

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1st May, 1956.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, 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. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, Mr. E. W. BARROW B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Medical Certificate from Dr. A. L. Stuart recommending ten days sick leave for the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Financial Report from the Accountant General for the month ended 29th February this year.

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st. March 1956 from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. John.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year to 31st March 1956 on Tenantry Roads from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. John.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st March 1956 from the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Philip.

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st March 1956 on Tenantry Roads

the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Philip.

LEAVE GRANTED TO CLERK

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Clerk be granted ten days sick leave.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk for the period of ten days.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for a period of ten days.

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement from the Barbados General Agricultural Society regarding the appropriation of the Legislative Grant for the year 1955.

NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

Resolution to place the sum of \$10,250 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 3, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.
3.25 p.m.

PRIVATE NOTICES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House draws to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the necessity for the institution

of an annual Christmas bonus for all public employees whose pensionable emoluments do not exceed fifteen hundred dollars (\$1,500) annually.

2. The House requests that Government take effective action whereby such will be paid from December this year.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if you will hear me, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that Addresses of this sort to the Governor are completely anachronistic. The Governor does not initiate any legislation, and I suggest therefore, that with a Ministerial system of Government, these Addresses should be put to the appropriate Minister. One can only address the Governor or the Queen on matters of State, but not on matters of policy. If the hon. member goes on with this form of directing Addresses to other than the appropriate Minister, it puts the Governor in an impossible position; he cannot take notice of things over the Heads of his Ministers. I hope that hon. members will move all Addresses which they feel like moving to the appropriate Ministers.

Mr. BRANCKER: I take it, Sir, that there cannot be any discussion on that matter at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, there is nothing before the House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

This House again draws to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the imperative and immediate necessity of implementing the Address unanimously passed by this Chamber urging the establishment of a Government printery in this Island.

2. This House urges Government to explore the possibilities of purchasing any Printery or Printeries in this Island capable of effectively doing all Government printing and binding with the assistance of trained available personnel presently unemployed, and others.

3. This House implores Government to re-adjust its list of top priorities and allocate Government printery to its first list.

Mr. BRANCKER: Also, of the following Address:—

*House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House is of the opinion that it is essential to create the professional post of Standing Counsel to this Chamber.

2. The House requests that His Excellency cause the necessary steps to be initiated for the financing of such.

QUESTIONS

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:—

Will the Minister cause to be published at the earliest date possible the figures showing the total amounts invested abroad as on 31st March, 1956, of funds accruing to:—

- (1) The Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund.
- (2) The Labour Welfare Fund.
- (3) The Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

2. Will the Minister cause to be placed on the Government Established Staff the herdsmen who

have been employed at the Pine Agricultural Development Station almost from its inception?

If not, why not?

3. Is the Minister aware that the prices paid by sugar factories for canes supplied by small producers in respect of the current crop are considerably less than what the price of sugar would permit?

In view of the appreciably large number of people and the appreciable sums involved will the Minister please state what steps it is proposed to take to ensure that the final prices paid bear an equitable relationship to the total value of sugar produced in the colony?

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Social Services:—

Whether it is true that Nurse Joyce Mason of the Barbados General Hospital was given notice to leave the Hospital?

If the answer to the above is yes, will Government state without delay the reason why?

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Social Services:—

What steps, if any have been taken to implement the Recommendation contained in the 1952 Report of the Salaries' Commissioner, Sir Errol Dos Santos, to provide "for rations or allowances in lieu thereof", for (1) the orderlies at the General Hospital, (2) seamstresses and washers at the General Hospital?

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Communications, Works and Housing:—

How many sealed tenders were "received at the Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing up to four o'clock p.m. on the 27th January, 1956, for the supply of Barbados Limestone, Cambridge Blue, Flintstone, Marl Filling and Earth Filling, to the Department of Highways and Transport for a period of twelve (12) months from 1st April, 1956" in respect of the Northern Division, Parishes of St. Lucy and St. Peter?

2. Is it a fact that Government advertised in respect of the above that it did not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender?

3. Is it a fact that the tenderers included the contractor who had continuously executed this assignment for the Northern Division during the time of the Central Road Board, and up to last year was re-awarded the contract for twelve (12) months from 1st April, 1955?

4. Is it also a fact that throughout the many continuous years that the said contractor had been performing the said contract it was invariably executed efficiently and to the complete satisfaction of the authorities both of the Central Road Board and the Department of Highways and Transport?

5. If it is true that the abovementioned contractor was not re-awarded the contract on this occasion, will the Minister explain why?

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister for Education at the next meeting of this House:—

In view of the Replies Nos. 58, 59 and 17 laid on 7.6.55 and 20.7.54 to Questions Nos. 58, 59 and 17 which were asked in this Chamber on 20.7.54 and 14.12.54 stating that Government still has under consideration proposals relating both to the provisions of a hot mid-day meal for children at Public Elementary Schools, and to the question of School Fees in Secondary Schools, has Government anything further to add to those Replies, particularly in relation to its decision as to priority of schemes of Government expenditure, ever bearing in mind (as stated in Reply laid 20.7.54 to Question No. 52)

that it is the declared policy of the Government to provide children at Public Secondary Schools with a hot mid-day meal free of all who are unable to pay for it?"

3.35 p.m.

ORDER PAPER

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before the first Order of the Day is called, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Order Paper of the Day, as is placed before us, is not the Order Paper which was given notice of at last Tuesday's meeting of the House. At that meeting I gave notice of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, and it was read a first time. I do not see anything of it on this Order Paper. Why is it that this Order is not placed on today's Order Paper? [A MEMBER. It is under Private Members' Business] I did not see it.

I would also like to draw to your Honour's attention that none of the Orders on the Order Paper are placed before me, neither have I received any of them by Post; and I want to know how can I begin to discuss these matters if I have not received any of them. I have not seen even cyclostyled copies of these matters. I do not know if I am placed in a different position in respect to this matter as regards other hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not placed in a different position from other hon. members. Unfortunately, the Clerk of the House did not make an early preparation of the Order Paper and it is only today that the Officers of the House had to try their best to produce the Order Paper which is placed before hon. members. That is the difficulty under which the Staff has laboured.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if I can now get any of the Orders to be discussed. I do not have any of them before me.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are some cyclostyled copies available. I do not know if there are copies of all the Items that appear on the Order Paper. I have already said that it is only this morning that some of these Orders were cyclostyled by officers of this House. It was unfortunate that the Clerk did not get the Order Paper ready before he left.

