English Trade Unionists often have heavy strikes. It has never happened in Barbados that a strike has reached such proportions that it was necessary to call upon the Governor for emergency powers. But the whole object of this Bill is to make it abundantly clear as to what the law means; because under the present Act some Courts may hold that the law only applies to water, light and so on, while we want to make it clear that it applies to any emergency in which the whole community may suffer.

There is nothing extraordinary about it; but as I said before only this morning, we discovered that there is a possibility of an emergency arising soon; and for that reason we have been asked to adopt this unusual course of passing the Bills through all its stages today.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I object, Mr. Speaker, to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph for this reason: if you read the notes you will see that it says:—

"For some time consideration has been given to certain serious deficiencies in the legislation in Barbados designed for the maintenance of public order and good government."

Honourable members will notice that the note says "for some time;" not this morning. Now this morning the Executive Committee met and they decided to come down with an Emergency Powers Bill. Normally the Governor-in-Executive Committee would have met this morning; and if Your Honour had to call a special meeting of the House, honourable members would have been given notice that an Emergency Power Bill was to be debated. Primarily you have come back to the House today in order to continue to deal with Government business which was not dealt with last Tuesday. Instead of that you have introduced an Emergency Powers Bill and you are saying that there is likely to be an emergency; yet you have not said what is the nature of the emergency.

In Great Britain about two months ago they had to pass emergency legislation to deal with a Dock Strike; but I guess that in Barbados you would not have passed emergency powers to deal with a Dock Strike; you would have passed legislation to lock up people.

We still have in this world certain democratic governments and when the Emergency Bill came to be dealt with in the House of Commons, the Government gave notice that they were going to institute an Emergency Powers Act and that they were going to debate it.

4.15 p.m.

What I am objecting to is this: I am objecting on the ground that this method of dealing with parliamentary issues is not the best one. No one would deny any Government any privilege of dealing with an emergency when you know that an emergency arises and you have to deal with it; but this is what the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill says:—

"For sometime consideration has been given to certain serious deficiencies in the legislation in Barbados designed for the maintenance of public order and good government. Consideration of the Emergency Powers Act, 1939, shows that this was framed on older legislation and in consequence to be declared only in the case of a threat to the supply and distribution of food, water, fuel or light, or to the means of locomotion to secure the essentials of life to the community."

You now realise that you have to change the law; what is wrong in this same Bill being given notice of in the normal way in the House so that honourable members can hear what is the reason for it? What is the emergency which the island is facing that if you do not pass this Bill today the island will be in jeopardy? I do not know if there is any information that there is going to be a hurricane or a strike. A strike is of course, always around the corner in any individual community; because you cannot control how workers will agree. There is no threat of any Civil War. If the members of the Government were not aware that they were meeting today they would not have asked the Legislature to deal with this matter today. Somebody says that an emergency is around the corner; I would say that an emergency is around the corner when you are looking for jobs, but what is the emergency around the corner? It cannot be a vague statement that there is going to be a commotion; you cannot say that there is an emergency but it is a state secret. I ask: what is the emergency around the corner?

The question that leave be granted the honourable member to proceed with this Bill through all its stages to-day was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, MILLER, J. C. MOTTLEY and VAUGHAN.—12.

Noes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—1.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 89

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rule 89 be now suspended.

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

The question that Rule 89 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

EMERGENCY POWERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Emergency Powers Act, 1939.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is no reason whatever on earth for a Government, using its discretion and judgment and knowing that it is not only the members of the Government but members of the Opposition groups or individuals who should be aware to the extent that it is desirable, not to know in a case of this sort why we are asking for for these powers. Let me repeat: today there is an emergency Act dealing with hurricanes and earthquakes or in similar cases where the life of the community is disturbed. I am not sure that under that Act, an occurrence like the Soufriere Fire would have been covered. If Bridgetown were to be burnt down tomorrow and we were in the unfortunate position in which the people of Soufriere are now in, we would not have had any power to commandeer property and the like so as to feed the people.

You could do it by voluntary arrangement, but you could not take a man's lorry and transport food and water to the suffering population. We made provision for hurricanes and earthquakes in 1939 which allowed the Government to provide food, water fuel and light or the means of locomotion whereby the community would be supplied with the essentials of life. If a fire took place and people were home-

less, you cannot act under this Act of 1929 because it applies only to earthquakes, hurricanes, or civil commotion. The words of the 1939 Act are as follows:

"If at any time it appears to the Governor-in-Executive Committee that any action has been taken or is immediately threatened by any persons or body of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be calculated, by interfering with the supply and distribution of food, water, fuel, or light, or with the means of locomotion, to deprive the community, or any substantial portion of the community, of the essentials of life, the Governor may, by proclamation (hereinafter referred to as a proclamation of emergency), declare that a state of emergency exists.

No such proclamation shall be in force for more than one month, without prejudice to the issue of another proclamation at or before the end of that period."

That proclamation cannot remain in force for more than a month. When a state of emergency has been declared, the occasion must be communicated to the Houses of the Legislature; and if the Legislature is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within five days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days.

And when the Legislature meets it has to say whether it will agree to the continuance of the orders that have been made, so that for no longer than a period of five days, (I think it is seven in England), can the Governor-in-Executive Committee rule by order. At the end of five days the Legislature must meet and say whether it proposes to let an order remain in force.

It is not a question of Fascism if you have to do anything to keep the community alive. Countries all over the known world have powers of this kind; but in democratic countries the Legislature has to approve of the order.

I am saying that the Government's attitude towards what might arise is absolutely and utterly above reproach; and if I declare what we foresee might happen and against which we have to provide, I will back it up with the utmost spirit of goodwill and without any intention whatever to threaten anybody.

This Government owes a duty to the community to see that life goes on. It is notorious that the bus Concessionaires of this island have said that unless Government agree to raise bus fares they will not continue their concessions after tomorrow. We have made certain proposals whereby we would give them a financial concession without raising bus-fares. The sum which we stipulate may be in one respect arbitrary; but it is more than the substantial sum which they say they have lost.

4.25 p.m.

I want that to be made very clear. They have asked the Government to allow them to raise bus fares because by the figures which they have presented to the Committee which reported recently, they have said that they have lost something in the neighbourhood of $37,000. We have made a proposal which would bring them $60,000 and they have turned it down.

We have been informed that they will be stopping their buses from running on Sunday night; and this Government will be failing in its duty to the travelling public for not having legislation which it can use, if necessary to prevent disaster to the public. As I have said, the Government in reply to their request said: "We are making this offer which is substantially more than you say you have lost." Government's concession is a rebate of 15 percent on their gasolene. In other words, every Concessionaire would be paid back 15% that is taken from him now in hard cash on the gasolene he uses in buses provided this legislation is passed. That would produce roughly $60,000 as against the $37,000 as a general average which they say they have lost. As a matter of fact, six bus companies say they have not lost anything; eight of them said they have lost money.

The Concessionaires also complained of "pirate" buses. We told them that we were quite prepared to stop "pirate" buses when we were satisfied that the Concessionaires had alternative buses to take their places. Could anything be fairer than that? We said: "We are giving you more than what you say you have lost in order that you can improve your service. You also complained of "pirate" buses. We say we will stop them when the Director of Highways and Transport has satisfied us that you have buses to take the places of those "pirate" buses." Sir, they have flatly turned it down.

This Bill which we had in cold storage, we have brought down this morning after being faced with the spectacle that this community might find itself wondering how it is going to get to work and back home. No Government would be desirous of calling itself a Government if it did not take steps to meet such a situation. We are hoping that bus Concessionaires will use their commonsense and will not be so silly as to take their buses off the roads. It seems to me that the travelling public will be solidly behind the Government when they come to understand that we are giving the bus Concessionaires more than what they say they have lost in order that they may have money to extend their services and to increase the wages of bus drivers and conductors. Of course, impossible wages are sometimes paid, but there is no universality in the wages of these conductors and drivers.

There are one or two Concessionaires who do not pay what others pay their drivers and conductors. I say again that the Government regrets that Concessionaires do not have sense enough to see that they are gaining enemies among the public when they fail to see that Government has allowed them the handsome offer of a rebate of 15% on their gasolene, while it is our intention to wipe out "pirate" buses as soon as they have buses to take the place of the "pirate" buses.

This morning a letter which Bus Concessionaires handed in yesterday afternoon to the Director of Highways and Transport was presented to the Executive Committee. In that letter it was stated that the Concessionaires were unable to accept the terms and conditions laid down in Government's decision, but that they were prepared to accept in principle the recommendations contained in the Report of the Bus Fares Committee subject to certain operational adjustments.

I repeat: we say that we are not going to raise bus fares; but we will give a 15% rebate on petrol. The only concession they have made is that they have agreed to wait until the 31st July, although we are told that there is the possibility of their going back to the 15th July. I am hoping they will do no such thing, but to be on the safer side if they say "nothing doing" the Government is bound to see to it that transport goes on.

As the Emergency Powers Act, 1939 now stands, it enables an emergency to be declared only in the case of a threat to the supply and distribution of food, water, fuel or light, or to the means of locomotion to secure the essentials of life to the

community. That means that we can commandeer transport to carry food but we cannot commandeer buses. We have brought down this Bill to make it abundantly clear that should there be an occasion of emergency or public danger such as has been mentioned, what would be our position.

Nobody hopes that it will come to what you call a showdown and I invite the greatest critics of the Government to say that we have not made the Bus Concessionaires a handsome offer.

Let me say again that some do not keep books and some have not made a loss. Some do not know how many passengers they have carried. Really and truly, only two companies keep books out of the fourteen Concessionaires.

If such be the case, how can a Concessionaire know the number of passengers he carries or how much money he is making? I am merely giving you the facts, Mr. Speaker. We are not threatening anybody.

4.35 p.m.

For that reason, I should say that in their letter of reply they stated that they want the terms of the report carried out. We are not going to increase bus fares, report or no report. If we are satisfied that some of them are making a loss, we are content even to go beyond the stage of those who are making a loss.

I know that some bus companies are making profits. The more money they get the more profits they will make. They will therefore have no excuse for not building or importing better buses. The persons who say that they are making losses, if they kept proper books to prove that they are making losses, would be able to devise some means to cover their losses. The 15 per cent. rebate that they are already getting will enable them to put their houses in order.

As regards the "pirate" buses, if tomorrow Eckstein's, the Lincoln Bus Company and all the other bus companies were to have enough buses to supply the present demand for public transport, the "pirate" buses would go off the road next week; at least we would bring down legislation to wipe them out. But you cannot ask "pirate" buses to go off the road unless you have buses to put in their places. All we are saying is this that if, in respect of public transport by bus we should find chaos happening next Saturday night, or at any time subsequent to that, we want to have laws on the Statute Book that will enable us to put an end to that chaos. In other words we are asking the House to agree to my motion, which is that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. MILLER rose to speak.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable junior member for St. George will give way for a moment—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable junior member for St. George seconding the motion.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is unusual for legislation of this type to be put through this Chamber in this way. I have no doubt whatever that the Hon. Premier is aware of what is taking place when he asks the Legislature to support him in a measure such as this. I think it was in 1939 that Mr. Neville Chamberlain, after much hesitation and delay said that the country of Great Britain was in a state of grave danger; and I observe that, we also have that unfortunate ugly word "danger" in this Bill.

I was at pains to find out what was the cause and why the Government should find the need for such legislation. The Objects and Reasons state in effect that under the Emergency Powers Act of 1939 only the Governor-in-Executive Committee can declare a state of emergency; and that the matter has to come before both Chambers of the Legislature within five days after the declaration of a state of emergency. It further states that the mere declaration of a state of emergency creates no change in any existing law; this can be done only by emergency orders, and that these orders made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee must be laid before the Legislature and may not continue in force for more than seven days from the date of being laid *unless a Resolution is passed by both Houses providing for the continuance thereof.*

Right now however, the Hon. Premier is even going further; he requires a month. There are certain things in this legislation that indicate that all is not right; this gives birth to a new trend of thought. If Government, because it was not willing to sanction the required increase in bus fares have introduced this Bill as the only means today of safeguarding the public against a possible disruption in public transport, then I think, Mr. Chairman, we should tell the Government that we are here to help the Government.

I can further say that if such a state of emergency exists I am a driver; I have been one for many years and I am at your service in that emergency. [**cheers**].

I observe that there is something unfortunate about the public bus service. I have been somewhat unhappy because I have never had the opportunity to see the terms of reference which were given to the Committee which was commissioned to investigate this prolonged matter between Government and the bus Concessionaires.

I see that the Hon. Minister of Communications is carrying on a conversation at a moment when the least he should be doing is to give a hearing to this Chamber. It is in his interest as Minister of Communications. It is all right to keep pecking at an individual and when he shouts for mercy you say you were behind the wall.

I regret that the report of the Commitee has not been in the hands of members of this Chamber before now; I wonder if the Minister of Communications could imagine that you could have given powers to investigate *re* an increase of profits. What would you have expected to reach in this? And since the Government is responsible to the people of this country for the full realisation of transport, obviously they would have to think of some formal solution.

If this $60,000 is going to be regarded as some form of subsidy to the bus Concessionaires I think it would be appropriate; but there was no hint from the Premier that this could be regarded as a case of the thin edge of the wedge by the Government; because I think the Government are aware that the present difficulties of this country will continue to exist if they let the bus Concessionaires carry on as they have been carrying on for the last five years.

We have this question about the "pirate" bus. The Government may not admit this, but "pirate" buses is a political question; and has been so from the beginning. It is not a question of ten or fifteen or forty little bus owners; it is the thousands of people who travel in this "pirate" bus service that the Government have not been conscious of.

4.45 p.m.

There have been solutions found for similar problems of transport all over the world. I am wondering if the Government is aware that this service should come under its control. You must have regulations and let the bus Concessionaires accept or leave them. You must be ruthless about

these regulations; and I repeat let the Concessionaires accept or leave them.

There have been several requests not only from big areas but from little hamlets asking for an extension of the bus services. I would not hesitate to say that no special effort is made by the bus Concessionaires to accommodate the travelling public at the peak hours between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. on days; you just pause for a moment at any of the bus terminals on any day of the week including Saturday and you will be aware of what the position is. You have people who live in the Black Rock area waiting at the corner by Harrison's for the bus instead of the Bus Stand and they have to pay an extra fare from Harrison's to the Bus Stand so as to secure a seat in the bus. Those conditions have been going on for several years, and I am wondering if the Concessionaires have not been able to add to the number of buses and improve the conditions of the buses and provide more suitable conditions for people during these peak hours.

If the Government really understood and appreciated the position of the travelling public, I am sure that they would come to the realisation that this is a grand opportunity, (it can be as gradual as the growth of a tree) for them to start ownership of the transport system of this island which is very important.

I want to draw something to the attention of this Chamber, and I hope that the Concessionaires will be aware of the position. You have similar conditions in Jamaica and the Government has been giving a subsidy; now the whole concern is controlled by the Government and they have declared that no shares in the transport system would be released to the Concessionaires. In Trinidad the same thing is happening with the Trolley Buses; the concern controlling the Trolley Buses is being sold out and I do not know if it has been sold already. Here another magnificent service is to be relegated to the devilry of another year.

To-day we have the "pirate" system developed in meeting the need of the suffering public. I read an article in the Daily newspaper in which it was stated that the Minister of Communications was unable to decide whether they should call off the "pirate" bus service; but there was also to be considered the full realisation that it is a question of the food crops and vegetables coming from the country districts. It was refreshing to realise that the Minister was aware of his responsibility and the conditions of the people who are suffering.

I believe that they are now for the first time at grips with the true realities of this affair; I believe that the Minister is at war in an effort to improve the existing bus service, and I believe that that is the reason aback of the Government's decision to pay a subsidy of $60,000 as a rebate on the gasolene.

I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister will not allow what I am saying to go straight through both ears and come through his mouth, and that he will cease to think that these are the utterances of a fool. It is a question of the number of buses, a question of time and a question of the suffering of people who have to pay double bus fares so as to get seats in the buses during the peak period especially between 4 p.m. and 6.30 p.m. on days.

As to the existing bus service taking care of luggage, things and people, we have the Regulations forbidding buses to carry bags, packages and so on. Sometime ago there was a custom for an individual to put a bag in a bus and one half was dumped on you. It is a question of what best the Minister has in mind with regard to the improvement of the bus service, how best he can regulate it having regard for what gave birth to what is now known as the "pirate" system.

The Hon. Premier referred to this matter and he used the word "cold storage." I wonder if this Emergency Bill should be in cold storage or if it is to be packed away in a mixture with moth balls. These are matters which will require much thought and decision before the Ministers should have attempted to bring such a Resolution before the Legislature. I have reason to think that the Government is making this concession for a rebate on the petrol to the Concessionaires as a result of the claim that there is a loss as a result of the service. I feel that the people of this island will be firmly behind the Government in this matter of an improved service.

It is unpleasant and undignified to hear the remarks which have been made by the Hon. Premier that some of these Bus Concessionaires have issued a threat to the Government to grant them an increase in bus fares by 15th July, else they are bringing pressure to bear on the Government by their declaration to suffer the movement of this community. It is an ugly thing to decide. Were it not that these bus Concessionaires had the protection of the Government, hundreds of persons would be prepared to put two or three buses on the same routes. The people are denied from doing that. If they were to carry out their threat Government should go as far as to enlist the voluntary help of the community so as to keep the service going.

I want the assurance of the Government, if what the Hon. Premier says is correct, and there is this attempt to suffer the travelling public of this country for even an hour by these Concessionaires failing to provide the means of movement for the travelling masses, that the Government would enlist the help of the entire community to suppress any such effort by the Bus Concessionaires.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, no amount of smugness or arrogance can ever be taken as the alternative or the answer to any question. When this Emergency Powers Bill was introduced today, it is alarming to say the least, that at the introduction, the introducer did not think that it would have been in the best interest of public conduct to have stated why this Bill should be passed in all its stages today and that it was because the Bus Concessionaires had given notice that they were going to strike or that they were not going to run their buses unless they were granted an increase in bus fares. The reason why I objected to the Bill being passed today was because no reason was given as to what emergency was imminent. It must be borne in mind that this Bill does not deal only with bus Concessionaires; it also deals with other matters, a few of which I would have to draw to the notice of the Government.

Sir, this Bill also deals with industrial matters; and as it now stands, the Government can decide tomorrow that where any strike may tend to threaten the safety of the community, Government has the right under this Emergency Powers Bill to declare that an emergency exists and therefore the people engaged in that strike would be doing something illegal. I have nothing against the Government possessing these powers. I am one of those people who believe that to preserve law and order you should call out the Police. If you are a Government, you should have the power to call out the Police to preserve law and order. If you are a Government, you have to govern; but you must do

so in a democratic way. You must not govern like a Fascist Grand Council where open parliament is only a facade; you must govern democratically. Of course, all the dictatorships that there are today were democracies before; but the people who governed those countries took democracy unto themselves and they have used it purely for dictatorship purposes

I want to say to the Government that it is nearly 18 months ago since notice was given to the Government that under the Better Security Act workers covered by that Act are not permitted to strike. It is illegal for workers of the Electric Company, the Gas Company or the Waterworks Department to go on strike. It was pointed out to the Government that in Great Britain where you have these same emergency powers, it is not illegal for such workers to go on strike. I now ask: why is it that 18 months ago, the Minister of Labour and the Government did not see fit to amend the Better Security Act in order to give the same type of workers in this country the right to go on strike just as the position stands in Great Britain; that is, if there is a grievance, they intimate to the Governor-in Executive Committee that they are going on strike if after 21 days a Board is not set up to deal with the matter. The Government has not done anything in the matter, yet here you have an Emergency Powers Act which is not different from other such Acts. This Bill is very wide. It is so in England too; but in England you have the right to strike.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member read Clause 4, sub-clause (2)?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That only says that you have the right to strike; it does not say that you have the right to strike at those places which I mentioned, because this Bill does not repeal the Better Security Act; it only deals with the Emergency Powers Act.

What I am pointing out is that I am in agreement with this Emergency Powers Bill, but I do say that Government should have seen fit to allow workers of the Electric Company and the Gas Company to go on strike after giving notice. That was suggested a long time ago to the Government. The Council of the Barbados Workers' Union passed a Resolution about it a long time ago and sent it on to Government, but nothing has been done to give those workers that benefit. Why should it be that because you work at the Electric Company you cannot go on strike? As the law stands today that is the case.

5.05 p.m.

Now so far as the reason now given is concerned, I am very glad to see that the Minister of Labour has returned at a time when this Emergency Bill has come down to the House.

Formerly the emergency powers in this island were restricted; now you have emergency powers just as in Great Britain. Recently there was a strike in Great Britain and the Prime Minister called an emergency Parliament to discuss it. In Great Britain no section of the workers in essential services can go on strike without giving 21 days' notice that you are going on strike.