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Order which stands under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, and which is placed above Government Business, I am asking leave to postpone that. I understand from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that his colleague and himself are not in a position to proceed with that matter today.

The Order under the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael is to move that this House thank His Excellency the Governor for his speech delivered at the opening of the Legislature and to promise to implement the proposals contained therein. As I have said, I am asking leave that this be postponed.

In connection with the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, you have already explained the position, and there is nothing further I can add. There are two money Resolutions as well as a few Bills which stand under Government business, the copies of which are cyclostyled, and I hope it is the wish of hon. members that we should deal with them today.

There being no objection to leave being granted to postpone the Order standing under the name of

the hon. junior member for St. Michael, leave was granted the hon. member.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands under the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

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

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

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

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

ANGLICAN CHURCH

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is for the sum of \$4,320 for the purpose set out in the Addendum printed on the cyclostyled copies of the Resolution which hon. members have before them. Under Section 15 of the Anglican Church Act, 1911, if a Rectory Vicarage or Curacy has been vacant for a period exceeding six months without being permanently filled, the salary lapses into the Treasury until a permanent appointment is made. As hon. members will remember, recently an Act was passed which said in future only temporary appointments will be made; the object being, not as some members of the Anglican Church think is the thin edge of the wedge of disestablishment and disendowment, but in order to help the Church to appoint parsons who otherwise may not be eligible for the permanent appointment. Consequently, in every case where a temporary appointment is made, the salary of the office will lapse after six months unless permanently filled; and will continue to lapse until a permanent appointment is made. Inasmuch as the money lapses, we have to come down with a Resolution for money to pay those persons who are now appointed temporarily.

Two temporary appointments have been made under the recent Act. Therefore, owing to their being no money to pay them, the amount of \$4,320 under this Resolution is being asked to be voted to pay these persons who have been appointed. This is a simple matter. I beg to move that this sum of \$4,320 be now voted and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956—57; Part 1.—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956—57, No. 1 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is not very long ago that a similar Resolution came before the House. I have been trying to get a copy of the amended Act, but I cannot find it among the records of this House. However, I thought, as the Resolution says, that no new permanent appointment would be made; that is how the Addendum itself reads. But I thought that the appointments that were to be made would be more or less permanent but not pensionable. That is what I thought we were passing. But, Sir, the next point is, if this thing is likely to happen not only with vicars but with rectors, why can't we have an amount of \$10,000 or \$20,000? We have money in the Estimates that will not be spent. This will only be spent where the appointments are made. And unless the

House is doing this in order to have an opportunity of reviewing each appointment, I do not see the sense of providing for this particular two, and then tomorrow if a rector dies and an appointment is made, the Government coming back with another Resolution. When another vicar leaves or dies, you will come back with yet another Resolution.

I thought the object of the amending Act was to get away from passing pension Bills and this type of Resolution. I thought the Government would have put a sum of money in the Estimates to cover contingencies. Let us put in \$10,000 or \$15,000 and save the House from continually having to do this. If I am not mistaken, we did this about two months ago.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, on several occasions we have argued against giving the Government a blank cheque. We have been forced to do so on a few occasions and we found that control of certain happenings was taken from us; and in those cases we only knew about the expenditure after it had been incurred. Therefore, I certainly must differ from the honourable junior member for the City in this respect. I prefer to handle a thousand Resolutions if they come individually, than to continue the practice of voting large sums of money only to be kept and used at will by the Executive without our having any say in respect of the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member has picked the worst possible item to make that speech on. If you have that method of appointment, and if you are appointing a rector or a vicar in St. John, the honourable member himself does it. He is on the Appointments Board, so he would be coming in here and criticising a member of the House. The honourable member is seriously mistaken if he thinks I am one to give blank cheques. The law on the Statute Books says the Appointment Board shall consist of so and so. Members of the House have a say in the appointment on this occasion, but the honourable member wants to accuse me of giving the Government a blank cheque. I am sorry that his thinking is so confused at the outset of this session.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I think the honourable member is mistaken about these blank cheques. Not a single cent is ever paid to any human being in this world by the Auditor General unless an order says the Legislature has voted it for that purpose. If you have \$10,000 voted, the Auditor General has to be satisfied that there is an Act which says the \$10,000 can be paid out to A, B, C or D. So putting any sum of money in the Estimates or sending down a Resolution for a certain sum of money does not mean you can spend it as you like. It cannot be spent unless you can turn to some Act to see where it can be paid out.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. We all know that money is taken for conferences and so on. There was a time when this Government came for money when delegates were to be sent out, and we were forced to agree to the sum of money to be placed in the Estimates and at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and after we had done that, there were several occasions when we were not 100% in agreement with certain passages paid.

I was only trying to remind the honourable junior member for the City of our experiences in the past and to clear up the point which the honourable member made. While it is true that in respect of St. John I might be on the Committee which makes appointments, if it happens in the City I would not have that privilege, because the

honourable member would be one of those members of the Committee making the selection for the City; therefore it is only here that I prefer to be able to say "yes" or "no" to any appointment I might have to decide upon.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member may rest assured that probably the only appointment would be the one in St. John. I thought he would have been good enough to get up and admit he was wrong. How can this compare with a conference? The Government can agree *ad lib* to anything sent to them. The Government can agree to the post of vicar in this island or create another rectorship in the Anglican Church, and I thought the honourable member would be decent enough to get up and say so. It is nonsense the honourable member is talking. He knows there are so many vicarages but you cannot go and create this and spend the money. To tell the truth, you mean for the sake of making a point, you make it irrelevantly. How can it compare with a conference? The Government says it is a thing they did not set out for; they put money in the Estimates for things that may arise. They cannot increase them, we have a law governing the appointment; and I say you would be coming here and criticising members of the House. The honourable member should admit if he lived in the City, that he would get the best representation possible in the House [A VOICE: From whom? You or Mottley!]

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried without division.