Now I am going to deal with the immediate reason for these emergency powers—the situation of the buses. I believe the Minister of Communications is a man who tries his best, especially politically. If he sees that something is likely to have any political consequences, he is very apt, and I will say further that he possesses a lot of perspicacity. When the Hon. Minister appointed a Committee such as the one he appointed, knowing that he is a Socialist, he did not for one moment think it was necessary to appoint any person on that Committee who would have helped to make it a truly representative Committee. If the present Government is a Socialist Government it should endorse the policy of the Socialist Government of Great Britain which since 1945 laid it down as a dictum that they do not appoint to any Committee, persons to deal with board matters unless that Committee has representatives of organised labour. You cannot call in Britain this afternoon one single commission that has been appointed within the last 10 years on which you will not find organised labour represented. In a small community like this the vulgar will probably say that you are raising this point because you want an invitation extended to you; but when you are discussing certain matters and anything personal is said you forget these people.

Now a Committee on Government printing was once appointed and not one representative of the printers was on that Committee. What do you expect? We have to accept the report of a Committee where in the composition of the Committee none of them have been members of the Government; because in the old days the former people used to say they were not accustomed to doing this and therefore they were not going to do it. Mr. Clairmonte, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Alkins, these were the members appointed to investigate this bus fares business. How could the Minister of Communications ever think of a Committee without asking an organisation of labour whether they could appoint somebody to serve on that Committee. You could not think of it in Great Britain.

To me that is the first failure; it is an error and I hope that in the future the Government will see to it when they are setting up Committees, that they make their representation so broad that it reflects the members of the Government. You do not want to set up a Committee and then ask to say what you want. I want the Government to see to it that they include representatives who reflect their point of view.

Now that is my first criticism of the Committee; my other criticism is this: I am very sorry that the Government would not adopt the policy of debating reports on the floor of this House, so that these reports, having been made public documents, the policy of the Government, whether or not they agree with it, can be debated. I have discussed this report (I do not have it before me now) and have concluded that it is a public issue. In order to get my point of view on this issue it is necessary that I should go through the contents of the report more thoroughly. I was out of the island at the time of its release; sometimes it is good when you are out of the island because then you can look more objectively upon your own territory than when you are in the midst of it.

I was able during my short stay in England to look at their transport system. It is true that in London you may have 10,000,000 people to deal with whereas in Barbados you only have a small quantity to deal with. I must say again that I regret that the Government did not lay on the table of this House, this report a little earlier and let there be a debate upon it.

I want to say that I consider the Government is very generous in this affair. Why do they offer these Concessionaires a rebate on gasolene? There can be absolutely no reason for the Government offering them anything whatsoever. In the summary of that report there was not enough statistical evidence provided by the bus companies

for the Committee to go on and make a recommendation. If a company does not possess sufficient statistical evidence as to be able to say what are their returns from the public, and they allow such a loose system to prevail where a bus conductor or driver can do as he pleases, are you asking the public to pay for bad organisation? If so, say it now; the bus Concessionaires should be in a position to be able to say what money and how much profit they have made.

Now I would say this: I believe that to give a rebate pre-supposes that you are satisfied that they were losing money, because this concession which you are giving is a concession in money. That is not going to improve facilities. Were you then impressed by the Committee's report that a case was made out to the effect that they were suffering losses and therefore you wanted to redress the losses? Without having read the report fully, I can say that there is no justification whatever for the Government to offer them a rebate.

5.15 p.m.

As soon as you offer the Concessionaires a rebate you are satisfied that they were losing money, unless you want them to make more money than they are making. We cannot discuss the matter here as intelligently as we should because the Committee's Report is not before us; it is unfortunate that we have to discuss this matter when the Report of the Committee is not here.

I am a believer in public transport and that the Government should own that transport. I realise that the Government works by expediency and sometimes they use money in other channels when they could use it better otherwise. The public transport has grown up in this island from the "fly buses" until we have a better means of transport to-day. We have seen certain bus companies improve their service and their buses, but what you have to ask is this: now that you are passing legislation to deal with something which we all regard as an essential service, is it not more essential that you should have better control in seeing that the public should travel adequately and well? What is your attitude about taking over the public transport? In London public transport has been taken over by the Government; in New York the transport system is run by the City; and why should the public in Barbados be left to the mercies of bus Concessionaires? The danger is that there is too much expediency in high quarters. I remember that some time ago a representative for St. Philip in this House raised "old harry" that the buses would soon be driven off the highways; and now the Concessionaires are the people who are putting a pistol at your head. In those days the Premier said "I will see that the buses are back on the road to-morrow".

You cannot deal with an issue of such magnitude on the basis that you are a supporter of the Labour Party. I agree with the hon. junior member for St. George; you are not dealing with the "pirate" buses because they would become such political dynamite now, that none of the Party members would say that they would vote against these owners and let such come against him. The Government is afraid of the "pirate" bus owners because of the political momentum they have been able to gather; and they have now become a part of the transport system. It is known that you will have to evolve something better before you can remove them; and you could have done it easily. These "pirate" buses have electricity in them, they are very prompt and they move off in time. You have some respectable people using the "pirate" buses.

In times gone by, these buses were not regarded by the affluent or the so well dressed; but now these people are making use of these buses. In these circumstances it is very difficult for you, as a Government, to pass legislation against them. My view in this matter is that there should not be any compunction on the part of the Government; the local people should not say "you have no authority to make them run." There is only one feature I am in doubt about and it is this: the Government has had a threat from these Concessionaires.

The former Director of Transport agreed to increase the bus fares of Concessionaires without any facts. On this occasion you were satisfied that something could have been done and that is why you have agreed to the setting up of a Committee. If you are satisfied that there should not be any increase in the bus-fares you did not want any Committee.

Why is it that the Government will burke the issue of dealing with public transport? It is true that I do not blame the Government because they are not getting that substance from the root of the tree which they should get, and they are left in a sort of stratosphere. When a tree has lost its substance it is sure to become withered.

I want to say that if this issue had taken place years ago it would have been easier to deal with it; I think you will be failing in your duty if you appoint a Committee to go into the question of bus-fares and not consider whether or not the Government should take over the island's transport. You should examine this whole matter not as an immediate issue but as a matter for the future; the question of transport is a very important one; I would not use the argument which the hon. junior member for the City would use in a matter like this; I would not say facetiously that you have got people who have motor-cars to deal with this matter of increasing bus fares.

5.25 p.m.

My views are different from the honourable junior member for St. George. Although we are not dealing with the report of the Bus Fares Committee, now that Government is faced with this question, I wonder if Government has given consideration to Government being forced to do something which it has not considered; such as having to take over bus companies and having to pay the wages of the people employed in that service. It is my opinion that Government will be forced to do that.

We all know that wages are low in Barbados. Fortunately for us in the Trade Union movement, we do not subscribe to the view which the Hon. Premier holds that because there are half a dozen people to take up your job when you leave it, you should not strike. Let me say that there are more people than jobs on the waterfront, but we do not subscribe to the view that you cannot strike because of that.

Now, without any big examination, you can see that nearly every bus Concessionaire is a man who lives in one house and forgets how many other houses he has rented out. Nearly every one of them started as poor men, and I do not think any of them won sweepstakes. They have said that they are not making money and their businesses are run at a loss; where did they get the money from? There is not a poor bus Concessionaire; neither is there a Concessionaire who, since he has been granted a

route to operate on, has been forced to give up the concession.

I remember on one occasion there was an attempt to take away a concession from Mrs. Weatherhead of the Liberty Bus Company and all the angels and archangels were brought out to support her in retaining it. Certainly you would not be afraid if somebody were taking away from you something on which you were losing money.

Let us remember what they told you during the last war. They said that it was impossible to get materials and as a result, it was becoming very difficult for them to run their buses. The war has ceased a long time ago. After the war, the Government spent a lot of money on roads which is reflected in the life of the tyres of motor cars, buses and lorries now using these roads. I have already suggested in this Chamber that the Government can easily increase the taxes on privately owned motor cars in order to get in more revenue; because it is a fact that the life of a motor car tyre is three times as long as it was ten years ago. Motorists do not drive on any bad roads in this island. You get something like 30,000 miles out of a motor car and some people who are better drivers get something like 35,000 miles. I have driven a car which did over 30,000 miles without having to change anything that could be regarded as a major repair. It is public funds which enable motor cars, lorries and buses to do that mileage. You are now getting materials easily and in some instances, the materials have been reduced since the war.

You do not relate bus fares to operating expenses. You can say that bus fares in Barbados are cheap, but you do not increase the fare because it is cheap. In London bus fares are cheaper than anywhere else. Sir, you have been to London and I do not think that you were forced to live in such impecunious circumstances that you would have to drive in a bus; but you should know that one can catch a bus from Trafalgar Square and drive to Lords and pay only six or seven cents. You pay only four cents to drive to some places, and bear in mind, you are driving in comfortable buses.

I feel that bus fares in Barbados are not exorbitant; they are cheap, but at the same time, I am not satisfied that the bus Concessionaires are losing money. My only plea now is that I hope Government will take the opportunity that is now presented to them to examine the whole question of public transport in this island. They will be doing the island a service by doing so. It will cost you some money, but you must bear in mind that Federation is costing you money without bringing in another cent for Barbados.

As soon as you become a man and you think of taking a wife, that is an expense to you; but it is a happier affair; therefore you pay for it. Similarly, you have to pay for nationhood. Of course, it would be preferable to increase the bus fares than to allow the same system as exists to be perpetuated, but we should only do so if bus Concessionaires are losing money.

Another thing which you must bear in mind is that if you are giving them a rebate on gasolene equal to $60,000, the community is still paying for that; because the bus Concessionaires will be getting something cheaper than what other members of the public are getting, therefore, you are providing them with an advantage. When the public give bus Concessionaires that advantage from the public purse, that money would not be there to be spent on other things for their benefit.

I feel that if the Government is satisfied that public transport is not what it should be, they should examine the whole question and say what should be done to have public transport operating as it should be. I do not mean only controlling it, but to own it. A lot of things want remedying. Bus drivers and conductors still get two dollars a day and they are employed on a day-to-day basis.

5.35 p.m.

Imagine a man employing a bus conductor today on that basis; I hope that Government will look into that practise and see about it. These wages have even made some of these drivers to become afraid to organise. The employers have threatened them with the sort of threat that you hear from the Hon. Premier. It has the effect of preventing a man from associating himself with a Union. We are dealing with the rights of organisation; we are not dealing with the vulgarism of those who do not know what Trade Unionism stands for.

I hope the Hon. Minister of Communications will see that this threat by the bus Concessionaires provides the best opportunity for the Government to intervene and take over the public transport without question, and put these people in their place once and for all. Pay them out for the old buses they have; let us have transport provided by the Government; and we will be sure then that it is a service worthy to be paid for. We have a good Airport service and the community must be prepared to pay for it.

I hope the Government will not get it into their heads to continue to import any of these new pioneer buses. I hear these people do not like this new type of enclosed bus. It is a bus that is not designed for the tropics; we here in Barbados do not like anybody drawing too close to us. We do not want this kind of bus which is rather more suited to temperate climates. I like to feel the air passing through the bus from the time I get in until the time I get out; therefore I would ask the Hon. Minister not to get too sweet on these streamlined buses.

Perhaps if we bought the tyres and certain other items not available in the Caribbean area, we might be able to evolve something of our own. I should like to ask the Hon. Minister to look into this question more seriously. I regret that the Hon. Premier did not state earlier why he wanted to have this Emergency Powers Act amended. I do not appreciate that smugness in saying that something is around the corner and the something is that the bus people are going to strike to-morrow. That is something which you want the public to know.

There is one thing I have heard that seems a little strange to me. Section 3 Sub-section 2(d) reads as follows:—

"Without prejudice to the generality of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of this section Orders made under this section may provide for—

(d) the entering and search of any premises;

This looks to me as if you can be searching for something other than a bus. [A VOICE: A crank handle!] The hon. junior member for St. George says it might be a crank handle; but I believe it may be documents.

I do not want this Emergency Powers Bill to be associated with any Communist idea that you are searching for Communist literature. Not that I condone the Communists, but I hope it is not an attempt to take away my civil rights in order to enter my home and property; because some of these obstreper-

ous policemen would take advantage of this to search your place and put you to inconvenience.

I, Mr. Speaker, am in sympathy with the lot of bus Concessionaires; but I am not in agreement with giving them a rebate on gasolene; and I hope that the Hon. Minister of Communications will undertake to have a debate on the report when it is printed. Before this Assembly I reaffirm my statement; that is, that I hope that in the near future when you are setting up Committees to deal with certain issues, you will take into consideration that representation should be accorded to people of accredited labour organisations so that you may embrace more of the thinking people in the community as a whole, rather than restricting it to people like employers, accountants etc., as on this occasion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As regards the last point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, how could a Government be termed a Socialist Government and not be doing that. This is a question of going into people's books; it is already our policy to do what any Trade Union would have done. We accept that it is not always necessary to appoint somebody to a Committee just to please them.

I believe that conductors are not being paid enough and that we should pay them more by increasing fares. We sought to put Mr. Clairmonte and Mr. McDermott on the Committee because they are persons who are accustomed to going into books.

We have been investigating, for some considerable time, the whole question of transport; but it is a tremendous matter. We even once thought of engaging the services of an expert in these matters; but it was found that financially it would cost something like $2,000 and he would have been in this island only five days. The fact is that he is a superconsultant and we would have had to pay him his salary from the time he left England.

I repeat that we have been investigating this situation for a considerable time; but obviously the whole question of reorganisation, control, and the rest of it would take sometime to complete. I anticipated what I thought a lot of people would say; you yourself Mr. Chairman, must know that if people do not keep books you cannot tell whether they are making or losing money. From what the directors put up to us for reorganising the complete bus services, we want to see that it is essential that the bus Concessionaires should have no excuse for not building or importing more buses so that the "pirate" buses should go off the street. If it is suggested that this Government is taking no step against "pirate" buses because we are afraid of what the owners of the "pirate" buses might do, it could not be a worst thought. It is utterly unfair to allow "pirate" buses to take money out of the pockets of the travelling public; but it is even more unfair that the public should have to wait and run for a bus. Therefore, in view of the deficiency of bus transport you cannot take the "pirate" buses off the road before providing some other alternative.

If, for example, the Concessionaires could tell us tomorrow that they could add a few more buses to the present number, the "pirate" buses would go off the streets as passenger buses. They might continue to run as parcel carriers, but not as passenger buses. We are not afraid of wiping "pirate" buses off the street; but we cannot allow them to leave the routes because we will be hurting the passengers travelling on the regular routes.

The debate is going altogether on the side of the Government and undoubtedly it must go. If we have been attacked for giving money even to those who kept good books and made a profit, I must say in reply we have done it to everybody, good books or no good books. We are not satisfied with the condition of some of the buses; we are not satisfied with the service as a whole. One of the conditions we have put up to them is that every Concessionaire must carry school children. To get school buses and to get extra buses is what we are urging; therefore honourable members will see that we are not giving to them any monetary advantages simply because they made out a case that no profits are being made. We see no reason why every bus owner should not make some money. 5.45 p.m.

Speaking for myself, and I believe for the Ministers as well, we believe that it is imposible for these people to be able to go to America on holiday and so on and still make a loss. We say that the transport is not as good as it should be, and so we take off gasolene tax as part of the Government's scheme for an improvement in the transport system. We are not going on with the report of the Committee which recommended an increase in the bus fares. If it is said that $7,000 is needed for a "Lincoln Bus" it might be asked how do they expect to find $21,000 for three buses ? We say that we are taking off this amount and let you put on these buses.

I want to say this in defence of the Minister of Social Services: the Hon. Minister was in charge of these matters; a sub-committee was appointed as far back as 1953 with the Minister of Social Services, the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the Acting Attorney General when the Better Security Act was drafted and considered. Now the honourable junior member for St. Peter says that this matter has been raised and nothing has been done about it. The reverse is true; the Bill was drafted and for one reason or another it has not been concluded.

In September, 1953, a letter was sent to the honourable member and the Labour Commissioner; a reply was sent back by the Labour Commissioner that as a result of a meeting the question arose as to whether compulsory arbitration should appear in the Bill to be drafted. Both the honourable member and the Government agree that there should not be any compulsory arbitration. Two draft Bills were prepared and sent to the Labour Commissioner for consideration, meetings were held and a decision was taken. A letter was sent by the Labour Commissioner to the Colonial Secretary to know what was the stage reached, and the reply was that the matter was under consideration of the Government.

In February, 1954, the Ministerial system had just begun, and the Minister of Trade took up the matter with the Labour Commissioner, and it was pointed out that there was a possibility of conflict with international requirements. The Government has been accused of doing nothing in the matter, but——

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. I said that the matter was before the Government for the last 18 months and nothing has been done to amend the Act. If he proves that I am wrong I am prepared to accept it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member said that for the last 18 months the Government has done nothing. The Honourable Minister who was out of the island has just returned and I expressed the hope that something would be done to amend the Security Act. The Hon. Minister of Trade dealt with the matter with the Labour Commissioner and he said that he accepted the position, but he wanted the

views of the Premier. The matter was postponed because the honourable junior member for St. Peter was out of the island all of the time. I said that we should get together and say that we want to be more liberal in our legislation; and that I should feel happier if I knew what is the considered opinion of the Workers' Union as to the form which the legislation would take.

If we agreed to certain principles we will have to start again, bearing in mind Mr. Secchi's points in which the views expressed were the views of the Union. The honourable member says that the Government has done nothing; we wanted to discover from the honourable member whether the views of the Union were still the same as when he, the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Labour Commissioner had agreed on the draft Bill.

All this took place approximately a year ago. A confidential letter was sent to the honourable member; all of this I have in this file. When these things happen we have been in the habit of sitting down and saying nothing and it may go forth to the public that the accusations are true. We were all out of the island at the time and we were——

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member has not said if the answer that came from him was signed by him or not and what time the last answer was given. I told the Labour Commissioner that we agreed on the matter, but it is not in the hands of the Union to send down legislation.

I have told the Labour Commissioner what the Union agreed on and if the Labour Commissioner fails to report to the higher-ups, what can I do about it?

5.55 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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, 2, 3, *and* 4 *were called and passed.*

Clause 5 *was called. It reads as follows:—*

"The Emergency Powers (Hurricane and Earthquake) Act, 1948, is hereby repealed."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving that Clause 5 stand part, Mr. Chairman, (perhaps, I am out of order, but if you will allow me) I would like to say that the honourable junior member for St. Peter made some reference to our doing something which affects labour. All we have done is to make a law saying that if there is a strike the effect of which is to hold up essential things to the life of the community, that there should be no industrial conscription. Far from introducing something to affect labour, the only thing we have introduced is something to soften it.

I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

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: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

6.05 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE WATERWORKS PLAN

On reassembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask leave to take Order No. 25 as the next Order of the Day. It reads as follows: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Michael.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to take Order No. 25 as the next Order of the Day and if there is no objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the formal Resolutions which come before this House from time to time to approve the Book of Reference and Plan for the laying of water main in the Government Housing Scheme. This particular one has to do with the laying of mains in the Bay Estate. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

BILL TO PROVIDE SECURITY FOR SMALL HOLDINGS C'TD.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day. It reads as follows: to move the House into Committee on a Bill relating to terms of tenure in respect of small holdings and for providing reasonable security of tenure for tenants thereof and for purposes incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day. If there is no objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Clauses 1 *to* 6 *inclusive were called and passed.*

Clause 7 *was called. It reads as follows:—*

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Stamp Act, 1916 no stamp duty shall be payable upon any memorandum of agreement referred to in section six of this Act."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not in favour of exemption from Stamp Duty. I will tell you why. A stamp has a psychological effect especially on simple-minded people who feel that it gives to a document a certain validity. Although the absence of a stamp does not render it invalid, I am

in favour of making a small charge of sixpence in having these agreements registered.

As I have said before, it gives to a document a certain validity especially where uninformed persons are concened. I am in favour of it although I do not know if anyone will support me. It is purely psychological and furthermore I do not consider the charge as exorbitant.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in this case the terms and conditions are implied in this contract of tenancy, even though there is no memorandum of agreement. If the honourable member will look into Part 2 of the first Schedule he will see that the terms and conditions are to be implied in the contract of tenancy. [Mr VAUGHAN: I am aware of that]. I do not think that in this case the absence of a stamp on the memorandum would cause any inconvenience. If on all of these contracts of tenancy the stamp duty is not properly adjudicated there is a section providing a penalty of £5 for contravention; therefore while we are endeavouring to do something by way of raising revenue, we may be doing a disservice to any who might not be aware of the penalties involved in not having a stamp on the memorandum of agreement.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 8 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 12 was called it reads as follows:

12. The tenancy of an agricultural holding or a house-spot may, notwithstanding anything to the contrary, contained in section eleven of this Act, be terminated.

(a) by the landlord without notice—

(i) where the tenant is convicted of larceny of agricultural produce or livestock or of being in possession of agricultural produce or livestock stolen or unlawfully obtained or of malicious damage to the property of the landlord or of some other tenant of the landlord or in the case of a tenancy of an agricultural holding where the tenant is serving a term of imprisonment exceeding one year;

(ii) where the tenant parts with the possession of, mortgages, assigns, sub-lets or otherwise alienates the agricultural holding or house-spot (except by will in favour of some member of his family) without the consent of the landlord previously obtained in writing;

(b) by the landlord by three months' notice given in accordance with the provisions of this Act expiring with the expiration of three months' from the date of service of the notice —

(i) where the tenant commits a breach of any term or condition of the contract of tenancy and the interests of the landlord are materially prejudiced thereby;

(ii) upon certificate by the Director of Agriculture or his nominee that the tenant of an agricultural holding is not cultivating such holding according to the rules of good husbandry and that the interests of the landlord are materially prejudiced thereby:

Provided that no such certificate shall be granted unless and until the tenant has been given, by notice in writing, a reasonable opportunity to remedy his default;

(iii) if any part of the rent payable in respect of the tenancy is in arrear for a period of three months or more or if any of the terms of the consideration for the contract of tenancy are not performed or observed by the tenant, and such non-observance or non-performance is due to the default of the tenant:

Provided that in the case of rent in arrear, if the tenant pays such rent to the landlord within the period of notice, then and in such case the notice shall be deemed to be cancelled and shall be of no force and effect;

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part.

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

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am unhappy about paragraph (a) of Clause 12. It reads as follows:—

"The tenancy of an agricultural holding or a house-spot may notwithstanding to the contrary contained in section eleven of this Act, be terminated.

(a) by the landlord without notice—

(1) where the tenant is convicted of larceny of agriculture produce or livestock or of being in possession of agricultural produce or live stock stolen or unlawfully obtained. . . . . ."

Mr. Chairman, I am not in favour of the wording of this Clause. We have to remember that we are dealing with a particular type of people—the agricultural worker in relation to the manager or plantation owner. A worker may take up a corn or something else and the manager having some hard feelings against that particular individual (because he may be the type who would speak up for his right) may, for that same reason, make an example of him by terminating that contract immediately.

I want to draw to your attention that according to this section any agricultural products so taken in possession may be regarded as having been unlawfully obtained. [Hon. C. E. TALMA: He has to be convicted by law.] Oh, if that is so I think that man will have an opportunity of defending himself before a Court of law. I understand it now.

The question that Clause 12 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 13 to 17 inclusive were called and passed.

6.45 p.m.

Clauses 18 to 25 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 26 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 26 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I am not happy about this Clause 26, it says. this: "Without prejudice to the provisions of Section 24, of this Act, the tenant of an agricultural holding or a house spot shall be entitled to receive compensation for disturbance equivalent to not less than one year's rent of the agricultural holding or the housespot as the case may be....."

I do not like the provision of one year's rent: that might be the yard stick which the landlord may be disposed to use in computing the compensation

which should be given to people. If the Hon. Minister thinks that this is alright I do not want to hold up the Bill. Perhaps he will explain the matter a little.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The amount of compensation for disturbance is not less than one year's rent. When a competent tribunal comprised of arbitrators is appointed in the manner set out in this Bill, it is only reasonable to expect that in such case of disturbance adequate compensation will be granted owing to the nature and constitution of the tribunal which has to make the award. I do not think that the honourable member needs to be unhappy about this Clause; not less than one year's rent is reasonable. What the honourable member is fearing is that the minimum may become the maximum; we have reason to believe that fixing the amount at not less than one year's rent will be considered reasonable on all sides.

The question that Clause 26 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 27 to 35 inclusive were called and passed.

The four Schedules were called and passed.

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

6.55 p.m.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1897.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This Bill seeks to amend the present Landlord and Tenant Act, 1897. The main amendments as set out in the "Objects and Reasons" are to extend the period whereby after a warrant has been issued, a period of two months will be granted to the tenant in order to find alternative premises, and also to bring the Act into line with the Security of Land Tenure Bill which we have just passed. Under that Bill the present system of appraisement will no longer exist but the system will be based on arbitration in accordance with the provisions of this new Bill.

This Bill is really complementary to the preceding Bill and I hardly think honourable members need any more explanation. It is just that the old Landlord and Tenant Act was drawn up in favour of the landlord and we are attempting now to bring that Act more in line with the times in which we live; whereas tenants should be given not necessarily more facilities but equality and fairplay. With that reason, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Section thirty-five of the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1897 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words—

"issue a warrant under his hand"

where they appear in the thirty-ninth line thereof and substituting therefor the following—

"order that a warrant shall issue forthwith or within such period not exceeding one month as he shall see fit. The date of such warrant shall be the date of issue in accordance with such order and such warrant shall be under the hand of the Police Magistrate and be".

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am asking for leave to make an amendment to this section. In line eight, there are the words: "In such period not exceeding one month." The decision is really two months, therefore I am asking that the word "one" appearing after "exceeding" be deleted and the word "two" inserted in its place and that the letter 's' be added to the word 'month." I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended do now stand part.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Section forty-three of the principal Act is hereby amended by deleting the words—

"appraisement under the direction of the Police Magistrate"

and substituting therefor the following—

"arbitration under the provisions of the Security of Tenure of Small Holdings Act, 1955."

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

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

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I feel happy that the Government has contemplated a change in this Clause, because I am fully aware of the hardship that renters of land and occupiers in There was many a hard feeling owing to the fact that the managers, book-keepers and such persons who were appointed to appraise land appraised it not in favour of the small holder; and I am therefore very glad to see that the interest of the small holder will be vested in this arbitration board which this Clause seeks to set up.

I do hope that the Introducer of this Bill will make it widely known when this Bill comes into operation so that the small holder will know that the old system does not obtain any more, and so that they will know how to proceed to seek their rights. Many of these Bills are passed in here but the people who are to benefit are not made aware of the benefits to them; and they labour under the illusion that the old-time thing is still in existence, and as a result they sit down on their rights and do nothing about them. I do hope that the Government would make these changes widely known because I know they will bring in more benefits.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Clauses 4 and 5 were called and passed.

7.05 p.m.

Clauses 6 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg that you do now report the passing of this Bill as amended in Committee.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

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

DEVELOPMENT BOARD BILL—Ctd.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume the "Second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Development Board charged with the duty of securing the development of industry and agriculture in the island and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If any other honourable member is not desirous of speaking, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and this House go into Committee.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Broadly speaking, this is a very desirable bit of legislation. It is true that it is a little late and that I do not know what were the views of the Government when the second reading of this Bill was first introduced; but I would say that any measure in connection with the development of an island is desirable.

What is the real purpose of this Bill ? It is to be found under Section 7 (1) the functions of the Board. Sub-section (1) reads as follows:—

"It shall be the duty of the Board to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of industry in this Island and to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of agricultural undertakings or projects not in the opinion of the Board already well established in the island."

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that some error has been made; that is, that the motion for the second reading has not been made yet.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: This is the second reading speech now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter may proceed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before I just want to express my view on this very important matter. I hope Mr. Speaker, that in the proposed functions of this Board serious attention will be given to the composition of the Board which is the most important factor. You have to be very careful in choosing persons to sit on this Board; because it must be borne in mind that this is not an island with any great natural resources. Therefore it means that whatever little scope for development there is, it calls for a great deal of experimentation, a great deal of resourcefulness, and for people who are not afraid to take risks.

I heard the Hon. Premier giving his dogma on the method for appointing people to Boards; and he said in effect that with regard to appointing a member of this House to the Development Board, Government did not think it was necessary for reasons which were satisfactory to be withheld. That is not good enough for people who have modern ideas of representation and of Trade Unions.

The question of taxation in the United Kingdom is a technical matter; but we find that to embrace the points of view of most sections of the community you try to use your representation on these Boards on that basis. I hope that in the appointment of these Boards (as the opinion has gone abroad) that those responsible will not be guided by what I regard as a mistaken idea that the only people who are capable of sitting on these Boards are people who have been running businesses, whether successfully or not, or people who have been interested in Government Departments. I hope Government will give some consideration to what is regarded today as the absolute necessity in modern industrial development for the representatives of the people to play an important part on such Boards.

The Hon. Minister of Trade has just returned to the island from an I.L.O. conference and he has cited the Director General's report of last year where this field was reviewed along with other aspects of industrial development. In his personal report the Hon. Minister has a very pertinent paragraph which deals with industrial development. I would not at this stage say what he has said, because the Hon. Minister of Trade took part in that meeting.

It is a narrow view that workers are to be allowed only on Boards where wages are considered; it is nonsense. You cannot think of industrial development without thinking of workers; and I want to repeat that the idea of putting workers on Boards where you are only dealing with wages is antiquated. I repeat my hope that when appointments for such Boards are being made that adequate representation will be given to the whole society of workers of today. In other words, I hope that the representation will be really representative of the community and will not be that old, narrow, sectional view that existed in the past; that is, that only a Bank Manager and such like are capable of representation on these Boards.

7.15 p.m.

When we come to Clause 7, I will deal with that. In this Clause 7 it states:

"It shall be the duty of the Board to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of industry in this island and to stimulate, facilitate and undertake the development of agricultural undertakings or projects not in the opinion of the Board already well established in the island."

I hope that this will not be the guiding principle, because you are likely to have an industry which is well established. For instance, the sugar industry in this island is well established.

Some time ago a discussion took place on the question of the Government acquiring Joes River Factory; the sugar industry is well established but it does not necessarily mean that this Development Board should not look into some aspect of the industry where you can stimulate some development. What you have to avoid is that mental attitude where you can only do something by reason of profit; and work along the system similar to the C.D.C. that it is only going to encourage any development which can show a profit. If that is so, all your efforts will be stultified; because many of the business people in this community are not thinking on the basis of the community. Where a Government wants to stimulate industrial development it must be on a basis different from private development, because private development is not done in the interest of the community; it is done for private profit.

I hope that the advice which the Government gets will not lead them along the line that they embark only on those industries which can show a profit, but they will also stimulate and develop where it will mean greater prosperity for the community and the island as a whole. There may be things where risks would have to be taken, risks which private employers would not take, and I hope that the composition of the Board will not be done on the basis that you take people whom you think have made good in business.

It is a question of the mental approach; it is not a question of the Conservative point of view. The old Conservative attitude was anti-Government

development because their whole idea was that the Government should not engage in any business whatever. I hope that that which is regarded as the Socialist concept will not be taken over by the old reactionary and Conservative view and used along lines which will stultify the very development at which you are aiming.

I feel that if you have the right people heading this organisation we may not be as swift as we would like to be, but we will have a great measure of industrial expansion. It is not for me to say what can be established; but I hope the Government will keep a close watch on what is being done by this Board. While I am in favour of giving the Board as much power to make it independent, at the same time you do not want the Board to be so far away as to think that they are what you can regard as people who possess different points of view.

It may be that the Colonial Office will have something to do with the personnel, but it is a pity that where you have men sometimes of the calibre of Dr. Arthur Lewis or Dr. Eric Williams who seem to have some little bit of odium from the Colonial Office, unfortunately these people are not being regarded as super-experts, but as "cast outs", because they do not fit into the regular Colonial Office pattern.

I was glad to see that the Prime Minister of Great Britain on one occasion has quoted from Dr. Arthur Lewis' work on socialist theory. Therefore, when we have West Indians who have reached that stage where the Prime Minister of Great Britain can quote one of them as an authority, although he did not quote him far enough and Dr. Arthur Lewis had to reply, where you have West Indians of this mental calibre, and are capable of giving us tremendous assistance, and who are interested in our development I would say that it is a pity that this Government could not think of using them.

I would say that there is no one who is a greater advocate of West Indian Federation than Dr. Eric Williams; he is no longer with the Caribbean Commission and it would be good if the Government could feel that people of this sort could be of use to them.

I do not accept the idea that because you set up a Board and you agree that wages should be well paid therefore no one who is representing the workers' point of view should not be put on this Board, because you do not regard that as being necessary. I feel that a matter of this sort requires the community as whole to support it; Its success cannot be achieved unless you have the support of the Community. I feel that with the support of the community a measure like this will be successful. Those who have to see after the appointment of this Board will have to see that interested people are placed on this Board.

I would like to say in closing that there is some grave regret when I see the personnel, not only the names, but the attitude of those who are appointed to some of these Boards. I saw recently that there is a member of a Committee which has to advise the Government now; I speak with bold assurance that that same person is giving the workers' organisation much hell; and he is an anti-socialist in his point of view. It is a tremendous thing to put people on Committees and Boards whose very thinking is opposite to that which you hold. You do not want to put people on Boards for others to say that they are your pets; but you want to stimulate things and you want to put on these Boards people who are interested.

The business men in this island are accustomed to using the penny stamp system; the system of trade in Barbados had been operating on a sort of commission basis. There are very few people who take the trouble to go in for the manufacturing side of business.

Sir, you are embarking on something which is new to the average businessman because he does not like to take these risks. I do hope that you appoint to the Board those who have a deep and abiding interest in this community.

7.25 p.m.

MR. GODDARD: Sir, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour in introducing this Bill said some months ago that he had taken clauses of it from the Jamaica Bill. It is known that Jamaica has three Boards: a Development Board for Agriculture, a Development Board for Industry and a Development Board for the Tourist Industry. The Hon. Minister of Trade said that they had combined agriculture and industry in one in this Bill. In a small island like Barbados, probably that is the correct thing to do because if you were to separate them you would be creating unnecessary expenditure. Agriculture is pretty well established here and we are producing what many in Barbados feel is our maximum. They feel that there is no new line to develop nor is there any virgin soil to be taken up in the growth of other crops as it is in Jamaica. They also feel that the industries which exist in Barbados are small and very minor indeed as compared with those of Jamaica.

It is a fact that Jamaica had the jump on us in this respect because the people there realised during the last war that immediately after the cessation of hostilities, the people in big countries would be looking around to establish industries; and owing to that, the people in Jamaica got the jump because they opened up their shores to those after-the-war investors whom they welcomed with industries free of taxation and the like. We are now opening our eyes to what they have done.

It can be said that we are a small community and we cannot offer those inducements; but I take it that we did not make the start. As I have said, we do believe in the industrialisation of Barbados and we hope by so doing that we would be able to find more jobs for the numbers who are unemployed.

That is the point which we have been more active about; but in thinking about industries, we have to look around to see what would be the more suitable industries for us. What occurs to my mind immediately is the tourist industry. Sir, every Commission that has been to the Southern Caribbean and reported on what can be done, has said that Barbados should try and develop tourism as a secondary industry. They have all said that our climate is good and there is the making of a good tourist industry in Barbados. We have a large population and a lot of unemployed and they can be put to work. Whether you put them into a factory or a home, as long as you employ them and pay them good wages, that is what you desire.

The Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour never for once mentioned anything of the Tourist Industry. I do hope when he rises to reply he would say what he has in mind for that industry. Do not let us fool ourselves about it; let us get down to it. It is a fact that some people are more interested in the Tourist Industry than

others, but the Tourist Industry can be very hazardous indeed to those who are looked upon as the people who make money out of it.

To some people it appears as if the people who have the industry in hand make money out of it while the others who work in it just get along; but I can tell you I have a small hotel in Hastings on half acre of land, and that hotel employs over 60 people all the year round. I can tell you that hotels are contributing to the taxes of Christ Church and the Central Government; the amount of which run into thousands of dollars; and hotels are bringing in hard currency which we need to buy our foodstuffs and so on. I wonder whether people in high quarters realise that. It amazes me to see that they look at the Tourist Industry with such apathy.

Our agricultural land has already been expended and if you get 200,000 tons of sugar in the next five years, that is all which we should expect. If we get that amount we would be producing more than our quota and therefore, anything over our quota would be sold at dumped prices which would not be remunerative.

This Development Board will have at its disposal at the beginning $1,000,000 and it would be interesting to hear what they have in mind as regards the type of industries which they want to help. We have had various Commissions going around the territories and we have not been able to attract any money in Barbados to develop any industry. There is a brick factory which has just been started here and I am sure it would do with capital for the expansion of that industry. You may say that the industry has not got beyond the pioneer stage. In Trinidad they have any amount of heavy industry, but I do not think we can interest any one to come to Barbados to put down a cement industry, therefore, we would have to buy cement from outside. The reason for that is, that an industry like cement takes a big outlay; and in order for us to get a cement industry here, we would have to interest some large company which is already tied up in that business, and I do not think a company would come here to put down such a factory; so it appears to me that we would be always a consumer.

There are cement factories already established in Jamaica and in Trinidad; and with Federation just around the corner and with free markets throughout the Caribbean, we would have to be buyers. It appears to me as if we will have to see what we can do for ourselves. As you know, in the *Advocate* newspaper recently, there was some talk of Trinidad contemplating putting up its duty on rum; and that is the one thing which we can sell to them.

7.35 p.m.

We have been enjoying a good trade in rum because the Trinidadians like every other West Indian realises that our rum is good. They are out for their own industries and they are not going to help us. It will be a long time before Federation works in our way of thinking on a reasonable basis. We have been sleeping for years when the islands should have got together in order to see what industries would be good for them. They have been saying let us see what we can get for Trinidad and Jamaica.

Now to get back to this Development Board Bill. When the honourable junior member for St. Peter said that Barbadians are very cautious and that they do not risk money very easily, he has lied to a certain degree; but we do not make money in Barbados easily either, [A VOICE: The Goddards!] We have to be very careful in going into industries. There is a vast difference between sellers and those going into industries. We have taken risks and have got burnt. Of course we came out on the wrong side.

It is not often realised in Barbados what risks are often taken. There is a limit to what you can do. We wish this Development Board well and we wish it to be established as early as possible.

I assure you that the proprietors of the few industries that are here wish to know to whom they can appeal for assistance. You cannot go to Government direct; therefore you need an intermediary Board. I have heard industrialists in Barbados say that Bills are passed in the Legislature in their favour, but when they make application to the Customs or to other Departments in Barbados they of the particular Department seem to know nothing about it; and they do not know to whom to appeal. It seems to take a long time to get through the necessary channels.

It will be the duty of this Development Board to help industry. I had hoped, constituted as it is, that it would have consisted of such people as would have an eye to helping the industries that exist, and which they say they wish to attract to the Island. Very little outside capital has come into Barbados for the last 25 years; all industries are owned locally. But we Barbadians have not got enough money to further these industries; in building up industries you do not only need money but you also need technique; and people from abroad are unwilling to invest unless they are coming in with Barbadians. They wish to feel that they will have someone on the spot who will take an interest in the development of that industry whatever the industry may be. There must be a conducive or healthy atmosphere or they are not coming. They want to know that not only the money market is good, but that the labour market also is good. They want to know that the Unions are reasonable. We have a very good record so far; but all of those points will help in the development of industry.

I see that the Secretary of this Board cannot be paid more than $5,000. What I am afraid of is that that is not enough. It is the Secretary who to a great extent is going to make this move forward. It is the appointment of a proper Board that is going to make this a first class venture; and if you do not have somebody responsible and pay him something like £3,000 a year you are not going to get satisfactory results.

Do not let us feel among ourselves that we can pick up cheap second hand people and get good results. The Trinidadians and Jamaicans are paying good money. You are not going to get a good man, I repeat, for anything under £3,000. £3,000 would be the figure. You had better overpay a man than underpay him.

I see that the Tourist Industry has been left out of this Bill. The Minister of Trade said that he has on his desk another Bill that is purely for the Tourist Industry. Sugar will be for a long time or may be the kingpin for ever in Barbados. We cannot see it being displaced. The prices may be good; but the morning that prices have fallen we may regret that we did not attract into Barbados another industry; what ever it may be, it would have substituted in this case where there was an adverse fluctuation in the sugar industry.

I am patiently going to wait to hear what the Minister of Trade is going to say about the Tourist Industry; because we are actively engaged and those who are interested directly in the hotel industry have set up a Tourist Development Board that is

now trying to further the development of the tourist industry from that end. But we need one at Government's end. We have the Publicity Committee to which we are subscribing $40,000 a year. Tourism in Bermuda is their all; but they live very well on it. There are no other people in the Caribbean area that have such a high standard of living. Bermuda is only three hours out of New York, whereas we are eleven hours; so that they have a big advantage over us. But there is something in our favour in not being too near to New York.

Let us get away now from the idea of discrimination in hotels. There is no discrimination that I know existing in Barbados. If that is so that can be corrected. Government has that in their power and everybody knows that. There is nothing to hold up the Tourist Industry now. We welcome everybody in our hotels; all we want is a full hotel.