REFUND TO THE BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$2,000, refund of overpaid fees under Companies' Act, 1910. Honourable members will see as the Addendum points out that the Bank of Nova Scotia was granted a licence to carry on a business of banking in the island. The fees for Registration under the Companies' Act is computed at \$2,239.20 which was paid by the Bank. There is however, a Companies' Act proviso that limits the amount of money payable on registration of a company to £50. That is how the old Act reads; but there was an oversight and the bank paid in the full sum as though that proviso was not in the Act. It has since been discovered, and it is therefore necessary for us to pay back the Bank of Nova Scotia the difference between \$2,239.20 and \$1,999.20.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

3.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that it does appear to me that the Legal Departments of Barbados are passing through very lean times from the point of view of the calibre of the personnel. It is, perhaps, euphemistic to call this matter an oversight; other people would regard it as sheer ignorance. If you have in the Companies Act a proviso limiting the amount of fees payable by a Company on registration to £50, is it not far more than an oversight to make a Company pay over \$2,000; and now we have to come for a refund of the money? This may be a small thing, but these straws show the direction in which the wind is blowing.

If in small matters, the Legal Departments are incompetent to apprise the Government, or to pursue their lawful operations without making these errors, you can imagine what will transpire when we have

important things before the Government. That is why I have said that in the current bus issue, the Government has to go outside this Colony and bring in Counsel. It is to be hoped that the Judicial Commissioners appointed recently will go into the competence of people who are filling important offices in the Legal Departments —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I should like to point out that this matter is nothing to do with the Attorney General's Department. It is regrettable that the mistake has been made, but it is quite possible for anybody to forget. The proviso comes in the Table of the Companies Act; and one can easily see that any Solicitor in the Island would have forgotten that. I repeat: this is nothing to do with the Attorney General's Department.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is quite in order to attempt to defend the Department involved, but certainly in the Registry we are supposed to have legally-qualified men; and if it is not one Legal Department, then it is another. My remarks about the competence of Legal Departments would therefore apply equally to the Registry; and they would apply to the Crown Law Officers' Department, if that were the Department involved.

Be that as it may, there is one other point which occurs to me, and it is this: normally speaking, there cannot be any obstruction placed in the way of any Foreign Company which wants to come to Barbados to do business. We already have two Canadian Banks and one English Bank operating here, and if another Bank wants to come here because the business appears to be sufficient to warrant its coming here, there should be no objection placed in the way of its coming here. However, I believe that we in the West Indies, should begin to realise that it is high time that a stop be put to this draining away of the wealth of the West Indies by Foreign Companies operating in this area.

This is the first time that I have seen this Resolution. The Government has a habit of taking important and unimportant matters and springing them on the House at a moment's notice. If I had seen this Resolution before, my remarks in connection with it would have been even stronger. There is no reason why the West Indies, which are on the verge of national independence, should continue to allow Canadian, American or any other foreign Banks to be established in the area, perform very little credit services in the area, and the profits they make are not ploughed back in the area, but are used to help other areas. Barclays Bank has now established a big Development Corporation and the funds are allegedly going to be used in the development of other under-developed territories; but I am yet to hear of any West Indian concern benefiting to any extent from the establishment of this Barclays Bank Development Corporation. I am yet to hear of any of these foreign Banks in the area extending proper credit facilities either to small-scale or large-scale investors who want to develop the country.

The inescapable conclusion is that the time has come for the West Indies to establish their own National Bank [*Cheers*]. The time has come for the West Indies to see that all the financial operations in the area are channelled in this area for the development of the area. In my opinion, the Government should have taken steps to prevent the Nova Scotia Bank from coming in the area. We have too many Banks in the area now; this Bank should have been told: "if you want to come here, you can come, but we are going to take the lead in the near future to establish a West Indian State Bank, and it may well be that shortly after your establishment, the business

to be obtained will not be sufficient as to warrant that establishment." It is almost a betrayal of West Indian National interest to encourage either openly or otherwise, more foreign Banks being established in the area.

Even although they come here as registered, in my opinion, it is not too late for the Barbados Government, in common with other West Indian Governments, to make its position so secure in this matter that the Nova Scotia Bank or any other Bank with similar ideas, would be discouraged from establishing themselves in Barbados or in any other West Indian Island.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, so far as the West Indian National Bank is concerned, while I think admirable sentiments were made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip on the matter, they are irrelevant on a Resolution of this nature. Sir, it would be a serious thing if you were to set out that certain companies cannot operate here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. The hon. member seems to have misunderstood me. I hope he does not mean to say that I said that they should not operate here. I have no objection to any company coming here to operate. I said that we should discourage Bank Companies coming in, if we are clamouring to have our own West Indian National Bank.

Mr. LEWIS: Why should we discourage them? If the West Indies had their own National Bank and they were supporting it, then nobody would come in, because they would feel that they could do nothing in the area.

The next thing is this: Unless your Bank is going outside to do business, it will be of no use to the West Indies. You cannot have a Bank in a particular area and just leave it there, unless it is some little savings bank. If it is to serve the area, it must have correspondence or whatever other associations it has outside of the area in which it is operating.

I share the hope of the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the Barbados Government will join hands with the Jamaica Government in urging for a State Bank; especially for the purpose of issuing currency and matters of this sort.

I do not know if to put it down to incompetence in your having to bring down this Resolution for \$2,000 when you need only \$1,999.20. Perhaps this must have been a mistake made by the Company's Solicitors and the Registrar of this Island, because I cannot imagine that the Registrar knowing that we can collect only up to \$240 for the registration of a company in Barbados still insisting on collecting fees up to \$2,239.20. If these fees are payable on the paid-up or registered capital of the Company, perhaps, we might not be accustomed to dealing with such large companies. However, my point is this: since we are dealing with a specific item for a specific sum, we should refund the specific amount. Of course, it is only a matter of 80 cents difference, but the Resolution should come down for \$1,999.20. It is just a small amount, but as far as I can remember of Resolutions for refunds coming before the House, the Resolutions were always brought down for the specific amount. This is a matter of your knowing how much was paid into the Treasury and how much you should refund; therefore, I am suggesting that you accept a motion that this amount be reduced by 80 cents. This is not a case where you are voting money for something which you do not know exactly how much may be spent out of it. You know exactly how much is the amount of this refund; you know

that the amount is \$1,999.20. I am not saying that when you vote \$2,000 you are going to pay out that amount, but I do not like the idea of our knowing exactly what the amount is and your bringing down a Resolution rounding off the amount. This is the first time that I have noticed in Resolutions for refunds that the amount was rounded off. As I have said, although I am sure you will retain the 80 cents, I do not like the idea of your bringing down a Resolution rounding off the amount.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the amount has been rounded off myself. Maybe it looks better. I really do not know what to say in reply to the argument by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. How can you reply? How can the Bank of Nova Scotia operating here possibly hurt the West Indies? Is the hon. member saying that a West Indian National Bank will provide all the money for the West Indies?