I am hoping that Government will really improve on the Bill the Hon. Minister has in mind and soon introduce it into this House. I foresee that with this million dollars in their hands after a time they may not have the industries to develop; therefore the Government will have to establish the Tourist Development Board in the very near future.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I am in agreement with this belated attempt to establish this Barbados Development Board. In fairness to my absent colleague, I think a word of praise should be given to him for his persistent clamouring for many a year for such a Board. I am glad to see it is on its way now. I notice that a million dollars is set aside for the initial setting up of this Board, but that is only a comparatively small amount when you come to consider the development of industry in Barbados on a scale big enough to find employment for the thousands of unemployed men and women and for the improvement of their finances.

7.45 p.m.

I have looked over this Bill and I do not see that any particular industry which the Government has in mind to develop has been mentioned. I drop this hint that this Government could employ themselves with this million dollars in creating some new industry and set it on its feet and turn it over to some enterprising business man or woman to be carried out. Let the Government get some industry or industries afoot and then turn them over to some enterprising men or women to carry them on for the development and improvement of our people.

Some honourable members have said that this is a belated move on the part of the Government; but, Mr. Speaker, it is never too late to do something good. Therefore, the Government must be given credit for attempting the establishment of this Board at this time.

If we are thinking of the construction of a Deep Water Harbour, improvements at the Airport, the erection of Ministerial Buildings, etc., all these things are needed and all of them can serve a good and useful purpose. I am not discrediting any of those things. We have been on the nap for too long and we have been waking up a bit. I hope that those boys and girls who have been away from this island for 20 or 30 years, when they return here they will see a modicum of improvement, though it will be nothing as compared with what we have seen in other parts of the world. We are supposed to be noted as the greatest thinkers and the most educated and enterprising Negroes; and I do not think we can compliment ourselves too much.

The present modicum of development which is to be noted all around is just a scratching of the surface; we have vast room for development around here. The boys and girls who come out of school with creditable certificates should not have to scratch their heads and look to other countries to take our burdens; if we have cultivated the power or prowess of increasing the population as it is being increased, we should be able to provide for this increased population and not look for a father or mother to provide for this increased population.

It is up to this Government with the help and co-operation to do more than it is doing. I hope that with the establishment of this Development Board we will be able to look around with pride within another year, and see what enterprising Barbadians pulling together with knowledge, wisdom, understanding and co-operation can achieve in the Universe. I give this Bill God's Blessing. Whether I am in this House or not, I will sit back and watch with eager expectation how those who are appointed to direct this Board will equip themselves.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I just want to reply briefly to some of these points which have been made. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has raised the question of the representation on this Board; and as this is a matter which has still to be decided, I will bear it in mind. However, I think the honourable member should be aware of the fact that it has been the policy of this Government in appointing Boards or Committees to place representatives of workers on such Boards or Committees where the claims of the workers rank very high.

For instance, there is the Domestic Servants' Committee; and on a Board like the Control Board we have put representatives from the Trade Union. With the Irrigation Board there is a representative from the Trade Union on that Board.

It has been the policy of this Government to appoint such representatives to the Boards; and we will continue to do it where the interest of the workers is to be protected. The honourable member has put the matter on a higher level and said that on all Boards we should broaden this aspect of the matter. As I said before we will bear the matter in mind.

With regard to the point made by the honourable member in Section 7 of this Bill about undertakings which are already well established, I quite agree with him that that should be interpreted as widely and as liberally as possible. It is the intention behind this particular clause to interpret it as widely as possible.

For instance: even today, there is a lot of waste from our Sugar Industry which could be utilised with industrial undertakings. I remember meeting some months ago a chemist from America who said that he was amazed at the amount of wastage which comes from rum and which would be utilised in America. I think that this Board should take advantage of all opportunities which present themselves to men of enterprise.

7.55 p.m.

This section was merely copied from the Jamaica Act. The mere reason why that was retained was because we have a well established industry which is well looked after by the Government. We have assisted this industry for years by means of special Acts; and we also have an Agricultural Department which specially looks after it, so that is no new enterprise. This Bill is to look after any

new enterprises; of course, it does not rule out any new feature of the Sugar Industry which may need undertaking, stimulating, and facilitating, to use the words in the terms of the Bill.

It is our intention that this Board should be so public-spirited and staffed, that it would be able to seize every opportunity and to take the risks that private enterprise would not be able to take. That is the spirit behind this Board; and I do agree that it must have the right people with the right approach on it; otherwise it can retard progress instead of pushing forward at the rate which it should proceed to do.

Sir, the honourable junior member for Christ Church drew to the attention of the House that we are not interested in the Tourist Industry. I would say this (and I have always made it known from the time I was a backbencher; and it is still my principle today) that so long as a Labour Government of this kind is in power we will rue the day when this island would become a Bermuda or a Bahamas. So long as I have anything to do with policy, it is my intention to prevent Barbados from becoming a Bermuda or a Bahamas.

I will never forget especially at the last I.L.O. Conference, my meeting with people from Haiti and Nigeria who said that we are poor men but no man can treat us as inferiors; we are equal to any other person. They have a pride of their own and they can hold their heads upright. They do not have to be lackeys to anybody. [A VOICE: What about their standard of living?] Let me say as regards the standard of living of these people that we are not willing to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage.

In an interview in a newspaper, someone pointed out how in Bermuda he was struck with the fact that the Colour Bar operating there was particularly viscous and that a lot of the people had to be lackeys. It was said that the people there did not look upon themselves as having equality, and those people had to buy provisions through their noses. The poor people there have to get the dollars else they would starve. It is the very American dollars that cause them to starve.

I say again as regards the Tourist Industry, it is not true to say that we are ignoring the effect of it. If the honourable member would examine the facts, he would see that in the Five Year Plan we stated that we would put aside a sum of money to assist in the Tourist Industry and that we would be willing to hear proposals from interested persons as to the best manner in which Government can assist in promoting this industry. Since I have assumed office as Minister, we have increased considerably the amount given to this industry. We give money to the Publicity Committee for advertising the industry and obviously that must have had some results, because the figures have shown that the number of tourists coming to the island has increased. I hope that the honourable junior member for Christ Church would not claim all the credit for that; I hope he would give some of the credit to the Government for advertising the industry abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I may tell the honourable member that if there is any delay, it is the fault of the people in the Tourist Industry; not the Government; because we asked that proposals be put up to us for promoting the industry. You will find that we stated in the Five Year Plan that Government is quite willing to do anything to promote the Tourist Industry, but in keeping with our principle we are not going so far as to be like Bermuda or the Bahamas or even Jamaica. In keeping with our principle what we can do to attract more dollars we will do.

I do not think that there is anything else I can say. I have covered most of the points.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Probably you will all agree —[A VOICE: You cannot speak twice.] Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of Order. You will agree that there are three industrial development Boards in Jamaica and only two are mentioned in this Bill. I was only refreshing the memory of the Hon. Minister on that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I think the hon. member will agree that this island is too small to carry three separate Boards.

Mr. F. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is to be expected that I must add my quota to this debate. I would not have spoken at all had it not been for some of the replies.

It seemed as though the Government really did not grasp the true situation. Although this Bill is somewhat belated, I do not think anyone should throw cold water on any Bill to provide for any scheme for the development of industry, whether agricultural or otherwise. We do feel that it is a very difficult thing in Barbados with our limited resources, and the limited resources of this area including Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana and even Dominica and the smaller islands. It is true that at present our agriculture is not as highly developed as is possible; and that is not the expressed view of local observers but of persons from outside who look with interest upon the affairs of this island. But as I have said before, we should not throw cold water on such measures; we should give some measure of support and that support I give. The views of the Hon. Minister of Trade brought me to my feet; one particular view is that he hoped that we would not develop like Bermuda or the Bahamas.

Now as far as I am concerned, the development of the Bahamas and Bermuda (I am dealing with the standard of living) has raised the standard of living of the people of those places; and I certainly should like to see that standard of living for the people of this country. By that I mean a standard of living where every man in this country would know that he is in a position to give himself eggs to eat and milk in his coffee. I should like to see that standard of living.

Personally I am not affected by people who come here and try to be snobbish. I know or understand the psychology of the European and American as well as anybody else. I remember when I was in New York in 1953 (I am saying this for the benefit of the honourable member to show that this cannot be operated here) I attended a lecture by some M.P. of Bermuda, and I was amused to hear that they were not very proud of being West Indians. He said that the people of Bermuda had gathered to hear of the progress that Bermudians had made over a period of time; and he was happy to say that at last they had coloured clerks in the Post Office [*Laughter*] Well, I smiled and said: you are progressing I notice! This is for the benefit of the Hon. Minister.

I went to New York when segregation was rampant; but I did not carry myself about looking for insults. I realised that the main object for my being there was to improve my economic position. I realised then that the forerunner of making coloured peoples all over the world to gain a measure of respect was Marcus Garvey; and I saw what was happening.

Do you believe that when you look over the island you can land sufficient tourists to push us back into St. Andrew? Look at the numbers of unemployed people. Do not think you can pass a law saying that you cannot have coloured people in hotels.

I do not go around with any chip on my shoulder. I have a society of my own and a very proud one. I have a right to. But I would not go around pushing myself and looking for insults. Somebody said something about birth rights; but if that person had gone to the Southern states of America he would have heard this: in Alabama and Texas whenever you go around, you are going to find 300 Europeans to about 50 coloured people. But I say that European psychology is of such that the moment that he walked down Broad Street he would realise the truth of the old saying that when you are in Rome act as the Romans do.

I had the pleasure in New York in 1953 of discussing the whole question of tourist development in Barbados with business people, with distinguished financiers and other interested parties; and to all of them I said I must make this clear to you: I am not one of those people who would be afraid to say things to your own Americans. I feel as proud to be a Coloured man as a White man; and I also took the opportunity to make this clear too: you cannot expect that there will be any hotels in Barbados that would appreciate segregation. I then went on to say this: people have private Clubs they also run hotels; but if you have a Club like the Colony Club, for instance and you charge $40 or $50 a day, I would never get up and say that you should not charge $50 a day because that is your own property. When it comes to hotels and business places involving a question of holding jobs that is a different matter. As a matter of fact, I am one of the people proud to see the prohibited measures that have been taken to prevent some people from going into these Clubs; because when that is done it is helping them to desist from stealing.

8.15 p.m.

If the politicians of this country have a grudge against the hotel people, I call them fools. When the tourist lands in Barbados in 1955, as soon as he reaches the Airport he realises the position as soon as he finds himself going to the Officer; if he comes from below the Mason Dixie Line, as soon as he lands at the Airport and he sees the Health Officer, then he will come to his senses.

You can still develop your industry; I have spoken with Southerners; one man said to me that he has been staying at hotels in Barbados, Trinidad and Jamaica and he has found the service in Barbados better than in the other colonies. There was an instance where he had lost his key to his room and he was given all assistance. He said that could never happen in Trinidad or Jamaica; that you could not see the attendant there going out of the way to give the necessary assistance. That is a tribute to Barbados.

I feel that while the passing of this Bill is an absolute necessity, although it is a bit late, we are going to try to help all we can. I am not trying to throw cold water on this matter; I have been told that there is no other plant which could come back as quickly as the sugar cane. If you went through the country a few months ago you would have seen that the canes were somewhat withering, but as soon as the rains came the canes came back again. We will have irrigation and so on, but I doubt whether you could leave the sugar cane for anything else. You will improve your sugar industry as much as you can and when you are finished improving your sugar industry if you want to develop anything else in the country, one of the first things you must have is your natural resources.

We have heard of Jamaica developing industries but they have been doing it from their natural minerals. We have not got them here; we have been trying to develop oil but we are in the hands of the oil people. The same people own the oil in Venezuela and Trinidad. Well, oil companies begin and end no one knows where.

The Gulf Oil Company may be fighting people in Jamaica and they may be the same combine in Texas. We have to search for our minerals; but we can safely say here that there is not one person either of influence or affluence who has been to this country who has not said "I should like to come back here." The beautiful thing about Bermuda, and there is mention made of the standard of living there, is that it is quite near to the United States of America so that you can get over to the U.S.A., quickly; but even in the summer from the average old lady back to the middle-aged person cannot remain in the sea for more than fifteen minutes. The reason is that the water is too cold.

If you go to Bermuda in the winter you must wear a coat; you cannot go naked. I have no personal grudge against anybody, but the Tourist Industry must be developed because it is the one thing which you must develop. In Barbados we have the three "S's"—Sugar, Sunshine and Seabathing. People have told us that we have the perfect climate. I have gone to the Bahamas and to Bermuda working on a ship; and you will agree with me that when you come to Barbados, (I am saying what the Europeans have told us) you can stand on the beaches for two or three hours. The Europeans have said that we have a few mosquitoes but the Sanitary Inspectors can take care of them.

There is a feeling on the part of the Government's members that the Leader of the Opposition because of his family's interest in hotels, has a reason for pressing for the hotels and the Hotel Industry. I want the Government to erase that completely from their minds; that is a stupid thing because anybody who is interested in Barbados will realise that the Hotel Industry is something to be reckoned with. During the hearing of the Hayman's case the fact came out that they employ 140 people in this factory for three months of the year and therefore, this factory should not be closed down.

8.25 p.m.

You would be surprised to know that Hayman's Factory employs 140 people during the crop time; and perhaps you would be also surprised to know that for more than a period of three months a modern hotel employs more than 120 people.

Let us say that Hotel Proprietors make money; have you ever seen the amount of money they bring in to Government? Government takes away one-third of their profits in Income Tax. As a matter of fact, it is really 40%. Let Government stand by and take away that from them, but give them a free hand to develop.

Let me say that the standard of life since the last World War has changed considerably. There were people who never took a holiday before they got to the age of 60 years, because they said to themselves that they had their boys to educate and to help. Since the last World War, that attitude has changed and every man looks forward to a holiday. His outlook today is that I am taking my holiday

now I am young to enjoy it, and I am going somewhere to enjoy it, and he is going somewhere to enjoy it every two or three years. To do that, he is saving so as to have an accumulated holiday. Therefore, it is not a question of bringing a few people when people are accumulating money to have a holiday.

The British have an idea that a man should work and put down so much money to get a car, and then that he should put down so much money to get a house and then a refrigerator and any such thing. We have a different idea about that. We think in the way that a man will die at a certain age; therefore if he buys a car at 24 years he can pay every week so much until he pays the full amount for it and at the same time he is using the car. He can also buy furniture on that method. By so doing, you keep everything turning and that causes the standard of living to go up. Instead of your waiting until you are forty-seven or sixty years to own what you need, you get them at the age of 28 years and pay, say $25 a week until you own them. In other words you begin to enjoy your life at 28 years instead of waiting until you are 60 years.

The feeling is that you need not go to spend a holiday in the $40 a day hotel which is in Jamaica and even in Grenada and Bermuda. The feeling is that the $10 and $12 hotels which you have here are the hotels that you want. The $40 a day hotel is quite all right for the Stevensons, the Trees, the Guinesses and the Lord Lloyds but they are the few.

When you are dealing with tourists today you are dealing with the ordinary working man, the man who works for $125 a week; you are dealing with the office man or the nurse in the Hospital. I know of a nurse in the United States from a Medical Centre who takes her vacation every year and comes down to Barbados to spend it. That nurse comes here and occupies a $12 a day hotel and that is the hotel which you want. You want more and more of that type of hotel.

By that how would we be selling our birth-right. Let us face facts. Do you think that if the honourable junior member for Christ Church invests money in any hotel that we will sit down here and if Mr. Manley, Mr. Bird, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Police Officer or Mr. Anybody goes to that hotel and anybody there says "I am not taking your colour" that we would take it lightly? I draw a line to that. What is the idea of your saying you are selling your birthright? Let me tell you that the people are interested in your raising the standard of living and getting a regular job. I can tell you that just today a man came into my office from the parish of St. John to see whether he could sell his house to get to England so as to help his family. Why is this talk about selling your birth-right? Is it because some politician wants to push his weight about? If I went to Texas tomorrow, I would not go there expecting to be put up as one of the Ministers, because a lot of them think that because they are Ministers they are Almighty God. They know very well that there is segregation there; but I will tell you that if any one of them went somewhere with anybody and, say, he was the Secretary of State, and they were receiving the Secretary of State and not him, I would be strong about it.

Let me say that I felt quite humiliated when our Speaker was humiliated. I felt the same way with the Hon. Premier when he was barred. Of course I feel that one of the greatest things that happened for the West Indies was when two of our journalists who felt themselves to belong to a different clique from that which they belong, were barred in Bermuda. May be, it is a very good thing when we have people in certain positions being barred. Some of my own people feel that so long as they are received in the company of some people they can spit in the face of other people. When the Hon. Minister talked of selling your birthright for a mess of pottage, you can see the position which the Government is taking in this matter.

8.35 p.m.

If as some people say you want to feel that you have a Colony Club at $40 a day and the Morgan Club, and I am getting $60 a month and I can go up there and spend money, then I am glad that they have barred such people. That is what I call selling your birthright.

From the remarks of the Hon Minister you can see what attitude the Government is adopting in this matter. The moment, I repeat, that tourists land here they measure the situation for themselves and they soon see that they cannot come here and adopt any Lord God attitude. Our main tourist business will be with Canada and the United States; and Mr. Speaker, Venezuela. [A VOICE: They do not count.]

I thought really that in this Bill the two main things should be to see what you could do to make agriculture more efficient etc., and then the next thing would be the natural wealth which you have in your lovely seabathing. There is no point going into figures now; but I could do so to show what it means to Canada and elsewhere.

Of course you have to depend upon sugar; but I was the most surprised person when I heard the returns of Accra Beach Club. This is what came from attracting tourists to the Accra Beach Club; and return was made to the Vestry notwithstanding the returns of income tax. If you have ever seen anybody making money—[A VOICE: Out of order.] I am in order now..

I do hope that when the Hon. Premier goes to England his heart will turn and he will see the wisdom in allowing Pan American to come in here. Call me Pan American; call me what you like; I believe it is the right logic. I believe that with Pan American coming in here and with direct traffic from New York State, industry will develop. Someone wrote in the Newspapers saying you are arguing today that you have not got room for any more tourists, so what are you going to bring them in for. But listen to this: the Marine is full, the Hastings Hotel is full, what are you going to bring them in for? Are you going to put them in the Drill Hall? No; but you have workmen out of work. Go into Trinidad and see what they are going to do. They are going to bring the people in. Do you think they are going to bring them in and put them on the wharf. This is how I see it: as you have started this tourist industry it will be the same with Barbados as it has been with other places; that is, wherever you go, you see that Pan American is providing work. Are they going to bring workmen from New York? No; from Barbados. Therefore I am showing you what the development of a Tourist Industry in Barbados will mean.

It is a risky thing to take a tremendous amount of money and put it into a hotel; but if Pan American were allowed to come in here the very standard of living in this country would be tremendously raised; but if the Government insists in allowing Barbados to be kept as a pawn for British West Indian Airways, then these people will live long under a low standard of life. They will never get to the standard of being able to buy coffee, bacon and eggs.

I am as loyal as any other Britisher in this country; but you must not strain loyalty. You cannot strain it. If this Government went to England, even England, and got somebody to advise them on the development of industry, I am prepared to bet that irrespective of what ever else he tells them, he would tell them this: you must develop your hotel industry in Barbados. The sea coast is so admirable. In the mountains of Kingston, Jamaica and in Cuba at half past five in the evening you have to put on your overcoat; that is not so in Barbados. Tourists come here and after two days they go half naked.
8.45 p.m.

Here they are attempting to get girls to go to England to be trained as Domestic Servants and so on. I repeat what I have read; the Vice President of Pan American told me that he had the pleasure of being here at one of our hotels and in respect of the Queen's Park Hotel, there was no comparison at all. Our service comes down from those who work in the ships, and we have a lovely lot when you come to the hotel service. I will draw this to the attention of the Hon. Minister: if he ever lived in a country where at least it made no difference whether you are a white-collar worker or not, he would appreciate this; there was no difference if a girl came from Queen's College or not. If you develop your standard in the hotels, it would not make any difference whether a girl was a bed-room maid or not; the main fact is that she would receive her money.

I went to the U.S.A. in 1924; I went to Child's Restaurant where often you had a glass of water and they broke the glass after you. I did not find myself at Child's to get the glass broken after me, but I had equally as good water in glasses in a coloured restaurant.

If people want to get kicked about it is a matter for them; it is a good thing for them because it would bring them back to earth. There is intellectual snobbery and financial snobbery; but people should not forget their background but look towards their smaller brothers. Mr. E. C. Hill had a porter down there and he was a white man. I know that some of the members of this very Government before they associate themselves with a decent coloured man would prefer to do otherwise. Let them say what they like about me; if that Government over there get snobbed and kicked about it is their business; do not let them tell me anything about selling any birthright. I speak what I feel; if they walk about and get into trouble well let them get in trouble. Let honourable members laugh; they cannot give me any flogging nor can they tell anybody to "fire" me.

The honourable member says he hopes that we will not develop either like Bermuda or like the Bahamas; he really means the segregation part of it. I am insisting that if they are going to bring out somebody to develop industries let them bring out somebody to do it. There is an accepted fact that agriculture cannot do much more than it is now doing for the people of this colony; therefore, I say that the development of the tourist industry is a necessity. I repeat that there is a feeling on the part of the Government that because the Hotel Industry is connected with the honourable junior member for Christ Church we are pressing this matter but that is not so; and there is the suggestion that if you change the wealth from the hands of the white people and put it in the hands of the black people it will not make any difference; but that is not so. There is always that feeling that somebody does not like this or that. I am speaking on the question of the development of industries; if you hear of a case that they wanted to turn back any business man I will hear them on that; but do not let them say that what happens in Bermuda will happen here. We have advanced too much. I am proud of being a Britisher despite what they tell the English people out here. I remember walking along the side walk in Alabama; I am one of those who, if you shun me, you shun me! [*Laughter*]. All the time that I was walking from the ship on a particular afternoon I had been seeing coloured people; but I am convinced that our people in Barbados have a better sense not of servility but of civility. There is no reflection on anybody.
8.55 p.m.

That is because of our high standard of education in the past which has been due for the most part to the Conservatives. Say what you like, you are the only country in the West Indies which has illiteracy of only two per cent. That has accounted for the civility and mannerliness of your people.

I did not intend to speak on this matter, but I resent much the inference about selling your birthright for a mess of pottage. I resent much the idea of the Hon. Minister of Trade saying he hoped this country would never become a Bermuda or a Bahamas. Of course he did not say in what way he meant; but I believe he means when it comes to their snobbery and segregation and by their trying to push their Tourist Industry they are pushing their people down and to the back. I am sure that cannot happen here. I am sure that if Mr. Stevenson or Senator driving my mule and truck?" [*Laughter.*]
up to this House of Assembly and get at the door and look around, they would hear from somebody in the gallery who directs this place and they would realise that they cannot do that sort of thing. Of course, that has changed in the United States and all over the world except in South Africa; and it is going to change there too.

Mr. Speaker, in Trinidad they got rid of the South Africans who were in the Civil Service but in Barbados, you have a South African Social Welfare Officer. Every now and then, and by virtue of her birth, she offends every person with whom she comes into contact. Get up and defend that statement. She looked at a black girl like you in the Civil Service and told her she is an inferior being. You have the Government telling you that they do not want to see this or that. Trinidad has refused to have South Africans in their Civil Service but we can appoint a Social Welfare Officer. I feel very strong in this matter.

I have all sort of friends and I really would like to see a development in the tourist industry. Why talk about selling our birthright? The average man here thinks that is so much nonsense. Let us show by our actions, and our legislation that you cannot debar coloured people from any place. I will tell you that some of our people would rather prefer to deal with those of white complexion. When Mr. B. L. Barrow first came forward for election in this country, the now Hon. Mr. Douglas Pile said to Mr. Barrow: "Do you know that you are getting on alright? But Mr. Barrow why do you dislike white people?" Mr. Barrow in reply to him said: "How can you say I dislike white people when I have a white man driving my mule and truck?" [*Laughter.*]

I say to members of the Government that that remark of selling your birthright for a mess of pottage is an unfortunate remark for the Minister to address to us. We say we will never associate ourselves with the Bahamas or Bermuda when it comes to segregation; but I say again that you have it in the United States of America. Dr. Ralph Bunche, one of the

greatest coloured men in the world said that he would not accept the post of Assistant Secretary of State in Washington because of his colour. I know that the Hon. Minister of Social Services would agree with me when I say that Dr. Ralph Bunche refused that offer in words to the effect that "you want to accept me in such a position but with the way you are treating my people in Washington, I cannot accept it."

I say that some of my people and even some over on the other side would like the Colony Club and the Marine Hotel to accept them so long as they can come outside and say "I went there." I am not interested in that, neither are the people of this colony interested in that. We are interested in something like if Pan American Airlines can bring in people to this colony, the result of which would cause 400 to 600 of our people to get employment.

I know what we should not accept. We should not accept that atmosphere which prevailed between the last war and the 1914 War when the people who made money in this country out of the sweat, tears and the blood of the people, took that money and invested in securities in Hong Kong, Honolulu and places like that, and then some of them lost their money and some did not know what they lost. We should see to it that the people who make money in this country spend it back in the country. You should encourage them to make money but you should see to it that they spend it back here. It is a fact that after the 1914 War, you could not get one man who made million of dollars out of sugar to put back anything in this country. He bought C.P.R. and such bonds and securities and in doing so, a lot of them threw away money. If you make money in Barbados, you should spend it back here in order to develop Barbados.

Let me say that a man can be turned into a butler overnight. When I first got a job aboard a ship, I knew nothing about laying a table but I learnt how to do so and you can learn how to do so overnight.

9.00 p.m.

When you start to work in America you get money. A man told me the other day that he intended taking his child from the Parry School and sending him to the United States and that he was selling his house to help him to do so. I told him do not sell your house. There is a case of another man who said to me I know I have no right to come to you who are in St. Michael, but I have had nothing for my child since Monday. Do you think he cares anything about snobbery? That man is 42 years of age and he wants to go and work. If he could manage to go and work in America he would draw $15 to $20 a week; but when you leave a man at the mercies of people that is a different thing.

I strongly resent the remark which the Hon. Minister has made. I cannot help him on this question of snobbery. I know a lot of people would say that they ought to be allowed to go to Club Morgan and then carry away a few things. I would rather be a big man among my people than to be kicked about in another society.

I say again that I resent very much the attitude of selling your birthright and not wanting to develop a Hotel Industry. I told them that it is the one thing we have in Barbados from which we can expect a great deal; it is a natural industry.

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

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS. seconded by Mr. L. E. SMITH the House was adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

9.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

DEVELOPMENT BILL—Ctd.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

The question that this House do now go into Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 *to* 8 *inclusive were called and passed.*

Clause 9 *was called. It reads as follows*:

9. (1) The Board may appoint a committee of the Board to examine and report on any matter whatsoever arising out of or connected with any of its powers and duties under this Act.

(2) Any such committee shall consist of at least two members of the Board together with such other persons, whether members of the Board or not, whose assistance or advice the Board may desire.

(3) Where persons, not being members of the Board, are members of a Committee appointed under this section, or where any person is co-opted under the provisions of subsection (7) of section six of this Act, the Board may by resolution declare the remuneration and allowances of such persons, and such sums shall properly be payable out of the funds and resources of the Board.

(4) The Board may by resolution reject the report of any such committee or adopt it either wholly or with such modifications, additions or adaptations as the Board may think fit.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In Clause 9 there is a typographical error.

I beg to move that Clause 9 stand part.

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

The question that Clause 9 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clause 10 *was called and passed.*

Clause 11 *was called. It reads as follows*:—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 11 stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this is the Clause to which I referred during my second reading speech. Paragraph (a) reads as follows:—

> "(a) no salary in excess of the rate of four thousand dollars per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee;"

All I can say is that if they are thinking of $4,000 a year people for jobs like this, I cannot say that the Government's foresight is very great. I am not one who advocates paying people large salaries for the sake of having somebody driving about in big cars and doing nothing; any job that cannot be filled at a greater sum than $4,000 without the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, gives an idea of what they have in mind.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before you put the question, I suppose the Hon. Minister could tell us the reason. If you are having a thing like this you might very well lose the chance of getting a good person. You know when you are paying $4,000 per annum for a job on a Development Board you want to have a man with initiative. [Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: $325 a month.] It is necessary for you to have a man with the ability and also the know-how for this. It is industry you are dealing with. This does not necessarily mean a man with a certificate; but you have got to have a man in a particular line.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, I noticed here in paragraph (a) of Clause 11, "no salary in excess of the rate of four thousand dollars per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the *Governor-in-Executive Committee.*" But in paragraph (b) I read "no appointment shall be made to any post to which a salary in excess of the rate of four thousand dollars per annum is assigned without prior approval of the *Governor*" and does not add "in-Executive-Committee" as in paragraph (a).

Somehow I do not like the approval of the "Governor" in (b) as against the approval of the "Governor-in-Executive Committee" in (a) and (c). I would suggest therefore that the word "Governor" in (b) should be changed to "Governor-in-Executive Committee" and delete the rest of Clause (b).

I, therefore, beg to move that the word "Governor" and the rest of Clause (b) be deleted, and the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" be inserted.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the fact that a salary cannot be paid without the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee means that we do not agree with what the junior member for Christ Church has said. We have discussed this with a certain authority and he voiced the same opinion; that it would be pretty difficult to get the required type of Executive Officer at say less than £5,000 per annum. But all that this means is that while the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have as little to do as possible with the day to day operations of the Board, utimately the Board must be responsible to the Government for its overall policy.

This is not a private Board; this is a public Board to a certain extent and we do not want to tie its hands. The principle is that a Board like this and similar Boards must be responsible to the Executive Committee when it comes to overall policy, and therefore certain people must have a say beforehand. We do not yet have ultimate control, and that is why we say that in the top-flight salaries, so to speak, this principle should hold good; that is to say, the Board might fix a salary at a certain rate, and if there is a certain rate where top-flight people will be involved the Board must act in accordance with the Government and subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. There is no doubt that which ever Government is in power, the Minister should have close liaison with the officers. If you have confidence in the officers, if you go forward with your venture, you are responsible for the operation; you have ability and therefore you use it. When it comes to the question of policy we must have close liaison with the officers.

As far as the amendment proposed by the honourable junior member for St. Michael, when it comes to the question of making appointments, the Governor is really responsible. In the Housing Bill which was passed recently, the Governor-in-Executive Committee was put in connection with making similar appointments, but I have no objection to that.

It is not a question of fixing £1,000 per annum for a certain officer. All this paragraph says is this:

"No salary in excess of the rate of four thousand dollars per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

This is not a question of fixing the salary of any particular post; this is a question of the salary of the top-flight officers. In the case of any salary which is over $300 a month, the Governor makes the appointment. I accept the amendment which has been moved by the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. GODDARD: Lord Reith said that you cannot get a man for a job like this under £2,500 per annum. That sum is a lot of money for us; but to talk about paying $400 a month is just playing with the matter; that is a Schoolmaster's salary.

The other day we came down for the appointment of a Principal for the Technical School and we thought we were offering a lot of money for the post. We waited for 18 months and then we had to come down to the House with a measure to increase the salary and then we got a man. If you were to have a conversation with Lord Reith, he will tell you what the position is. It is true that people may like Barbados for its sea-bathing and they may like the Barbados rum too, but they want something to put in their pockets as well.

I would suggest a salary of £1,500 for this post. If you are only playing with this matter you will get off to a bad start. You will look around for a long time in order to get a man at a salary of $300 a month; you will get a lot of applications but you will still have to get a man. This will really delay the operation of the Bill.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The honourable member is reading something into the Bill which is not there; you cannot do what the honourable member has suggested in a Clause of a Bill. What this Clause says is this:

"The Board shall appoint and employ at such remuneration and on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit such officers and servants as it deems neccessary for the proper carrying out of the provisions of this Act: Provided that —

(a) no salary in excess of the rate of $4,000 per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Where does it say that we are fixing a salary of $4,000 per annum for a particular officer? I started out by saying that we were not getting a man for less than a certain figure. [Mr. GODDARD: What is that certain figure?] It is not in this Bill. You cannot put that in a Bill.

10.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The way in which we interpret this Section is the only way you can interpret it. Besides the normal run of servants you will have a top-flight officer. You are saying first of all that you will set up your Board and later on you will say that the Board will have its officers. You start from the Messenger up; you assume that you will have to appoint some technical man, but you cannot say that you expect to pay anybody more than $400 a month? We are saying you had better cut this $400 out of the Bill. It goes on to say: "and

on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit'' such officers and servants as it deems necessary for the proper carrying out of the provisions of this Act.'' Is it going to be deemed that it is necessary to have a technical man? I say ''yes.'' You will need to have such a man for the proper carrying out of the provisions of this Act. As soon as you introduce your Board, the first thing they have to do is to see that they get a technical expert to advise them on what developments there should be.

You go on to say: ''Provided that—

(a) no salary in excess of the rate of four thousand dollars per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee:''

I suggest that the man you are thinking of is a technical man. The salaries of the other persons you may need would be in keeping with your General Service. You are not going to sit down and say that the Board should appoint a person doing the job of a Long Grade Clerk at $300 per month. This does not apply to those persons. I ask again: is it going to be necessary to have a technical person? I say ''Yes,'' you must have that type of person. I am saying that you can take out the four thousand dollars per annum. Give the Board the opportunity of coming and discussing the thing with you. Let them come to you and say: As far as we are concerned, we can get a man who is trained in development with such and such qualifications at a salary of say £1,500 or £1,800 per annum. These are his qualifications. Does this mean a man suitable only for running the office? I submit that it does not mean that type of man. If you mean a technical man, a man with the know-how, then that is a different matter. According to the clause, first of all, the Board must deem the officer it wants as necessary; then the Governor-in-Executive Committee must say ''Yes'' to it. If the Board submit to you that it wants a technical man, say one to advise it over what change the Board wants to carry out in agriculture, it has first of all to get the man; but you say no salary shall be assigned to any post in excess of four thousand dollars per annum. I would reverse that and say ''All salaries shall be with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I say again take $4,000 per annum out and leave it at that. I think that would be a better thing to do.

I say again that it is as plain as a pikestaff, if you read it thoroughly, that it means that the salary is with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the inference is that the type of man, whatever he may be, must not get more than $4,000 per annum. An infant can see it that way. If you read it, you will see that you are not legislating for Clerks and Messengers; therefore, you are legislating for the appointment of someone with industrial experience. And if you admit that you want a man with technical experience for this top post, I am saying that you are bound to pay a salary for that post at something like $6,000 per annum. You said that you cannot get a man for this post for less than $325 per month; therefore, why put this in?

Suppose you are the Chairman of the Board and you have to make an appointment of some person for the proper running of the Board. Now, suppose you get a man at £2,000 per annum; you are bound to ask the Governor-in-Executive if it approves. If the Governor-in-Executive Committee does not approve, you cannot appoint. Why put the ceiling figure at $4,000? Do you know the danger of that? Nobody as the Bill stands now can be brought in to advise that Board at a salary of more than $325 a month.

You can take this out and whenever the Board finds a good man you can go back to the Executive Committee; that is all.

10.25 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Why is there this hesitancy in connection with the salary of the officer who is going to manage this establishment? As you are going to pay money, gratuities and pensions after this Bill has been passed, can you get some idea as to what the salary you are going to pay out will be? There can be no secrecy about the salary you are going to pay. I should like to ask the Minister of Trade at this stage: how do you intend to run this Board? Are they going to run it with a Chairman as a Boss of the show or with a Chairman plus a Secretary?

It is stupid of thinking to run an Industrial Board with the salary of the Chief Officer under $4,000 per annum. The only people you may get for $4,000 a year are political touts. I am dealing with the question as to how they intend to work this Board. If there is going to be a Secretary, is he going to be a Secretary like a Civil Servant, or a Secretary appointed by the Board? Do you mean to say that you are going to give the Board the authority to appoint persons who will have to work under the Board, but that the Executive will have the authority to appoint the personnel of the Board?

I believe the reason behind it is that the Governor-in-Executive Committee wants to know the persons to be appointed. But to give the Governor authority to appoint a person at the rate of $4,000 per annum gives rise to the question as to whether or not his salary is going to be based on the established salaries of Secretaries in the Civil Service or on whom the Board can get. That is why I should like to know whether you have any clear-cut idea as to what salary you are bound to pay out.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In reply to the honourable junior member for St. Peter he should be able to appreciate this: I do not know if he wants to know why we do not write salaries into Bills. If that is what he wants to know I can tell him that it is not customary to write salaries in a Bill. I can tell him further that we intend to have a Chairman and a high powered executive officer; a person who can advise on financial matters and give other appropriate advice to the Board.

However according to paragraph (b) of Clause 11 ''no appointment shall be made'' to such a post without prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee according to the amendment previously made. From this you will see that ultimately, it is the Governor-in-Executive Committee who appoints. In short the Governor-in-Executive Committee reserves to itself the power of refusing to sanction appointment which it might not approve for some specific reason. But what Government would refuse an appointment made by a Board unless it had some special reason. It will be a very serious consideration to refuse an appointment of an officer which the Board had recommended.

I believe that certain honourable members on the opposite side of the table are at conflicting ends; that is the junior member for Christ Church and the senior member for the City. All the senior member for the City is saying is: let the Governor-in-Executive Committee approve; but paragraph (a) of Clause 11 says: ''no salary in excess of the rate of four thousand dollars per annum shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.''

I take it that the honourable senior member for the City is saying: why put in that, and that what the junior member for Christ Church is saying is that

we should not wipe out that section altogether. But as I have said before it is a matter of principle. If you believe that this should be a self-contained ordinance, if you fundamentally believe that, then you should put your motion in accordance with that. But in my opinion this should not be a self-contained ordinance. We should have very close liaison between the Government and the Officers of the Board. That is why we say "no salary in excess" of that rate "shall be assigned to any post without the prior approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee." It does not mean that the Board cannot differ in fixing the salary of such an officer. In short it means that you can get him down at the salary set out in Clause 11 and then tell us; but you cannot put that salary above what is stipulated there unless we approve it beforehand. I see nothing conflicting in that and I see no danger. This is in accordance with the right policy and the right way in which the Board should co-operate with the Government.

Mr. GODDARD: The point I wanted to emphasise is the very one which the Government just related; that is that there should be somebody or some Executive appointed on the Board of a calibre far above the ordinary. Notwithstanding what you have heard, it can be done.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I notice that there is no provision in this Bill for the dismissal of these people. I do not know who is going to be responsible for dismissals.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I believe that that would be covered by regulations.

The question that Clause 11 *as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clauses 12 *and* 13 *were called and passed.*

10.35 p.m.

Clause 14 — *was called and passed.*

Clause 15 — *was called.*

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 15 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This Clause says:—

"The Board shall pay to each member of the Board, in respect of his office as such, if any, remuneration and allowances as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may determine and to the Chairman and to the Deputy Chairman in respect of his office as such, if any, remuneration and allowances (in addition to any remuneration of allowance to which he may be entitled in respect of his office as a member) as may be so determined."

As regards the usual practice with Boards, it looks to me as if you should limit the fees. As to these Board Meetings, like all business meetings, it is always provided that no member shall draw more than £5 per meeting; and further, it is a question of avoiding the appearance that you are paying a salary. The amount drawn by any member shall not be more than so much a year. I wonder if that matter had been ever thought of; you would not actually say that the amount should be so much.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We have considered that point. We feel that we will follow the same principle as in the case of the Public Service Commission. As regards the Public Service Commission we have a limit; and I think that Lord Reith did comment on that and he felt that there should be some limit. However, this matter will be considered further when we come to deal with the Regulations.

Mr. GODDARD: It is the common practice to pay so much per meeting or pay a salary; but if there is a question of meetings there is also the question of limiting the number of the meetings.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Will this matter come under the Regulations? To avoid paying any salary you say that the maximum which a member shall draw annually is so much and so much. The Hon. Minister has told us that they will follow the procedure in connection with the Public Service Commission; that is all well and good, but we want to make it clear when we pass the law what the position is. If the Hon Minister tells me; "We see the point and that matter will be dealt with in the Regulations" I will take my seat. You either give an assurance that they will be in the Regulations or that they will be an amendment to the Bill. What we are saying is that if we pass this Bill and it is passed by the Other Branch of the Legislature it is the law. If what I have suggested is going to be put in the Regulations then, that is all well and good.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We do not usually fix allowances in Bills.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That would not be fixing any salary; it would be just like what we have just passed. The other section says: Provided the salary does not exceed $5,000 pr annum and that was not a question of fixing any salaries.

What I have suggested is always done so as to prevent the appearance that there will be too many meetings. The Hon. Minister has said that they will work it along lines similar to those of the Public Service Commission; I submit that this matter be put in the Regulations. It is not a question of fixing fees but you are saying of what the amount should not be in excess.

10.45 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Section 11, relates to the appointment of officers and servants; Section 12 states that the Board may make Regulations and Section 15, deals with the remuneration of members.

Section 12 gives the Board power to make regulations to carry out their duties and that gives them the power to fix allowances without the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We are not saying that the Board does not have the power to fix allowances; all we are saying and we are entitled to say is that you should say that the Board should not pay, say, more than £5 per meeting and that the total remuneration should not be more than a fixed amount, if you put it at £500 or £600. You always fix that. If the Hon. Minister says that the Board is going to make regulations, all well and good.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The same thing is done with the Public Utilities Board. All that the Act says is that the members of the Board shall receive such remuneration as the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall determine. That is all that it says. The salaries, the allowances, and such things will all be put in the regulations.

The question that Clause 15 *stand part was put and agreed to without division.*

Clauses 16 *to* 24 *were then called and passed.*

Clause 25 *was called. It reads as follows:—*

"In making loans under the provisions of this Act the Board may charge such rate of interest as it may deem fit in any particular case or may grant any particular loan either wholly or partly free on interest."