The hon. member every day gets up and say that we should have an international Bank. I am sure that because it has happened recently in Jamaica, he is going to attack this Government for not going to the United States to get a loan. I really do not know what to say on an argument of that sort. You have only to state it to see the absurdity of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member does not know what to say, he should say nothing. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should have]. It is sheer nonsense to mix up an international bank with a commercial bank. An international Bank is not a commercial bank. The International Bank is an agency of United Nations which is set up specifically for helping countries and for making loans to Governments who want to borrow money. What the hon. member has said is such a gross error that I want to know how could he be capable of it. Of course, only he could fail to realise that a foreign bank only comes here for the purpose of making money. It does not come here to operate because it likes him or us.

The Hon. Minister apparently is assuming that because the Bank of Nova Scotia is coming here to operate, that it is going to develop the country. If you want to start a business, in Barbados or Dominica or anywhere, unless you have proper security you cannot get one cent from a bank. Banks do not develop countries. If you have security, real estate collaterally, you can borrow money; or if somebody who has money and you want money from a bank and that person can endorse the note, you can get it. They charge a certain commission for the performance of the service which they render to Barbados. They are more or less commercial houses collecting bills and advancing credits on commission. I am yet to hear of a single commercial bank ploughing back to a country some of its profits to develop the country. 4.15 p.m.

To have the bank of Nova Scotia coming here does not mean one single thing to the expansion of the economy of Barbados. Only the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would think it does. All the international credit facilities we want, we have through the established banks; and the point made by the honourable junior member for the City is tenable in that a West Indian State Bank would have certain established connections abroad in the same sense more or less as Codrington College is entirely established with a University. While that is tenable, it is absolutely beside the point to fool the public that the introduction of another foreign operated bank in Barbados would mean anything at all to the colony of Barbados; it would mean something to Canada and to those countries in which this bank of Nova Scotia invests its surplus

capital for development. We do not get any here. I doubt if any part of the West Indies gets any. They come here because some of the West Indian Islands are developing and there is good picking; therefore they will come in and do a little plundering while the going is good. That is all there is to it, and I repeat, Sir, that the sooner that sort of thing is done away with the better it is for the West Indies.

By all means they should have been encouraged. All the banking in the island is already properly handled in so far as it can be handled, and a link between Nova Scotia and Barbados in the form of a commercial bank will mean everything to Nova Scotia but not one single thing to Barbados.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I stand to correction, but until the honourable member had spoken I did not realise all that might have been said on this subject. I will promise him this in view of what he said; if the honourable member can do anything to borrow money without security, I will do my best to get him made Managing Director and Comprehensive Director of a bank for the Island of Barbados!

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member is regarding this matter as a matter for amusement.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You said these banks did not lend any money without security.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member knows that what I said is this: the fact that you have Barclays Bank, the Royal Bank of Canada, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, does not mean they developed Barbados. They exist to advance money against proper security; but Mr. Chairman, a West Indian National Bank would have to go further than that. It would have to take risks.

We have in Barbados, in our small manner, a small bank for the development of Peasant Agriculture. We have what you would call a small bank for loans to fishermen. These banks take risks. When you lend a fisherman money to build a boat you have not got proper security; and the Peasants' Loan Bank will advance money to a peasant who rents land; you advance money against the crops. It is done elsewhere; it is done in Jamaica. And the idea is that the bank is concerned primarily with taking risks in developing the country which no outside bank will take, because it does not stand to benefit in the long run. A West Indian Bank will have to take risks because with the area's expansion, the business of the bank will also expand.

You cannot expect a foreign bank will have any interest at all in taking any risks in the area because they are not concerned. But the main point of my argument is not only the question of advancing money with or without security for development, the point is that banks render a service to the community for which they are paid; and there is no justifiable reason why we should allow these services to be rendered and paid for by foreign companies. That is all there is to it.

Ask the Hon. Premier to get the balance sheets of Barclays Bank, the Royal Bank of Canada and the Canadian Bank of Commerce and see what they make every year, see what they pay in income tax. Do you think they operate because we have good sea breeze and make good fishing? They operate because they make good money and the money should be made by a West Indian Bank and remain in the area. The money that Barclays Bank is using to develop all parts of the world should be kept in Barbados; the surplus profit made by its operation is spent all over the world and we contribute to it. St. Lucia, Jamaica and Dominica contribute to it.

Why ask the bank of Nova Scotia to come here? There must be money to be made in the West Indies in banking; and are we to understand from the Hon. Premier that there is some moral or legal objection to the West Indies themselves making in banking the money made in the West Indies, and that only foreign banks should make it? If we are to have that motto at the head of affairs it is no wonder we are drifting while other countries are marching forward.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. senior member for St. Philip said that while the views I expressed were tenable, they would tend to fool the public—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say so.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know whether he had a full stop in his mind when he spoke about fooling the public on the issue. I merely pointed out that it would be very difficult for Barbados to legislate against companies coming to operate here. You cannot do it to any people coming from the Commonwealth; that is what I saw. If he feels assured that the Bank of Nova Scotia would come here for what it can get, if it does not get it directly it would get it indirectly. However, that could wait for another time. I am going to move that the amount be reduced by eighty cents so that the amount voted by Government will be the exact amount to be refunded.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will accept that. While I am on my feet, I will say although it will provoke the hon. member to make another speech, that a bank is a company doing a particular form of business. Is he going to stop Fogarty and Sahely from doing business in Barbados?

4.25 p.m.

The honourable member apparently thinks that he is lecturing to second standard school children. If you accept that a Bank is only a Company doing business, at least Matouk and Sahely and other people are from other West Indian Islands; they come from the area and the profits they make in Barbados remain in the area. The Nova Scotia Bank is not from St. Kitts. How, on the eve of a Caribbean Federation, could you object to any West Indian firm or Company extending its operations to any other West Indian Island? But that is not the point at all. The extent of the business done by Sahely and Matouk or anybody else in this Island is regulated by a certain amount of competition; but in Barbados or the West Indies for that matter, where banking is concerned, the established Banks know full well that the only competition they can get is from some other Bank from a big metropolitan country.

Tomorrow morning Barbados cannot start its own Bank as easily as Sahely or Matouk can come in here. Banking is a special form of business. If Self-Help Enterprises Ltd. or anybody else were carrying on the same business as Sahely and they could cut prices, Sahely would lose money; but who is going to offer competition to the Bank of Nova Scotia or the Royal Bank of Canada or any similar Bank. To compare these things is to compare a public utility service with a rum shop; to make this comparison is like comparing water and telephone services with the sale of ginger beer and coconut bread in a back street somewhere. There is no comparison between these things at all; one is a highly-specialised service, and the other is a service in which anybody can enter without any special protection or knowledge or without any special guarantee or knowledge that you are going to make money.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

REGISTRATION (BIRTHS, BAPTISMS, MARRIAGES AND BURIALS) (AMENDMENT) 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 Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I hope honourable members will not object to dealing with this Order although these Bills have only just been put into our hands. This is a Bill to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act. Some of us forget to register the birth of children which according to the Act should be done within a certain period, and sometimes the position becomes awkward because a child has not got either a Birth or a Baptismal Certificate. Of course, you can get around that position by getting an Affidavit from a Midwife or a Doctor to the effect that the child was born at a particular time; and that is accepted by the Registrar as the equivalent of a British Certificate.

Provision is made in the Act for persons to notify the Registrar and if they have failed to register the birth of a child, they pay a fine. This Bill is an Amendment which will make it easier to correct the omission. One of the things about this Amendment is that this legislation is similar to legislation existing in other Colonies and in the United Kingdom. At the same time, this Bill repeals Clause 9 of the Principal Act and makes it no longer necessary for the Registrar to sign copies of duplicates sent to him by religious bodies. Honourable members are aware that some religious bodies perform marriages, baptisms and so on.

I am suggesting that even although this is a non-controversial matter, the Acting Clerk should read out the Clauses of this Bill for the benefit of honourable members. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like the Hon. Premier to pay attention to a little point which struck me on reading this Bill. I take it that this new Clause 9 starts off by saying that the birth of a child has not been registered at all, and how does the Registrar know for whom he should send? If a birth has not been registered at all, and the person has forgotten to register it, how can anybody know that that has happened and ask you to correct it: 4.35 p.m.

You do not ask for a birth certificate forty days or afterwards. It is when you get 20 and 30 years old and you want to go away that you ask for a birth certificate. I am wondering if something can be done. [A VOICE: It is after 40 days.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have the idea that when a matter like this came up before in this House so

that births could be registered at various points for the convenience of the people, I raised a point relative to the fact that when a birth certificate is given, it does not necessarily have the name of the child that is registered. To tell the truth, the exactness of the point, I cannot remember. This really, Sir, is registering the birth of a child rather than giving the name of the child; and I have heard of certain difficulties arising in view of the fact that you cannot go back and put a name on the birth certificate. There are occasions when a Birth Certificate would suffice for the purpose you want, if you got the name of the child on it. I remember mentioning that at the time because it was brought to my attention during the discussion on the Bill. I did not know that this Bill would have been dealt with today, otherwise I would have looked up that debate.

You have to get both a Birth and Baptism Certificate and there are certain difficulties and expense which people have to go through if the name of the child is not on the Birth Certificate. However, Sir, if I can find what is the real difficulty a little later, I can make it known when dealing with the Bill in Committee.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a most important amendment that we are dealing with today when so many persons are moving about. Having to get passports to get away, they have to get their Baptismal Certificate to verify certain facts. Then there is the fact that many parents are rather careless in the registration of the birth of their children. They put the matter off and then they find out it was an error of judgment.

I know the purpose of this Bill is not to make it easy so that there would be more forgetfulness, but I do hope that the easy method of registration now will bring home to parents the need for registration of births, and will not permit them to slip up and wait until the last day to register a birth because they have days of grace. I hope that they will realise that the child is injured as a result of their carelessness, and that they will do it at the very earliest date possible.

This method of regularising the registration of births in case it may have lapsed over 42 days is to be commended; but, as I have said, I do hope that this method does not make parents more lazy and cause them to put it off. Another point is that it may cause the Registrar an awful lot of work over his normal duties if he has to summon parents to register their children. As I have said, it is a small but important amendment. It is one of these things that are very necessary in these days when so many people are applying for passports because of the movement of persons.

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. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, 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:—

2. Section 9 of the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials) Act, 1891, is hereby repealed and in place thereof the following section shall have effect—

9. (1) Where a birth has, from the default of the parents or other persons required to give information concerning it, not been duly registered, the Registrar of the Island may, at any time after the end of forty-two days from such birth, by notice in writ-

ing, require any of the persons required by this Act to give information concerning such birth to attend personally at the Registration Office within such time as may be specified in such notice and to give information to the best of his knowledge and belief of the particulars required to be registered concerning such birth, and to sign the register; and it shall be the duty of such person, unless the birth is registered before the expiration of the time specified in such notice, to comply with the terms of the notice.

(2) Every person required to give information under the preceding subsection who wilfully refuses to answer any question put to him by the Registrar of the Island relating to the particulars concerning a birth, or fails to comply with any requisition made in pursuance of this section shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the original Act, as far as I remember, is to the effect that if you do not register within a certain number of days you can register within a certain further time on the payment of a fine. Then in 1949 we extended that time and said:

“Notwithstanding anything contained in the principal Act, the Registrar of the Island may at any time after the expiration of twelve months from the date of birth of any child, at the instance of any person present at the birth of such child, or any person interested on behalf of such child, who makes statutory declaration, to the best of his knowledge and belief, of the particulars required to be known touching the birth of such child, register the birth of such child according to particulars of such declaration.”

There is also a proviso to the effect that the Registrar of the Island shall not effect any registration in pursuance of this subsection unless the person applying to register the birth shall (a) have obtained the consent of the Governor-in-Executive Committee (b) have paid into the Public Treasury for the public use of this Island a fee of two pounds.

It is obvious that a civilised country must ensure that people are registered, apart from the question of knowing what you have for “cannon fodder” as some people term it. Therefore, it is essential that there should be some sort of penalty in order that people might register births. It has grown up, sometimes deliberately on religious grounds, that people object to registering births.