Hon R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 25 stand part.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want you to explain how does this Clause compare with the Act governing interest charged in this country. [A VOICE: You cannot exceed 6%; anything under 6%.].

If you pass a Bill here to establish a Board and in the Bill you put a section saying that the Board may charge such rate of interest as it may deem fit, I am just saying that the Board should be able to lend money out at 10% or 25%. Cannot the Board do that? [A VOICE: Oh no; unless you repeal the other Act.]

I am putting this to the Hon. Minister of Trade. that you cannot lend money at more than 6% interest and you come in here and establish a Board and say that the Board may charge such rate of interest as it may deem fit; cannot that Board lend money out at 10% or 20%? I submit that the Board can do so. [A VOICE: No]. What does this mean, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the answer is 'No.'

10.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon Minister says the answer is "No". I think this wants clarifying. I am not suggesting that it is badly worded; I only think that the Section is misleading.

The question that Clause 25 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clauses 26 *to* 30 *inclusive were called and passed.*

Clause 31—was called. It reads as follows:—

31. (1) If any loan made under the provisions of this Act or any part of such loan has been misapplied the Board may —

(a) where such loan has been secured by mortgage by notice in writing addressed to the mortgagor, recall the said loan or that part together with any interest due on such loan or part thereof on the date of the notice to be repaid on a date to be specified in the notice and in default of payment on such specified date any security given for the purpose of the loan may thereupon be realised;

(b) where such loan has been secured otherwise than by way of mortgage, by notice addressed to the borrower, request the loan or any part thereof together with any interest due on such loan or part thereof on the date of the notice to be repaid on a date to be specified in the notice and in default of payment on such specified date any security given for the purpose of the loan may thereupon be realised.

(2) The provisions of sub-section (1) of this section shall be in addition to any other proceedings under any Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In this Clause the question is "misapplication of loans secured by mortgage or otherwise." This Clause is pretty strong to my mind. If you want this Board to succeed does not the Minister of Trade think that this particular Section is fairly strong.

When people borrow money for development purposes there are certain unforeseen ways in which a loan may be misapplied. Changes for instance which persons may make in their plans may hinder the progress of the industry for which they have borrowed the money. If the Hon. Minister of Trade looks at it more closely he may be able to appreciate what I am saying. I just want to hear his view on this particular section. You are getting this money for development; but as a matter of fact there are things which crop up in which you may have to make certain changes. The provisions relating to mis-applications seem very strong to me and I should like to hear the views of the Hon. Minister on them.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this is simply to safeguard your finances to the utmost. After all these are public moneys that the Board will be dealing with. I do not think that we realise that it is public moneys; otherwise the Committee would not feel that we are being too strong in doing this. Clause 31 (1) says: "If any loan made under the provisions of this Act has been misapplied. . ."

This shows that loans can be misapplied; and in that case the Board must be given power to secure its funds. Obviously while the Board has to take risks there is a limit through such risks. If it is a small sum and the Board thinks there is no harm, obviously it would not be harsh; but big sums may be involved and all that this Clause says is that where there is misapplication of these sums the Board "may" carry out the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b), sub-section (2) of Section 31. It does not say "shall", which implies that a discretion is given to the Board. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That "may" means "shall."] The purpose of the Board is dedicated to the development of industry and agriculture, and obviously some risk must be taken.

The question that Clause 31 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clauses 32 *and* 33 *were called and passed.*

Clause 34 *was called.*

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a typographical error. This occurs in line 1, of paragraph (a) sub-section 1. The "A" in "and" should not be a capital "A". I beg to move that Clause 34 stand part.

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

The question that Clause 34 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clause 35 *was called.*

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, in line 4 of sub-clause 1, the word "changed" in the phrase should be changed to read "charged".

I beg to move that Clause 35 stand part.

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

The question that Clause 35 *stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Clauses 36 *to* 41 *inclusive, were called and passed.*

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

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

The question that the CHAIRMAN do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

11.05 p.m.

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

On motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE
Concluded

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to revert to Order No. 1: to resume Committee on the Bill to consolidate the Laws of this Island relating to the Representation of the People.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee I should just like to draw this matter to attention of the Committee dealing with the saving rights of creditors, the printing of the paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) is bad. I drew that to the attention of the Clerk. I do not think that this is the sort of thing you could regard as an amendment. It is only a question of the typing, and the printing has somewhat been the same as occurs in the typing. I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with amendment

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.15 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th July, 1955

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., 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*) Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded on behalf of His Excellency the Acting Governor to lay the following:—

Report on the Training Scheme Fund for the year 1954-55.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Reply to Question No. 29 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding appointments to the Governing Body of Combermere School.

Hon M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay: Reply to Question No. 41 asked by the honourable senior member for St. Philip regarding the water main to Sam Lord's Castle.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to place the sum of $980 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 13 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Copyright Act 1915 so as to provide for the preservation of copies of books.

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

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to amend the Copyright Act, 1915 so as to provide for the preservation of copies of books was read a first time.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS BILL, 1955

Mr. SPEAKER: The first order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of the Island relating to the keeping and auditing of public accounts.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is an important Bill in the sense that we are at last, almost for three centuries I may say, getting a new and reasonable method for providing for the keeping and auditing of Governments accounts. This House has always been jealous, (perhaps more jealous) of the pre-audit system than any other public matter in the whole life of Barbados; and although at first sight, this Bill might appear to be altering the present arrangement, what it actually does is to alter the present arrangement of audit though it does not alter to such an extent as the changing of the pre-audit system.

There are two main points in this Bill. It is suggested in this Bill that the Accountant-General should do the pre-auditing instead of the Auditor-General. The effect of this change will be (if I may use a phrase of yours which has now become a historic phrase to end any slip up on the part of other departments. It will, of course, be the means of stopping up gaps, one may say, even before they are created.

At present the Auditor General does the pre-auditing. Vouchers come to him and his Department audits them and he says: "Yes, you may spend this money." After that, he checks the spending so as to see whether it was charged or probably spent by the right department. Of course, I do not know if it

has ever happened that the Auditor General wondered whether he was right on the first occasion; but as this Bill reads now, it will be the duty of the Accountant General to do the pre-auditing and the Auditor General will be free from any influence, supervision or anything else.

From the time this Bill comes into effect, neither the Governor, the Attorney General, or anybody else will have the slightest right to tell the Auditor General what he should do. In short, he will be, for the first time, deserving of the title which has so often being used in this House of him; that is "the watch dog of this House." The fact is that he would be checking up, not on his department, but to see whether the public funds have been rightly spent according to the Resolutions of this House.

I do not know if there is anything more I can say. Those are the two points in the Bill. The Accountant General will do the pre-audit before the money is spent and the Auditor General will check up on the spending afterwards. In case of wrong spending, the Head of the Department is liable, except in a general way. Where the Head of the Department may do something which he should not have done probably Government might say: "Try and don't let it happen again." Any question of overspending comes out of his pocket. There is provision in the present law whereby he will not get his money at the end of the month until he has accounted for all the money entrusted to his care.

3.25 p.m.

We have left that out in this new Bill because it is capable of two interpretations. It is capable of a strict interpretation which might be unfair and unreasonable. I am told, for instance, that some people are not able to pay their fees at the General Hospital when they have to be paid. Accounting means that every cent due to the Government has to be paid in, otherwise the Head of the Department would not get his salary.

I, for one as a lawyer, would know that accounting for money due to the Government is to be able to say so and so owes two or three hundred pounds another person owes so much and so on; but it is unnecessary to keep that stipulation on the Statute Book with its ambiguity. I think I have said all that is necessary; but if there is any specific point to be given in answer to honourable members I would be glad to give it.

Honourable members will see that for the first time we have set out in detail the specific duties of the Accountant General and the Auditor General. The Accountant General must supervise receipts, supervise expenditure, bring promptly to account, charge promptly to account etc. and submit detailed statements given as in the same way that the annual statement is submitted by the Accountant General and the Auditor General to this House. In this new Bill we have endeavoured to make it as far as possible a safe and efficient system, whereby the public accounts of this island may be kept in an up-to-date way.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Other Place has now adjourned to meet us. At this stage in view of the arrangements that we have made for the purpose of meeting members of the United Kingdom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in conjunction with honourable members of the Other Place, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for one hour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn for one hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

3.35 p.m.

On re-assembling:

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS BILL—*C'td.*

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was debating the motion for the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this island relating to the keeping and auditing of Public Accounts.

The honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I regard this Bill as a very important one. Although I did not hear all the remarks of the Hon. Premier in introducing this Bill, I still feel that he was too brief in dealing with such an important matter. We have in this island carried on the pre-audit system in the payment of our accounts and I think we have got some benefit from it. We have not got in this island the record of the loss of money that we read of too frequently in some islands and occasionally in others; and I have always heard that we can credit ourselves with not having these losses, because we have adopted this pre-audit system.

Now, there is one thing that you might expect to hear against the pre-audit system: that people have been delayed unduly in their collection of the accounts from the Government. I do not think that that charge can be brought against the Audit Department; and recently, sir, to bolster this system as I think, we have authorised a method of petty cash to the extent of $240 or $250 at a time for those departments which do a certain amount of housekeeping, like the General Hospital, the Mental Hospital and some other departments which deal with the sending of telegrams and petty cash of that sort. I think that when we agreed to that, we were consolidating the system which we had.

The Hon. Premier has of course said that this is absolutely nothing to do with changing from the pre-audit to the post-audit system. I suspect that if it is not intended at the present to be a complete change, it is undoubtedly not only the thin end of the wedge, but I think the wedge will have already gone in half way if this Bill is passed.

The first question I would like to ask, is whether this Bill has the blessing of the Auditor General of this colony. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Yes] So far as his opinion is as given to the Government, if he has given it his blessing, it would be a good thing for the members of this House and the people of this colony to hear it. I would be glad to hear that that can be said; because the very last sentence in Clause two of the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill attempts to flatter the Auditor General by saying this: "The result of the proposed change will be, therefore, to enhance the power of the Auditor General and ensure his complete independence."

I regard that as sheer flattery; I do not know how it is taken by the Officer to whom it refers. If this Bill is passed, I suspect that the Auditor General will ask questions about things and have a large

number of questions from various departments piling up; and they will reach a stage where they will be like questions asked in this House, where you cannot get answers to those questions when they could easily be given.

It has been the experience of people in other islands working under the complete post-audit system that that state of affairs has resulted. I am at a loss to see how it is possible for the Accountant General to do the pre-audit which is intended to be done without having the audit office staff transferred to his department. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We are going to transfer them.] Are you going back to the Audit Department when the checking has to be done there? Are they going to do both the pre-audit and the post-audit? It appears to me that these two offices, which should be kept far apart, will get too much entangled.

At present the Accountant General pays out the money and the Auditor General is supposed to see that vouchers submitted for payment of public accounts are checked for accuracy as to the amounts, and that there is money under the Heads for which the vouchers are claimed; I regard that as an ideal system. It is true that after the accounts are finally audited a situation may be created by the Audit Department discovering that the department itself has made a mistake in passing a voucher that might have been blocked; and it is in order to ask the question: Would the Auditor General be disposed to question himself and show himself up? I think that from the calibre of the men we have had occupying that post they will do it.

I am not saying that this is an idea of condition, but then the moneys are voted by this House. These votes are not paid out at random, and any body who cares to do so can look through the accounts at the end of a period although it will be a long time after the period has ended, and you can see what has taken place. I do not like the idea of the cashier checking the accounts and being solely responsible up to that point for the amount which has to be paid out.

For many years this House reserved for itself the right to appoint what is now the Accountant General. At that time he was known as the Colonial Treasurer and Store-keeper of the island. This appointment was taken out of the hands of the House; and soon after that happened we had a loss of money in the Treasury. I do not say that that was in any way connected with the change in the method of appointment; because it took place at the time when there was a withdrawal of currency notes and the issue of territorial notes; and it might have induced someone skilled in the art to take advantage of the position at the time.

I do not think that we have lost money in maintaining the system of pre-audit; no matter its disadvantages. We are now experimenting; and I do not know where we are in this matter. We are on the threshold of a Federated British West Indies and we might find ourselves as being the only island with a pre-audit system and they might wish to compel us to change. Like they said that we must have a retiring age the same as the other colonies.

I think from the relationship of this House and the Accountant General's Office, I would say that a Bill of this sort should be referred to a Select Committee of this House, and that Committee should be interested enough as to visit these departments and have demonstrated to them how this new method is going to work. In theory it might be quite alright. Hon. members may know nothing about accounting and checking of accounts, but I believe that with a certain amount of commonsense of the change in a practical way, hon. members would have their fears put to an end, or at least they would be able to vote for a Bill of this nature more intelligently than they could possibly vote for it now.

5.20 p.m.

That, sir, would be a good recommendation if this House would adopt it; and I intend, at least, to propose it. This House is very thin at the moment and I cannot say, except for one special instance, that there is any reason that it should be thin. I cannot plead that hon. members did not know that this Bill would be considered today, because it is put down as the first item on the Order Paper. It is true that Government only decided that last Thursday, but hon. members should have known that it would have been considered the first thing today and I think they should realise that this is an important Bill.

Sir, there is a fear that we are being enticed along certain lines in our accounting system so that we may reach a point where it would be easy to apply a colonial audit system to this colony; and I do not think that it is going to be relished by many people if that day does arise. I would like to see exactly what would be the position of the Auditor General then if, of course, we have one at all.

In the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, we are told that in 1953, Mr. J. W. Foster, Organisation and Methods Adviser, carried out a survey of the structure and organisation of the Treasury and Audit Departments. Now, sir, you have heard me in this House before say that suspicion was cast on Mr. Foster's activities out here because he concentrated on these two offices. He is a great man on Organisation and Methods. We collect our revenue from income tax and customs. He came to Barbados to advise us on organisation and methods and those are the two offices—the Income Tax Department and the Customs — which he should have visited but—I do not know if he was ever told where they were. I have criticised that already in here. We were merely told that he would look into the organisation and methods of certain departments. One would expect that Mr. Foster would have come to advise us as to the best methods we should adopt as regards the collecting of our revenue. He did nothing of the kind. He concentrated on the Auditor General's Office and the Accountant General's Office.

Sir, we have never debated or adopted his proposals as he reported them. We have got them in here piecemeal; that is, whatever of them would suit the Government, they took them out of the report and brought them in here and said that it was a recommendation of Mr. Foster. This is another piece of his report. We have never dealt with his recommendations comprehensively so as to know exactly what the Government desired to accept and what they would not accept. This is the method they have adopted of dealing with his report and it is very unsatisfactory indeed.

As I have said, sir, I do not like this method. It is one that is fraught with difficulties and dangers. We have our system of accounting already working here and nobody is inconvenienced in getting Government to pay him his debt. I do not think the greatest critic of our system would charge that any such thing has occurred with our Audit Department. That department does facilitate the

payment of money and along with that, every year the Clerks in that Department have cast upon them some new department and other things coming in from, such as emancipated Boards being turned into Government Departments, and you have never heard of any great increase in staff; so I think the staff of that Department have performed a miracle in coping with those new duties thrown upon them; and so far, I have heard of no complaint.

There is just this method of someone coming from outside and pointing out to you that the Auditor General is checking in the final analysis on his own work. The question is whether you should attach all that weight to it and which does appear on the surface to be doubtful.

I do not think there is any great hurry for this Bill. It can be got through in time for the next financial year which begins in April 1956. I think this is one piece of legislation which the House should take seriously and one which the Government should accede to the wishes even of the minority, and not rush it through. Government should give honourable members the opportunity to have it investigated on the spot by a Select Committee even if you put a date on the time when that Committee should report.

Those are my feelings on the Bill and I have no doubt that they are the feelings of other honourable members. I do feel that the pre-audit system has great advantages which you can never get in any up-to-date post-audit method; and no matter how many independent checks you may make, you will find that your money is already paid out. You would merely be able to go around apportioning blame without any proper redress.

Even with the pre-audit system we have from time to time in this House and in recent years detected that money has been paid out from one head to another without the full authorisation of the House. I think those are serious things which we do not take very seriously. All that we say is that the money was spent in the interest of the island and that is the end of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as if this new post-audit system that we have here is the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge to get at somebody.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this amendment springs from a report by Mr. Foster dealing with organisations and methods. You would have expected that according to what one reads from this report on such a subject, that Government would have adopted some method whereby the House would have had the opportunity of dealing with Mr. Foster's report.

My criticism is that the Government has not adopted any method. This higgledy-piggledy manner is very regrettable because at no stage at all had the Government, at any single moment, indicated to the House that it had any intention of debating that Report. But when you get these accidental bits of legislation coming from the Government, it means that you have to have these amendments. The Government is not convinced that the post-audit system is a bad system. You are removing the pre-audit system. It is not a question of removing the pre-audit system and putting it in the hands of the Accountant General. He is a cashier and his job is to pay out under the legislation that is being passed. You are removing that and you are going to have the system like any of the other Crown Colony Governments where there is the post-audit system.

Now under the conditions in the past, our predecessors were very cautious about public expenditure; today it does not seem that we are going to be as cautious as they were. In dealing with money, especially with people's money, you have to be able to account for every penny of it to the last farthing. What is the difference in the administration of the pre-audit and the post-audit system? There are some officials who have come here in recent years who are opposed to the pre-audit and the post-audit system. This is no Government's policy, no political or administration policy; but it is one of those administrative ideas that have permeated the minds of those who do not pay much attention to financial and accounting matters; and that is what has happened today.

When Mr. Foster came here it was drawn to his attention and he made certain recommendations. More money has been stolen under the system which we are now about to adopt than under the one which we had before. One of the ideas that have persisted in Barbados is that we have had less thieves under the old system; and it is a fact that there has been more embezzlement in colonies without our system than with the system that we now intend to adopt.

Sometimes you can be unique and sometimes you can be antiquated. Moreover, why should any government, having a report like Mr. Foster's (and this is not the only report which deals with financial matters) refuse to let the public and the Legislature know what the public funds have been paid for? There is too much suggesting that when you have a private report you can treat it as you like. Now that Mr. Foster has come here, we should know what are his views. He has made recommendations for other departments of Government; what are his views on them?

You gave the House no opportunity to discuss the Report. But I am one of those believers in the old system; in the system that we now have; because, in my opinion, it has served to keep more men out of trouble. Honourable members know that to human beings, with all their frailties, money is very precious and very tempting; and you cannot guard it too much. Sometimes people are not bent on embezzlement; but if opportunities are opened to them, if they have rather easy means of getting it, they will get it, and then we hear nothing more about it.

Recently, we have lost three thousand dollars. That had to be considered as nothing; that was just a matter of the notes being stolen. Any system that you intend to change you must be very satisfied with it before doing so; the proposed system leads to corruption; and is so open that people can make use of it for improper purposes.

I am of the opinion that our present system is a better system because the whole object of the pre-audit system is to keep a proper safeguard over the money that comes from the Treasury. Mr. Foster expressed a certain opinion; I did not share the opinion of the hon. junior member for the City that outside opinions have been sought. Sometimes the statement is made in the House that they have sought the opinion of 'so-and-so'. I do not subscribe to it. If you are going to act on the basis of what the Civil Service agrees to do, then you may as well go home and let the Civil Service run the Government. The only thing that has made me a little worried is that it seems that the more we evolve towards self-government, the more the elements of Crown Colony system are being employed in our administration.

It is true that in those days you had no Financial Secretary, it is true you had no Accountant General; although today the relation between the

Financial Secretary and the Accountant General cannot be so clearly defined, because it seems to me that they are two civil servants dealing with money from two different quarters. It is true that today we have a Financial Secretary and an Accountant General who are carrying the same names as in big territories. Are they getting more things done? You have no Economic Advisers and we should like to know if the Financial Secretary is head of the Finance Department.

5.40 p.m.

The Financial Secretary in some territories, is the post of the Accountant General. It seems as if in this Bill we are changing from the pre-audit system because it has outlived its usefulness; it has not served the colony well and therefore we are changing it. It is suggested here that you should change the system, but you are only changing persons; you are removing duties from the Audit office to the Accountant General's Office. The Accountant General is the chief cashier of the island.

I think it is a dangerous system to have a man paying out money and also doing something else, because if corruption takes place, the second phase will be more serious. You will know how much money has been stolen only after it has been stolen.

I do not want what I say to be a reflection on the honesty of a Civil Servant, but when you are dealing with money you have to keep a rigid control. I believe that you cannot be too rigid in any control which you keep on money. My experience is that you have to keep a most rigid control on money no matter whom you are dealing with.

Do not allow any system to lend itself to the goodness of human beings. You must always think that a man is liable to do the wrong thing; therefore, I am a believer in the old system. If it is antiquated it has served the colony well; and I am a bit skeptical of taking the chief accountant and make him head of a pre-audit system, in that it is the same source which will be paying out money.