The point made by the honourable junior member for the City is a good point. However, if the honourable member reads the amendment carefully he will see that after the expiration of 40 days where a birth has from the default of the parents or other persons required to give information concerning it, not been duly registered, the Registrar of the Island may, at any time afterwards by notice in writing require any of the persons required by this Act to give information concerning such birth to attend personally at the Registration Office within such time as may be specified in such notice and to give information to the best of his knowledge and belief, and to sign the register. If you get your doctor or midwife to swear that this child was born on a particular day, it makes it easier. It happens sometimes that you have to get such people to swear in order to prove a will. It happens now and then that people like these have to come before the Courts and make a declaration that to the best of their knowledge and belief John Jones is the child of Mary Jones.

This is an attempt to make it easy for people who for various reasons have not complied with the law. The declaration is in order to prove the date of the birth. That is more relevant than the exist-

ence of the birth because the person whom you are seeking to find out is obviously standing before you 4.45 p.m.

I think it would be a good thing for all Newspapers to give unlimited publicity to this matter so that persons may know they may go any time without danger of being fined and get a record made of the birth of children whose births may not have been recorded in the past. Much good could be done if columns dealing with House of Assembly debates of this sort could be publicised so that people of these parts would know what the law is.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I take it that this one sheet is the entire Act. Is Section 9 which is being taken out the one that allows a person to pay a fee? I am wondering if Section 9 is the one where you pay a fee.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: When I was looking at it I thought the same thing as the honourable member; and I think it is possible that everything is not here. I am going to ask leave to postpone further consideration. In the Objects and Reasons this Section is repealed and may be there is a page that should be attached to this.

Mr. LEWIS: This section repeals it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Section 9 merely provides for the Registrar to send district registrars copies of the duplicate registers of births; so by repealing the whole section and re-enacting this, it has nothing to do with the original Section 9.

Mr. LEWIS: Then, Mr. Chairman, is the 1949 amendment repealed too? That is what I would like to know. Mr. Chairman, what I want to get clear is that in 1949 you said notwithstanding anything contained in the principal Act. In 1949, as I heard him say, you could go and pay a fee and register the date. What I mean now is, does it still stand? Would it read now "notwithstanding this you can pay a fine"?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know if I were drafting this if I would draft it this way. Section 9 says the Registrar must send copies to district Registrars; Section 10 speaks about forty-two days. What the draftsman of the amendment has therefore done is to repeal Section 9, and instead of that he has put in its place "after forty-two days" which would logically come after Section 10. Section 10 says up to forty-two days; this says even after forty-two days have passed you can still go and register, so scientifically it should come after Section 10 and not take the place of Section 9.

Mr. LEWIS: Just to put it right, Sir, I am going to make a motion that further consideration of this Bill be postponed and let somebody second it and put it right.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I agree with the honourable member. Logically it should come after Section 10. I confess I did not read it before it came here. It is better to amend Section 10 and tack this on to it.

The question that the Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that your honour do now report progress.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wonder if the Government has anything they have in mind to do. If they have one thing in mind to do, I would ask them to withdraw the motion and get through with it. We know printing is difficult and what not, but

no matter how much debate we have on it, let us have the debate and finish with it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to withdraw the motion.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

SUGAR INDUSTRY BILL

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Item 4. as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour; the second reading of a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Local Consumption) Act 1952.

4.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Since 1952, sums accruing from levies raised on sugar for local consumption have been applied to subsidising crystal sugar. For the past three years the price of this sugar has been held at 7½ cents per pound. It is proposed to continue the system of subsidising this sugar from these funds to hold it at the same price.

As I have said, the total amount of sugar sold locally is 10,000 tons, and it is expected that the levies to be raised on this sugar will amount to about \$140,000. There is a balance from last year of \$27,699.60 and that makes the total amount \$167,700 for subsidisation. In order to keep the price of this sugar at 7½ cents per lb. that amount of money will subsidise 33,126 bags which is the equivalent of 3,312 tons. I am perfectly aware that every year we are faced with the same problem when it comes to this sugar. It is something like a perpetual problem so long as we keep this system of distribution for longer than eight or nine months, or three-quarters of the year.

Quite naturally, what happens is that although the subsidisation of this sugar is principally intended to benefit the consumers, because of the fact that this sugar is not rationed—it is very expensive to set up a system for the rationing of this sugar—much of it gets into the hands of bakers, mauby sellers and other people, and it is therefore very difficult, as I have already said, to control the distribution of this sugar and see that it is channelled into the sources and mouths of the people whom it is intended to benefit.

I have this year cut down on the profits of the wholesalers in order to spread this sugar a little further, and I may say that the profits compare very favourably with profits elsewhere although they have been cut down. We are trying out a system of rationing; last year we tried out a system of part-rationing so to speak; we tried to make this sugar last throughout the year. As honourable members know, this system will fall through because there is not a sufficient amount available for the subsidisation of this sugar. We cannot allow the cost of living to go up; we must try to keep down the cost of living. We feel that it is better to avoid a greater evil and stick to a lesser evil of continuing a short supply of this sugar and keeping it at the same price, rather than allow the price of the sugar to go up and have a month's supply more at the present rate of distribution and consumption. That is our policy, and I do see the snags in it; but, faced as we are with a rising cost of living, we have decided to keep this sugar as it was last year.

In the previous year, we had marginal differences which have not occurred again this year, and therefore the amount of money available for subsidisation is less than it was last year. We provide for a greater number of bags of sugar to last for a whole

year, but it is not possible to raise any other amounts this year as we have done in the past. Last year, we took the surplus balances in the hands of the Controller of Supplies and used them to assist in this matter, but it is not possible for us to do that again this year. We can therefore only subsidise this sugar by the method proposed. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: This Bill has become an annual one, and this year the Hon. Minister is holding the price at $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb., and giving us an inadequate of sugar for the supply of the entire twelve months. I should like to say that if the same subsidy had been used to subsidise a greater quantity of sugar and fix the price at 8c. per lb., just a half cent more, the same result would have been achieved. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: How could we do that?] We would be paying half cent more, but instead of buying sugar for eight months at $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb., people would be buying it at 8c. per lb. for the whole year.

To continue the argument of the Hon. Minister in favour of the price of $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb., he could subsidise a smaller quantity even heavier at 6c. per lb., and let it run for four or five months. He would have expended the same subsidy, but the sugar would have gone into fewer channels. It is just a question of the method. I feel that it is better, if an item is to be subsidised, if you have so much money to expend, you should give us a year's supply. Instead of this sugar being $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb., it might be 8c. per lb. There is another reason why people are clamouring for this sugar at $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb.; it is because it is out of all relation to the other two grades of sugar which are not subsidised. Whereas if this sugar were held at 8c. per lb., there would have been a greater demand for the sugar at 10c. and 11c. per lb. That would have at least given the consumers the opportunity of buying sugar at 8c. per lb., for twelve months of the year. When it comes to the question of this sugar being used to a great extent by the mauby sellers, bakeries and other people, I should like to say that with this sugar, it either reflects in his profits or in the increase size of a loaf of bread.

5.05 p.m.

It is the same thing with the mauby seller. If this is going to be used in the mauby, the seller makes either another six cents per day or it is passed on and probably another half gill of mauby fills the glass.

There is one thing of which I am glad. I am glad that this Bill has come down a little earlier this year than is accustomed in previous years. Last year, this Bill was brought down in June and the sugar disappeared off the counters before Christmas. It has come down this year on the 1st May, and if it is passed through the Other Place as speedily as it is passed through the House, then this sugar will go on the market early this month; and I am sure there will be no $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound sugar after November this year.

As I have said, you are subsidising the item wrongly. I say, let the full subsidy be paid but in a different way, and I am assured it will achieve better results. You will still be expending and subsidising something for local consumers. You should not discriminate. You should not say it should not be used at the Marine Hotel but it should be used in St. Joseph. [A VOICE: Who said so?] This is for local consumption and you must not do that. As I have said, I would approach this matter in a different manner. I hope that the Hon. Minister

of Trade is listening to what I say and next year he will come back with my proposals. [A VOICE: Who told you that he is coming back next year?] However, Sir, I hope this type of sugar will soon be put on the market; but I am warning you that the sooner it comes on the market, the quicker it will disappear.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable junior member for Christ Church, as well as the Hon. Minister, has put up a proposition on something on which he does not know what he is talking about. The whole purpose of this Bill is to amend the Act so as to continue its operation indefinitely. If you read the "Objects and Reasons," you will see that you are not making this Act any longer than an annual Act, but that it will be *ad infinitum* a law of Barbados.

I want to say that the scientific approach to this matter is not that the sugar sold locally should be at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, because we are not wedded to the idea that the consumers should not pay a greater price than $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound for any commodity. I am saying that it is fantastic to suggest that you are ceiling the price of sugar at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound without relation to the other economic factors. Let me say that the price of sugar is wedded to the price of sugar which is exported. It is because of the subsidy which you get from those three funds that you are subsidising this type of sugar, therefore it cannot be excluded from any section of the community. This type of sugar should be reserved for the whole community. The next thing is that under this context which you are subsidising this sugar it means nothing, because you are only subsidising something for a certain part of the year. Another thing is this: no one can guarantee that this grade of sugar which is to be sold at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound is not mixed with the other grades which are sold at 10 and 11 cents per pound. There is no inspectorate to check on it.

With regard to the question of rationing this grade of sugar, it is ludicrous to talk of it when you have more sugar than you can use. As a matter of fact, you do not need a ration system when you have more sugar in supply than the population can consume. Would you have expected after these years of seeing the evils of subsidising this grade of sugar that Government could not make better use of the subsidy?

The Sugar Producers' Association, the employers and the Trade Union have agreed that the time has come when you should have a Provident Fund for the people who toil in the sugar industry. I make bold to say that if you go throughout the length and breadth of this community and take a census, you will find that the greater number of people will agree with your taking this \$140,000 with which you are subsidising this grade of sugar and using it as a Provident Fund to benefit the people who work in the industry, and so as to prevent cane cutters and such people from wending their way into the eleven Almshouses of this Island or depending on the 5/- per week Old Age Pension. Why are you using \$140,000 to subsidise an item like sugar when there are other commodities which you are not subsidising that the whole community uses? Are you going to subsidise milk which is produced in this colony? I know that you are subsidising rice. To put in a Bill that you are going to subsidise sugar at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound is tantamount to your saying the price which should be paid for it is uneconomic for the Barbadian to pay. Do you know how much sugar is consumed in the Island? Do you know how much money a man spends on

sugar? As far as I know, the average is 79 pounds of sugar per annum per man.

5.15 p.m.

The annual consumption for any man in the West Indies is an average of 79 lbs. of sugar. That comes from the International World Sugar Council; 79 lbs. being used in warm climates and 99 lbs. in colder countries. This means you are going to subsidise sugar of which he uses 79 lbs which is less than two lbs. a week; therefore, in his budget you are subsidising an item that does not really come up to a shilling in the whole financial structure. You go to the expense of taking \$140,000 to utilise in something that is less than a shilling a week in the budget and leave out other items of which you are using a larger proportion.

The proportion you pay in rent is higher than the sugar which you are subsidising to the tune of \$140,000; therefore, you leave the section of workers for whom you are subsidising without any security whatever. It is the same worker engaged in producing this sugar that is forced to go to the almshouses. He does not get from the industry at which he works one single penny as security. Moreover, the price of sugar should not go above 7½ cents but he also had to buy a dearer kind. Then again, there is no inspectorate system to control the dilution of this sugar when it goes to the shops. There is no means of controlling it and therefore what you would regard as putting something by, some would get it at 7½ cents for a certain time.

I would ask the Minister this: what has happened to the idea of providing a Providence Fund for these people. I would suggest that you should garner all your funds at a stage like this in order to provide a Providence Fund for workers in the Sugar Industry. I think the Government should realise they have to face the issues. They will find the quantity you are subsidising would be infinitesimal when you come to look at it from a budget point of view; but if you tell a man it rises from 7½ cents to 11 cents per lb., and you give him that and take it \$140,000 to subsidise, let us do something about it.

When you realise the average man's or the community's consumption cannot exceed 79 lbs. per annum, he will realise what you are subsidising. You are giving a man a subsidy on an item of which he is spending less than one shilling a week, so my suggestion is that you should look upon giving some aspect of social security in the Sugar Industry which is vital in order that when the people grow old you can give them sick benefit; that is something lacking in the community. When a man can go to doctor to get medical attention he is therefore a better worker than when he cannot go; and when he grows too sick he cannot go any longer.