I do not believe that you will find any money in the Audit Department other than what is found in the pockets of the clerks who work there. Barbados is one of the few colonies of the old Colonial Empire that is still one of the original Representative Governments. All the other colonies were Crown colonies and the system that the Crown wanted in each colony prevailed; that is why a similar system was adopted.

I feel that if good reasons have been given why this old system has not served us well, then by all means change it. If the old system has served the colony well then why are we changing it? Because somebody said it should be changed? Is it preventing the accounting of money in the proper manner? I repeat that if this system has not served the island well then by all means let us change it; but nobody has said that the pre-audit has let down the island.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not think that I should fail to reply to honourable members. The last honourable member who spoke could not possibly have read either the Bill or the "Objects and Reasons," because nobody reading them could have made the speech which he has made.

The honourable member speaks of our changing the system and he says that more theft has taken place in another colony different from this; he says that we are doing wrong by changing the system. We are not changing any system; except by a system he means that we are having two people instead of one looking after our accounts.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member is accusing people of not being capable of reading. Did I not say that?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In the other colonies there is no pre-audit system. You spend money and the Auditor General comes along and checks. Not one cent is spent in Barbados today until the Auditor General says "Yes, it may be spent; the House of Assembly has voted it under such and such a head and you cannot spend it under any other head."

After the money has been spent, he sees whether it was properly spent. We say that he might make a mistake; and in spite of the saintly attitude of life with which the honourable junior member for the City has endowed people, Auditor Generals are still human beings. The Auditor General is hardly likely to say that he has made a mistake.

What should the House have done when Mr Scott-Bushe spent money before it was voted by the House; he repaired a road on which money was not authorised to be spent. If today the Head of a Department makes a mistake, the most that can happen is that the Government will say; "You must be more careful in future," and if he makes another mistake we promote him. You remove him to another colony.

Now we are saying that the checking is to be done by the Accountant General to see that the money will be spent under the proper head; and the checking is to be done by the Auditor General to see that it has been spent on the proper head and that it has not been spent otherwise.

5.50 p.m.

We go one step farther. We are surcharging the Head of the Department. We have the sanction of the law that he does not get his money at the end of the month until he has accounted for money voted to his Department. If the Director of Highways and Transport or any other Head of Department overspends, he pays for it out of his own pocket. He has to pay it. [A VOICE: Has he got it?] At least, he gets a year's salary; and we can still collect it from his credits if he drops dead. I say again. instead of putting the Auditor General in the embarrassing position of doing both jobs, let him do one.

The honourable junior member for the City said that we are overdoing it when we say we are enhancing the power of the Auditor General. Whether it be the Governor, the Attorney General. or anybody else, it is the Auditor General who will have to say, no matter who gets vexed: "You have done a wrong; you have spent more than what you should have spent; the Accountant-General made a mistake in letting it pass and I am going to inform the Governor-in-Executive Committee that the money must be paid back." [A VOICE: But how when the Governor-in-Executive Committee makes a mistake?] Well, in the long hereafter, they will be turned out of power by the Opposition; but they are not really to make a mistake.

I say again that we are not changing the pre-audit system. The honourable junior member for the City made use of the words pre-audit and post audit. Frankly, they should not be used in the same connection.

The honourable member talked about people coming here and telling you to do something. We know that a Mr. G. H. Adams, C.B.E., came here and strongly recommended getting rid of our pre-audit system and we did not take any notice of what he advised. We said "No." Mr. Foster came and he has said to keep a pre-audit but do not put the

Auditor General in the embarrassing position of checking up on himself.

The Objects and Reasons say that the Bill seeks to re-allocate the respective duties of the Auditor General and the Accountant General and to re-define their responsibilities in the light of Mr. Foster's recommendations generally. These duties and responsibilities are prescribed in principle in the Bill, while power is given for the making of Rules (which form a schedule to the Bill) in which detailed provisions respecting the responsibilities and liabilities of accounting officers and Heads of Departments are set out.

As honourable members will see, when they read the Rules, it is a general all-round tightening up.

There were one or two other points made. I find it difficult to follow the honourable junior member for the City when he said something about the thin edge of the wedge. What can be more farcical? We are saying, far from getting rid of the pre-audit system, we are tightening it up. Even the very point made about money is in the law today. We are tightening that up by saying: "Will you please pass this Bill now whereby money can be got back from the Head of the Department if he overspends?"

The honourable member has the most versatile brain. It may be an excellent thing when he suggests we should send this Bill to a Select Committee so that honourable members can walk in the two Departments and ask questions. May be, it is a good thing to take a child around to look at works but is it always a good thing for Parliament to look at works? I would suggest that he make that recommendation on another occasion.

I am not saying that I am not trying at all to see such arguments as may have been made, but I do assure both honourable members that I have never in my life in this Assembly or outside of it come across any Barbadian in favour of abolishing the pre-audit system. This Government knows that officials who have been accustomed to other systems of accounting have come here and said: "Why do you not change your pre-audit system; it is so difficult to get things done. We have somebody here to pay three cents to, but because there is no provision, we have to come to you to get that three cents. You have no sum of money left to be spent at the discretion of the Financial Secretary."

We are proud to know that you have to come here for the expenditure of three cents and we are not changing it; although we are not so absurd as we used to be, say like what we did when we put in these lights in this House of Assembly. All these things might appear ridiculous from time to time, but it is part of the traditional habit of Barbadians to be very cautious about spending money.

Barbadians for 300 years have been telling Governors: "You are birds of passage; you come here and spend our money and you are gone." We respect that traditional carefulness about the expenditure of money and therefore, we are preserving the pre-audit system. I can say no more.

I suggest to honourable members that we can very well pass this Bill this afternoon.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker: "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

6.00 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I have had no support that this Bill should go to a Select Committee.

There is a difference between the curiosity of a child looking into the back of a watch and some big person being childish about a watch; and I think that is the position with this Bill. However, it is quite obvious that some members have swallowed the bait and they do not think it is worthwhile to examine this system which has been in existence for centuries. It does not occur to them to retain the pre-audit system. I have made the motion that it be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak

Mr. SPEAKER : Has the honourable senior member for the City seconded the motion?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes.

The question that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the negative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker that the "Noes" have it.

The question that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called it reads as follows:—

3. The Accountant General shall be the chief accounting officer of the government and shall have the general management and supervision of the cash transaction and accounting operations of the government subject to the provisions of this Act and to such instructions as may be prescribed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We have had to take into consideration the Accountant General's Act and we have had to take the Auditor General's Act in arriving at these duties. The detailed list is set out in such a way as to prevent all possibility or to enable the Accountant General to see that no hanky-panky can be played with the Government's money. This Clause consists only of a few lines; but it makes the matter quite clear.

The Governor-in-Executive Committee may prescribe from time to time specific things. For instance, I understand that at the time of the enquiry of the stolen Banknotes the Accountant General felt that he could not call on certain Departments to produce certain documents. Well, that will never happen again Actually we give specific power in this Bill to call on all Departments to give information.

Although section 3 seems brief, you will realise that if there are thieves it will be easier to trace them. There may be overspending; but nobody can prevent thieves from stealing. I think it is said that in Heaven one of the angels did not do the things he was supposed to do and therefore he had to leave

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 15 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Schedule stand part of the Bill. The Schedule contains the Rules setting out the functions and duties of the Accountant General in paragraph 3. He must supervise receipts of public revenue, supervise expenditure etc.

Then the duties of the Auditor General are set out in paragraph 4. This deals with deposits etc.

A most detailed study of the several duties are set out here in this Bill. For instance take No. 7 (vii). It says that stores should be duly supplied and properly accounted for. There may be stores from abroad in which case he has to see that they having reached Barbados safely, are properly kept. What stores are used must be accounted for, and what stores are not used you must be able to see in the storing yard. It is made much easier for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to see that as much tightening up as possible should be done.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 4

Surveyor Draughtsman H. & T.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: "To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) No. 4 Order, 1955".

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if honourable members will read the Addendum they will see that following on the decision to build the approach roads to the Deep Water Harbour, it has become necessary for us to make a survey.

6.10 p.m.

The Department of Highways & Transport had a Surveyor Draughtsman who has been transferred to the Waterworks Department. With these new roads which are being built, inasmuch as the Department of Highways and Transport has now been denied of a Surveyor Draughtsman it is necessary, with the amount of work which has to be done, to have this officer. This is what is stated in the Addendum to this Resolution: "It is considered that the status of the present post of junior Surveyor Draughtsman which was created with effect from the 1st April, 1954, is not commensurate with the duties and responsibilities which devolve on the holder of the post. The range and volume of surveying work undertaken compare favourably with those performed by the Surveyor Draughtsman in the Waterworks Department (Salary $1,920 x $120 — 2,880 x 144—3,456)."

I will not worry to read the Addendum any further because honourable members can see for themselves. We are constructing a road up the Pickwick Gap down by the Badley's property into Westbury Road and a great amount of surveying has to be done. This is one of the approach roads to the harbour in addition to the approach roads which we have already done. We have already voted money for constructing roads at Welches and so on.

The House can see that it is essential to have a Surveyor Draughtsman whose duty is not less than that of the Surveyor Draughtsman at the Waterworks Department; and he should not be in a scale different from that of the officer in that Department. The object of this Resolution is to approve the Order ensuring that position. I repeat that this post should be filled at this salary. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to ask the Premier something. On an occasion once before when we were discussing the appointment of a Junior Surveyor Draughtsman at the Department of Highways and Transport, there was some discussion as to whether this was a Survey Draughtsman or a Surveyor Draughtsman. That question seems to have been settled now.

As far as I am concerned, it is because of my vocation that I made these remarks. I like to see able men get promotion, but I want to make this point clear: there is a feeling that they are persons occupying positions, persons who are not qualified in the sense of holding the qualifications necessary which the law of this island demands that they should hold.

The Hon. Premier has mentioned that it is necessary to have this Surveyor Draughtsman since there has been a transfer from this Department to the Waterworks Department where it is absolutely necessary to have a qualified person for the work in hand. In cases where you are going to carry out survey lines between the Government Highways and the people's property, you may get difficulties arising about testing these cases in Court. The Government has not yet amended the law, and with a person who has not served as a sworn Surveyor his evidence is not acceptable in Court. I think the honourable junior member for St. George raised the point in this House. I listened on that occasion, but on this occasion it has been rumoured that persons not possessing the prescribed regulations to be registered as Sworn Land Surveyors have been promoted to certain posts.

I hear *sotto voce* the name of Mr. Harris called; I do not know if we realise how many people actually suffered in the country as a result of some juggling between the Registration Office and Lawyers and others responsible when non-qualified men slip on the Roll of Surveyors and cause much damage and suffering to the people. In this Resolution, this is what is stated.

"The range and volume of surveying work undertaken compare favourably with those performed by the Surveyor-Draughtsman in the Waterworks Department (Salary $1,920. 1,920 x 120—2,880 x 144—3,456). The Department of Highways and Transport, which is at present without a surveyor, will be required to undertake immediate surveys for the provision of road facilities in connection with the construction of the deep water harbour. . . ."

I want to say this: a surveyor must be a surveyor, I do not know from the phraseology used in this Resolution if this surveyor is a registered person. I repeat for the benefit of honourable members who may think that this is anything personal against anybody employed in the service from getting promotion, I have no axe to grind. Let me say this: any surveyor who is worth his salt would laugh at this salary.

I warn the Government that if you are surveying a line between the Government's highways and people's property you are bound to find some people testing out the areas and so on; and the only persons qualified to give that evidence in a Court of arbitration would be persons who are registered under that Act as Sworn Surveyors.

6.20 p.m.

I repeat, sir, that by some means, by some juggling, and some practices, an alleged Surveyor got on the Roll of Surveyors of this colony. We hope that a similar occurrence would not happen in this case. There is a feeling that persons holding certificates other than the recognised prescribed certificates as laid down in the laws of this country, and

who have not gone through the front door for acquiring those certificates, are being groomed and favoured for certain jobs. I do not think that is a right thing to do. If you take it from a professional point of view, you better suggest that anybody taking a Solicitor's examination which is not the one prescribed by the law, should also go on the Roll of Solicitors.

As I see it, you do need this Surveyor Draughtsman in the Department of Highways and Transport; and I suppose you are bound to have this officer; but I throw this out to the Government, lest you repeat what happened to Mr. Harris here: I counsel Government to be very careful in this matter, although I am fully aware that it is not for the Minister to make the appointment. I am counselling Government not to accept persons who have qualifications other than those prescribed by the law; neither should you allow persons holding unprescribed qualifications to use their influence on the Government or the Public Service Commission. If that is done, it is absolutely wrong.

The laws of this country say how a Surveyor should be qualified before he is registered. That being so, you can have no end of trouble as you have had in the past, by accepting an unqualified person on the Roll of Surveyors. You have had a person on the Roll doing work which he was incapable of doing. Anybody can draw four straight lines. A lot of people can draw and show a very pretty plan but they cannot compute it properly.

I remember well the remarks I have made in here on a previous occasion about a similar instance. When the word "Surveyor" was used, it was contended that it was not necessary that the person should be a qualified Surveyor. That was the explanation given and that was the reason why a number of honourable members backed down from the arguments they had put up against the Order. In this case you have presented to the Legislature of this colony, backed up by some influence on another occasion and by bits of paper which show that at some night colleges either in America or in England or some other place, persons have taken correspondence courses. Nearly everybody can do that. When they produce that piece of paper, they are accepted on the Roll. If that is the case, you can accept solicitors or doctors trained by that method. You might cause a lot of confusion if you adopt that practice; you might even cause murder when you get a Surveyor who does not know what he is doing. Therefore, it behoves you when you are admitting persons to be placed on the register of Surveyors to see that they are qualified persons.

There is absolutely no reason why any particular individual should be picked out because they took out a correspondence course and be placed on the Roll of Surveyors, whether that person is in or outside of the Government Service. What is worse is for that person or anybody else to use his influence on the Registrar or the Public Service Commission. I have confidence in the Hon. Premier and I hope he will see to it.

I remember very well, as a member of the Housing Board, seeing very beautiful draughting by a man in the Service; but the law is that you can only put a plan up to the Board of Health which has been sworn to by a qualified Surveyor to append his signature to plans drawn by that person.

The bad practice of the Housing Board was to ask that young man to draft all the plans for them and then carry them to the Surveyor Draughtsman at the Waterworks Department and ask him to append his signature. I think it was a dishonest practice and one which was enough to cause the Surveyor in the Government Service to be struck off the Roll. I objected to one of such plans then, and I drew it to the attention of the General Board of Health warning them not to accept that plan. Because the Housing Board could not get that plan considered by the General Board of Health, the Housing Board intimidated the Surveyor at the Waterworks Department to sign that plan and actually offered him £5. [A VOICE: How could they be so stupid?] I know you cannot believe that they would be so stupid to do that.

Sir, what is the point in demanding that people be qualified and causing them to burn midnight oil in order to be qualified and then you are going to say, because somebody can use his influence on you, that because somebody took a correspondence course from some night school or college somewhere, that that person is qualified. You are bound to agree with me when I say that it is not right. [A VOICE: I agree with all that you have said.]

Sir, I am asking this House to wait and it will see that Government is going to appoint somebody as Surveyor Draughtsman who possesses no qualification and who cannot be put on the records of this colony. I am going to wait and see if the Public Service Commission would be so dishonest as to appoint that person. It would be rank dishonesty if that Commission make such an appointment after hearing this debate, and after knowing what has been said, to pitchfork that person as a Surveyor Draughtsman.

You do need a qualified Surveyor to make drawings of the areas of somebody else's boundaries and yourself. Now that the Deep Water Harbour is coming into being, you will want somebody to make out accurately a plan of somebody's land coming down through Goodland and thereabouts; and I am going to suggest that you do not want somebody who is merely able to draw or make sketches.

I repeat that in my 25 years of experience in such matters, I have never seen anybody who could produce a prettier plan than Mr. Harris who was once employed at the Department of Highways and Transport. They were beautiful to look at but everything was in equal lines; everything was in feet. So it may be in this case.

I am counselling the Government if you are encouraging people to be qualified and if you have an Act which says that they must be qualified before they can be put on the Roll, to aim at that. You cannot ask people to get qualified and then let in your friends through the backdoor, be they Civil Servants or anybody else. All of us who are parents have to try and get our children qualified. I am sure not one of you would like to have children who are qualified and then to see that somebody who is not qualified is taken on to do what your child was qualified to do. This thing is wrong in principle.

6.30 p.m.

There is a difference between a Survey Draughtsman and a Surveyor Draughtsman; if the honourable member follows what I mean. I hope the Hon. Premier will follow this: there is a difference between a survey draughtsman and a surveyor draughtsman; because the Addendum says that "the range and volume of surveying work undertaken compare favourably with those performed by the Surveyor-Draughtsman in the Waterworks Department."

It appears to me that to go to the Registrar, and take along somebody and then register them, can be called by no other name than rank dishonesty. I hope that what I have said will be taken seriously up by the Hon. Premier; and that

it will not necessitate my having to come back to the House and saying to the Government that the Hon. Premier had said that the man must be qualified and now an unqualified man has been appointed. That, as the Hon. Premier knows, would bring an upset in this colony.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I think that we are so near to the last debate that we can remember all that took place. On that occasion I warned the Hon. Minister of Communications and he attempted to give an explanation to this matter. I am going to say now that the person whom I said would receive this post is a person—

However, I think I had better read the Addendum before going further. It states: "The Order entitled The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1955" has been laid in the Legislature.

This Resolution is to give legislative effect to the Order which, provides for the substitution of a post of Surveyor-Draughtsman — salary $1,920 — 3,456 — for the present post of Junior Surveyor Draughtsman—$600 — 2,280—in the Department of Highways and Transport.

It is considered that the status of the present post of Junior Surveyor Draughtsman which was created with effect from 1st April, 1954, is not commensurate with the duties and responsibilities which devolve on the holder of the post. The range and volume of surveying work undertaken compare favourably with those performed by the Surveyor Draughtsman in the Waterworks Department (salary $1,920. 1,920 x 120—2,880 x 144—3,456)."

When we were debating that matter, I asked the Minister of Communications if they had someone in the Department whom they wanted to appoint to the post and I was shilly-shallied; that is, I was not given a definite answer. I also enquired from them as to where they are going to get a person to be a Surveyor Draughtsman. That was done on the eve of these last Estimates. Now to-day, what is the position? The Minister of Communications has come back to the House saying that this is the same post; and that you have now upgraded this post because you say that it necessitates putting the present holder of this office in a higher grade.

To that I have no objection; but I am not so dumb as not to know that when we were dealing with this matter you had a man who was not then qualified; but as soon as he has become qualified it is a different matter. That, in my opinion, is creating a post for a person. The young man who has worked in the Department of Highways and Transport was accorded a post and in less than six months you have justified this salary.

In the Addendum to the Resolution you will see this: "It is considered that the status of the present post of Junior Surveyor Draughtsman which was created with effect from 1st April, 1954, is not commensurate with the duties and responsibilities which devolve on the holder of the post." When I counselled the Minister of Communications he replied that this was the same salary as that of some other post. Now this is the same post that we passed money for in the 1955—56 Estimates.

I know the present holder. The present holder of this post is an individual I have nothing against; but I hold that a matter of such importance should not have been dealt with in that manner; because the honourable member must know that if you are asking that this post be upgraded to the present salary, it is not in the best interest of everyone to have it said that you did have to create that post. The honourable member knows that the Deep Water Harbour could not be regarded as a red-herring.

I should like to suggest Mr. Speaker, that you get the debate on this matter because I want to bring the Minister of Communications down to what he said in answer to my remarks about this post of Surveyor Draughtsman. I said that it was not the best thing to create this post at a low salary in order to give it to someone. But we live in a small community; the young man was over there working and I think they were right to give it to this man. But this is not the best way to run Government's affairs, because as soon as you run affairs like that you open the way for Civil Servants to say that you are dealing out certain posts.

6.40 p.m.

If you look at the Waterworks Head in the Estimates you will see this post of Surveyor Draughtsman. I asked the question as to the difference between that post and the other post, and the reply was given that a Surveyor Draftsman meant that he is not necessarily a Surveyor and there was slight difference made between these two posts.

It was pointed out that you could not get a qualified man to accept the job at that salary and the assurance was given that it was quite in order. Now, in less than 18 months you come back to the House and ask the House to change it. This method will only make the Civil Servants feel that you are taking certain posts to give salaries, but other people have to wait until a crisis takes place.

Hon. M. E. COX: If it had not been for the remarks made by the last two speakers I would not have said anything on this Resolution; but since it was made to appear that when we dealt with the post of Junior Surveyor Draughtsman in the Estimates of 1954, it was a matter of helping some unqualified person, I think I should make my position clear as to the question of appointments, dismissals and things of that sort.

Every honourable member, more particularly the honourable junior member for St. Peter, knows that where appointments are concerned the members of the Government have little or nothing to do with them.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. The Hon. Minister cannot quote me as saying that he has something to do with appointments. I will repeat what I said when this post was being dealt with. I said that this salary cannot attract qualified men; and since there was a man in the Department of Highways & Transport, it appeared to me that you were creating a post for a man and I did not agree with that.

The honourable member has said that they have nothing to do with appointments to posts, but eventually that same person was appointed to the post. I am dealing with the principle; the salary attached to the post was fixed by law.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure that everybody who listened to the debate or any knowledgeable person, must come to the conclusion that the influence of some member connected with the Government had something to do with this particular case. The Head of the Department can say to the Chief Secretary: "I need a Draughtsman; I need a Clerk, Messenger. or whatever it is." After that, the proposal is put up to the Government who agrees or disagrees as the case may be. If the matter is agreed to an order is brought down to this House and when that order is passed, the Public Service Commission selects the individual for the post and recommends to the Governor that that individual be appointed to the post.

I would like to make that point crystal clear. There are too many misleading statements made in this House which tend to make the people believe that one uses his position in trying to help people in getting jobs. If I remember correctly, the individual who was appointed to this post served for three years in a temporary appointment in the Department of Highways & Transport under Mr. Skinner who was the then Director . As soon as the present Director came and he evaluated the services of his staff, he recommended to the Government that this post should be made a permanent one. He said that this post was too important a post as not to be a permanent one; and that recommendation was agreed to by the Government.

The salary which came before the House was fixed by the Public Service Commission; it was recommended by the Public Service Commission to the Government and the Government accepted it. I myself felt that the salary was too low, but it was the recommendation of the Public Service Commission which the Government accepted.

I have never said on the floor of this House tha' there was any similar post in any other department; I know of no other Junior Surveyor Draughtsman in any other department.

6.50 p.m.

I know of a Draughtsman and also a Supervisor Draughtsman; I did not know of a Junior Surveyor Draughtsman, so I did not follow this post as well as perhaps I could, if it were fixed along the lines even suggested by the member.

I want it to be made crystal clear that it was not a question of my deciding what salary should be attached to this post; neither have I decided who should be appointed to this post.

Surely, if a Head of a Department recommends to the Public Service Commission somebody after having a thorough knowledge and evaluation of the person's work and says that person is a suitable person to fill the post, I would like to see any layman who knows absolutely nothing of it having the temerity to say that person is not suitable. If your Head of Department who is a technical man tells you that this is a suitable man, this is a man who has been doing all the survey work, all the drafting and all that is required in that line at that Department for over five years,—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. The hon. member has made a statement here. If he says today on the floor of the House that the Director of Highways and Transport says that this man is doing all the survey work, then I call on the Government to make an enquiry about that because that is a dishonest statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as regards this post, the Addendum to the Resolution to approve the Order explains that the range and volume of surveying work compare favourably with those performed by the Surveyor Draughtsman in the Waterworks Department. The Department of Highways and Transport, which is at present without a Surveyor, will be required to undertake immediate surveys for the provision of road facilities in connection with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and it is essential that the status of the post of Junior Surveyor Draughtsman be revised without delay and placed on the same salary scale as that of the Surveyor Draughtsman in the Waterworks Department.

As the Hon. Premier pointed out not long ago, we can only go by the recommendations made by the Public Service Commission. I think hon. members know that it is an offence if one canvasses the Public Service Commission to get a job for any particular person; and that person can be sent to prison for it; therefore, I want to make it crystal clear that we have absolutely nothing to do with appointments in the Public Service.

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

CURRENCY AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Currency Act, 1950.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to confer status and legal tender in this island on currency notes issued in Jamaica. I am not sure of how many other territories have passed similar legislation, but as hon. members know, we are getting near to unified currency in that all the colonies of the British West Indies have agreed to have each other's currency accepted. Jamaica's currency is in pounds, shillings and pence and they print pound notes. On the other hand, we print five-dollar notes. Gradually Jamaica will abolish the pound note and print five-dollar notes as we do.

This Bill only seeks to confer legal tender status in this island on Jamaica's currency notes at our normal West Indian rates; that is, the currency in Barbados of the Jamaica pound note will be four dollars and eighty cents. I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, 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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

7.00 p.m.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS 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 motion of Hon G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SAVINGS BANK AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that there was a Savings Bank (Amendment) Bill previously given notice of. A Bill must have been sent down earlier in the session; but in consequence of our desire to make further amendments than provided for in that Bill it must have been withdrawn.

According to the Objects and Reasons, "This Bill seeks to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914 so as to effect certain changes in the administration of the Bank.

By clause two of this Bill it is sought to effect changes in the personnel of the Directors of the Bank

As the law stands, the staff of the Bank is specified in section five of the Act, in consequence of

which it is generally necessary to amend the Act whenever changes are made to the staff. Clause three of this Bill seeks to render that procedure unnecessary; and that Clause also seeks to make certain amendments to section five rendered necessary by amendments made to the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1949 and by the repeal of the Public Officers (Security) Act, 1910."

At present the Attorney General and Chief Secretary are directors of the Savings Bank; but when the Savings Bank managers make investments abroad they are subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; so that we have the anomalous position of the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General sitting on the Savings Bank Board making proposals for the investment of the Savings Bank money, and then having afterwards to sit as members of the Executive Committee to give effect to their own recommendations.

The Government feels that that should no longer be; therefore Section 2 seeks to change the appointments of the Attorney General and the Chief Secretary to that of the Accountant General and to further make provision for the appointment of the Postmaster General and the Solicitor General.

If you have to make any changes on the staff under the old Act you have to come to the House with an amendment each time; but with the new Bill it will therefore not be necessary from time to time to come here with a Bill in order to make additions to the staff as the Act now specifies.

Clause 4 of this Bill seeks "to enable withdrawals to be made on the order of the depositor." I think hon. members will remember the days when they used only to bank in the Savings Bank, and one had to go to the Bank oneself. This amendment is to enable you to draw on a written order instead of going yourself.

Section 23 of the Savings Bank Act, 1914 reads as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for the Directors to deposit all the moneys received by them in any Bank approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee in the name of the Savings Bank, such deposits to be drawn only by cheques signed by the Accountant and Manager; provided nevertheless that it shall be lawful for the Directors to keep in the iron chest of the Bank such sum as they may deem necessary for the ordinary payments."

Clause 5 of the Bill seeks to cure that. Clause 6 seeks to amend section 26 of the principal Act. I think hon. members will agree that all these amendments are meant to promote the smooth running of the Bank; and to prevent the possibility of the Attorney General and Chief Secretary having to sit in Executive Committee to support something upon which their minds have already been made up.

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

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

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Paragraph (a) of section seventeen of the principal Act is hereby amended by inserting therein the following—

"or the person named in an Order signed by the depositor."

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 4 the proposed amendment reads as follows: "or the person named in an Order signed by the depositor" I should like to know what that means.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know, but I think there would be the regular withdrawal slips printed so that they can send it in. The practice will be like other Banks so as to prevent forgery, though I do not think it would be so expensive. A Bank will take a cheque if you write it on a piece of foolscap. [Mr. BRYAN: They used to use them before] I will bear in mind what the hon. member has asked.

It seems to be cleaner and everything else to have the regular withdrawal slips. I will pass on the honourable member's query in the proper quarter. 7.10 p.m.

The question that Clause 4, stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 and 6 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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 Bill was read a third time and passed.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TAXATION RELIEF) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Technical Assistance (Taxation Relief) Act, 1955.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we passed an Act recently to provide exemptions from Customs Duties on materials and supplies imported by or on behalf of the Government of the United States of America for the purpose of carrying out projects under the Agreement for Technical Co-operation. That Act granted exemption from Income Tax and certain Customs duties to employees of the U.S. Government who are engaged on such projects. On further consideration of the Agreement for Technical Co-operation, the Government is advised that the terms of the Agreement are sufficiently wide to include relief from certain other taxes on the personal property of those employees. This Bill accordingly seeks to amend the Act so as to grant such relief to the same extent as is granted under the Consular Conventions Act of 1952.

In short, no Consul has to pay these different taxes set out in Clause 4, of the Bill: Motor Vehicles, Fire Arms, Wireless Telegraphy or Dogs. These exemptions are granted to Consuls all over the world. It is considered that the terms by which this Technical Assistance is given by the United States Government covers the same concessions as are granted to Consuls. We did not have it in the Act which we passed earlier this year and we are putting it in now.

As honourable members will see from Section 4 of the Bill, Consuls do not have to pay licence on Motor Vehicles, Fire Arms and so on under the provisions of the Technical Assistance Bill, but they must not be citizens of the United Kingdom and colonies; they must not be engaged in private occupation for gain in the island or be permanent employees of the Government of the United States of America, or if permanent employees thereof,

not resident in this island at the time of his assignment to such duties.

In short, if an American who is already living in Barbados is appointed to this job he would still have to pay these duties; but if an American is sent out from America to this job he does not have to pay them.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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.

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS 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 motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

7.20 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS. seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

GENERAL LOAN AND STOCK BILL, 1955

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to amend the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving that this Bill be read a second time, I shall have to read the Objects and Reasons.

This Bill seeks to amend the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935, so as to bring the Act into conformity with the provisions of the model upon which most colonial legislation is based. The effect of the amendments is as follows:—

(i) to bring the definition of "Crown Agents" up to date and to include the definitions of the terms "stock" and "registered stock;"

(ii) to make it clear that powers of investment of the Crown Agents under section 16 include the power to place at interest as well as invest any moneys remitted to them for the redemption of debentures and not actually required for the payment of interest for the current half-year;

(iii) to make it clear that the powers of investment and placing at interest conferred on the Crown Agents to accumulations of interest as well as to the dividends, interest or produce of investments;

(iv) to make it clear that the power of the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 32(b) applies to debentures and stock issued either before or after the commencement of the Act.

In short sir, from time to time it has been brought to our notice by Colonial Office and the Crown Agents that in England, it is not always felt that the wording of our General Loan and Stock (Amendment) Act, 1935, is as clear as they would like to have it. None of these amendments is really changing any principle; it is only that our Act does not make it sufficiently clear as to the powers of investment.

I do not know if I can put it any better than that. If honourable members would look at each of these amendments, they will see that it is not altering anything; but only using language of such a nature that nobody can have any doubt as to the real meaning of the different sections.

If honourable members want any further information, as we come to the different sections, I would endeavour to give them. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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 to 5 were called separately and passed

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

TRUSTEE INVESTMENT IN BARBADOS GOVERNMENT SECURITIES BILL, 1955

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: second reading of a Bill to amend the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, according to the Objects and Reasons, during the course of the Statute Law Revision of 1940 section 6 of the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902, was repealed. Government has now been advised that in respect of colonial loans the Market has recently become more selective and investors tend to look carefully into every aspect of the territory concerned, including the protection to the investor afforded by local legislation. In order therefore to avoid the danger of Barbados stock not being taken up merely because the Market, having referred to the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902, as it now stands, was unable to find therein the formal declaration which almost all other colonies have embodied in legislation, this Bill seeks to amend the Act by re-introducing section 6.

Opportunity has also been taken to amend the definitions of "Crown Agents" and "Colonial Stock Acts" so as to bring them up to date.

7.30 p.m.

Long ago the legislators of this colony put in a section in the 1906 Act that loans made by the people of Barbados who invest in the Barbadian Securities shall be deemed to convey not exactly a lien on Barbados money but shall be entitled to be paid first I do not know exactly why that was put in.

If a Colonial Government has borrowed money the British Taxpayers will put it back; so that the investors in England would not suffer. The investors in England have written to say if you want to borrow money people are more careful nowadays to whom they lend it. For that reason we have agreed to put it back; and we have put back a section which de-

clares that whoever lends this money will get it back out of Barbados Government funds.

The Secretary of State has also suggested that instead of saying "Government Security" we should put in the word "Barbados". It is a trifling; but as I have said before, if you want to borrow money you have got to make it clear that you have got to pay it back. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, 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 2 was called.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of Order, I beg to draw your attention Mr. Chairman to the absence of a quorum.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker is on the premises.

Mr. VAUGHAN entered the Committee and took his seat.

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Order No. 8 was called: Amendments from the Other Place.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments: Orders Nos. 17, 18 and 19 which have not been passed; so I am asking leave to deal with Orders Nos. 17, 18 and 19.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to deal with Orders Nos. 17, 18 and 19 and if there is no objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Order No. 17 was called.

AMENDMENT TO PAROCHIAL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I apologise to the House. While I am waiting perhaps if the House will agree, I could take Order No. 19 first. It reads as follows:—

"To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend The Parochial Employees Pension Act 1944 as amended."

The amendment is really that the section which says that nothing shall affect the rights of Her Majesty's etc., has been left out. I am asking leave to take Order No. 19 first.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the consideration of the amendments by the Other Place to the Parochial Employees Pension Bill.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Parochial Employees Pension Act is amended by the 1941-2-3-4 Acts. In the Other Place it was found that the clause concerning the rights of the Crown was not inserted. The amendment reads as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, all bodies politic and corporate, and all others, except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by, from or under them."

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case the amendment was read a first and second time and agreed to.

7.40 p.m.

AMENDMENTS TO VESTRIES (COST OF LIVING BONUS TO EMPLOYEES) BILL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 18, as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947 as amended.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is a Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947. It is a Bill which also went up to the Other Place without the Clause dealing with the saving rights of the Crown. The amendment is to put in that Clause, which is as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, all bodies politic and corporate, and all others, except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by, from or under them."

I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

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

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

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

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 21, as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This is a Bill which seeks to remove an anomaly which exists in the Pension Act. Under the provisions of Section 16 of the Act 1947, when an officer holding a pensionable office dies while in the service of the Island, his personal representatives are entitled to receive a gratuity of a sum which is not to exceed his annual pensionable emoluments. Where he dies suddenly his personal representatives will only receive a sum equal to his annual pensionable emoluments; whereas if he had retired on grounds of ill-health and taken a reduced pension and gratuity, the financial benefit to his estate might have been considerably greater. Actually, when an officer is about to die he resigns; so that it was better for him to resign than to die in the service, because his people would be better off.

This Bill seeks to replace Section 16 of the Pension Act by a new Section which provides for the grant of a gratuity to the estate of a deceased serving

officer of either a year's pensionable emoluments or the pension gratuity which he might have received if he had retired at the date of his death.

I do not think I need explain that; if you die, your people get only a year's emoluments. If you resign, the gratuity and reduced pension which you might get may come to more. This Bill says, that if you die in the service your estate gets either a year's pensionable emoluments or a reduced pension and gratuity which you may have got whichever is the greater; so that your people are not the worse off from your dying in the service as if you had retired before you died.

Sub-section (2) of this new section provides for the case of an officer who has elected to take an unreduced pension on retirement and dies shortly afterwards. This provision authorises the grant to his personal representatives of any difference between the total payments or amount of pension received by him since retirement and the amount of a year's pensionable emoluments at the rate he was enjoying at the date of his retirement.

If an officer does not take a gratuity but takes an unreduced pension and dies soon after, this Section will allow his personal representatives to get the difference between the pension which he had begun to draw and what he would have drawn had it been a year's pensionable emoluments. For instance, if an officer who was getting £500 a year gets a pension of say £300 and dies before he draws it, his widow would get the equivalent of one year's pensionable emoluments. The object of this Bill is, as I have said, to get rid of an anomaly which is wiped out by the United Kingdom Legislation.

Sub-section (4) of this new Section extends the benefit of the new provisions to officers who are otherwise subject to the provisions of the Pensions Act, 1925.

I think that is sufficiently clear to honourable members. Mr. Arthur Hinds, Clerk of the Legislative Council died last week; he was one of those who resigned a couple of days before he died, so that his relatives benefited from his having done that. His relatives would have been worse off if he had not resigned. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

7.50 p.m.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, 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.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, 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. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL, 1955

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House that Order No. 16 be taken as the next order of the day. The Bill has already been read a second time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the House in Committee on the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I see from the Order Paper that this Bill was read a second time on the 31st May, this year. I presume I am in order to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving that Clause 1 stand part, I would just like to remind honourable members what this Bill is about. It is to exempt the Bellairs Research Institute of McGill University which is the marine biological place situated at St. James, from payment of duty on the articles and equipment imported for constructing and equipping its laboratory. I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams, 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. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND IN SPEIGHTSTOWN

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House that Order No. 24 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Compulsory Acquisition of land by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of certain land in Speightstown for the purpose of converting it into an Esplanade.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to purchase compulsorily two spots of land in Orange Street Speightstown. As regards lot 44 which concerns the honourable junior member for St. George, I should like to say that there is no question of dispute as regards the acquiring of that spot; but it is necessary to purchase it compulsorily in view of the fact that the honourable member has not got a proper title (or should I say no title at all) for this bit of land.

Now, as regards the piece of land which belongs to Mr. Felix Walker, the Government has purchased other bits of land in the vicinity at 40c. per square foot, but this gentleman wants a much higher price than that. He wants something like 80c. per square foot for his piece; and as agreement has not been reached on the purchase price, it is necessary to purchase it compulsorily. This Resolution seeks to proceed along that line accordingly.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

8.00 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I was just asking the Hon Minister who is in charge of the Resolution to make the points clear. In the Resolution it gives the impression that all the owners of the land in the particular area should sell and release this land to the Government. I was approached or reproached by one or more members of the public as to whether we were offering this land for sale or not. I said the Government could say what they want.

Lest any one should misconstrue what I said—(probably I did not hear the Hon. Minister and he will forgive me if I did not hear.) I have only asked him to make it clear because it is a source of discomfort to me.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, both of us are very pleased to see a matter like this before this Chamber. About ten years ago I had asked if they would purchase land in Orange Street for the purpose of erecting an esplanade. We are very pleased to see that we have gone a little step further in the esplanade proposal.

The Addendum states that this is a recommendation dealing with the Welfare Funds. As far as I remember money was allocated for some specific purpose; it was not Welfare Funds at all. There was a difference in the price being paid by the Canadian people for sugar and some of that money was used for the purpose of amenities. In this Addendum it appears under Labour Welfare Fund; and I should like to know if this is out of Labour Welfare or if this is out of the money set aside for rural amenities. Rural amenities came from the British Fund and it was divided in three portions.

I did not know that this was one of the Schemes for which it should be used. If the Introducer does not mind at this stage he could give us some brief idea of what was proposed, in the matter of the esplanade; that is, how far it would reach etc., so that the public would have some idea. It is one of those things that is necessary. I think it would be a good idea that at Bathsheba a similar thing could be done. I think it was suggested that public baths should be erected; and so again I say that Bathsheba is a suitable place (if the Minister does not mind my suggesting it to him) where many amenities can be provided along the stretch in that area.

I know that you Mr. Speaker cannot take part in these Resolutions because they are being dealt with in the House. Both of us are very pleased to see that we have not been left out in this session. Maybe we have not shouted enough.

However we are very glad to see that the honcurable junior member for St. George is so magnanimous as to say that he would offer this land to the Government. At one time I can say he was quite willing to give the land to the Government; and another time he said if the people are willing to give the land to the Government he was willing to give his too.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I consider it is unfortunate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It was not anything that he had said on the floor of the House. I am only saying that he has said that there was a question of giving the Government the land.

Hon. M. E. COX: As regards the reference about the rural amenities, that only came in sometime in 1953 when it was discovered that there was a windfall from sugar sold to Canada from which we received dollars.

If I remember correctly, the decision to purchase the burnt out area in Speightstown was made long before that. I think it was about 30th June. It was a sum of $11,256 to purchase the area and also to construct the esplanade; so that the question of the Rural Amenities Fund did not arise at that time.

Government has not changed its decision; it is still proposed to purchase this area. As a matter of fact some lots have already been purchased. There are only two lots that are not yet purchased; but it was agreed even before the proposal had been put up to purchase this area from Labour Welfare Funds and to construct the esplanade also from Labour Welfare Funds. The Government has not changed its course since then.

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

PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be but fair that we should discuss the matter concerning the staff of the House which I gave notice of last week. If I wanted to be as unkind as the honourable senior member for St. Michael——

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I object. Un kind in what way?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am going to point out to you after we have adjourned for dinner—

Hon. M. E. COX: We had decided as soon as we had finished Government's business that we would deal with the matter of which he gave notice; and that this would be the last item. I do not wish to embarrass the honourable member.

8.10 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have given notice of this matter———

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to deal with Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There is objection. In the way in which Your Honour put it, there was no time to object.

The question that leave be granted the honourable member to deal with Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs BRYAN, F. L. WALCOTT, MILLER and ALLDER—4.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP and MRS. BOURNE.—7.

ADJOURNMENT

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: I beg to second that.

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

8.15 p.m.

On re-assembling.

HOUSE ADJOURNS OWING TO NO QUORUM

Present

Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN.

Mr. SPEAKER entered the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now three-quarters of an hour since this House has been adjourned, and there is no quorum present. I now declare that this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next, the 26th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.