You can subsidise a section of sugar but the \$140,000 could be used to put in a fund to do something of a positive and constructive measure to increase the economic structure by giving workers better social security. When you make him a better worker he becomes of more economic value to the community as a whole. This is a palliative for the person who is not thinking of these economic values. Does it mean much to a man's budget that is so heavily weighted; it is not like flour and rice, things without carbohydrates. If you cannot subsidise all the sugar for a man for a portion of the year, what are you doing for the people generally? But when you examine the amount of money you are spending or the sections you are taking from the Sugar Industry for this purpose, it could be used for the people in the Sugar Industry. The purpose of the Price Stabilisation Fund is to assist people in

the Sugar Industry. It is now being used for other things; but at this stage the aspect of social security should be meted out to the workers and they would not be worried about the funds which are going to help a section which represent a portion of workers in this country.

Mr. SMITH: I do not think I should allow a debate of this sort to pass without saying something. I feel that I would be wasting time to throw out my suggestion, but I will do so. Now, Sir, the honourable junior member for St. Peter said that this money should go in a fund. I am saying that this money could be used otherwise which would help the people we want to help. There are other commodities that should be subsidised, that the mauby seller or the baker would be able to make use of and the people you want to help.

Now, Sir, when you subsidise part of this sugar the quality is such a nice quality, (it is near the 11 cent quality) that the Hon. Minister will be surprised to know that at this time when the sugar is scarce, when it has all gone there are some business people who still have some sugar to blend with the expensive one and sell for the higher price. So long as you cannot subsidise it in such a way that every person would be able to buy it whenever they can get it throughout the year, you are doing nothing.

Now, there are some people who get a very small amount of this sugar because it goes quickly. There are some shopkeepers who cannot get it at all; and there are others who have it throughout the year and some part of the year, and the people you want to help still have to buy the expensive kind because they cannot get the sugar to buy at 7½ cents. I am sure the people would be more pleased to buy it at 8 cents per pound and get it throughout the year than to keep it at 7½ cents and get it for only part of the year.

Now, I can see that the Government wants to help these people by way of subsidisation; but they are not helping at all, they are making it harder for them. There are some people who cannot use sugar at all, but there are other commodities they have to use twice a day. They would like to buy these other commodities but because of the expensive rate of the subsidy, the Government cannot import them. If the Hon. Minister wanted information he had me at his disposal and I would have told him what to do. This \$140,000 could be used to subsidise these commodities and take the subsidy off sugar entirely and let it go wild.

There are certain salt meats which people have to use daily and sometimes twice a day; they cannot get it because it is not being subsidised, and it is being rationed because the Government cannot import this meat that would help the people. Take the \$140,000 and use it with the other commodities that the people have to use daily, then the bakers would get a chance to benefit from it, the blenders of this sugar would not be able to blend it, and people would use the expensive sugar only when the other one has gone. I am saying you should take the subsidy off altogether and put it on other commodities that will help the people of this country.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the honourable junior member for St. Joseph to know that there are some people who cannot eat salt. This is a Bill in which, from the time that the idea started, the intention was to keep this idea. The Government has got into trouble by perpetuating this Bill, and in my opinion, this Bill should be an annual one. This is something which needs to be reviewed in the

light of your experience, and it does not seem as if the Government is capable of reviewing it in that light.

If you institute a system of rationing, the only result would be that you would know how much was mixed; you know that you can subsidise 3,312 tons of sugar, you would issue ration cards for that amount, and you would know if any body is hoarding that sugar. That is all that can happen. However, there are great difficulties in carrying out this scheme, and you cannot prevent people from buying this sugar when it is available. As the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, if you are making this difference in the sugar, you cannot expect people to buy sugar at a greater price when they can get another grade at a lesser price.

I would really like to see the Government institute the scheme which has been suggested to them every year; that is, that this sugar be sold at 8c. per lb. and let the people get it for a longer period. The Government have been accused at one time of bringing in this Bill too late so that it will last with in the financial year. If you bring in this provision early, the sugar will go quickly.

Now, there are times when the people cannot get this sugar; This sugar should be subsidised and distributed, but we are taking sugar and subsidising sugar. We are saying that the wages of the people and the profits allowed are putting up the price of the sugar and we have to subsidise it. There is no reason in the world why sugar produced in Barbados should approximate the price at which you can sell it abroad. That is a ridiculous idea; when somebody says that it was always so that is nonsense. I suggest that you should regulate the price of sugar, make it a reasonable price and cut it adrift from what you would get for the sugar abroad.

We have made a mistake in contributing to the cess funds from locally-consumed sugar; that is ridiculous. I say that the Government should have cut adrift from that idea ever since. If you want to subsidise this sugar, then use the Price Stabilisation Fund for that purpose; that is what you should do. I would like to know for what purpose is the Price Stabilisation Fund used? I can never get that clear. If you want to give the people cheap sugar, then you should subsidise it from this Fund, or manufacture more of this sugar so that you can get it for the people throughout the year.

I have heard somebody saying something about sugar at 10½c. per lb., but when the sugar at 7½c. per lb. has all gone, it is 11c. per lb. which people have to pay for sugar. I am wondering if the Government would re-draft this Bill and make it an annual one. This is a Bill which would have been revised already, rather than come here with it every year and admit your difficulties, and when there is a remedy for those difficulties, you cannot use it. This is a Bill which has been placed on the Statute Book for all time; are you going to perpetuate these Funds?

I think it is time that we be told that some proper assessment is going to be made of the condition of the sugar factories in this Island and whether we can stop the Rehabilitation Fund or allocate more or less to it. During the War you did not do much to your sugar factories, and you were given this advantage by the British Government. I say it is time that we have some survey of these sugar factories and see what the position is; it is time to have this survey, I repeat, and let us see the extent to which this particular Fund is necessary.

5.35 p.m.

So far as this Provident Fund is concerned, I do not know that it will be a worthy object to contribute this fund to; but let us get away from the idea that we should get a Provident Fund for a parti-

cular set of people. We want a type of welfare Fund for the entire community of this Island. You have a Welfare Fund for sugar workers already. It is time to think of the welfare of everybody in this Island. In the absence of a general scheme let us have this.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what would be the effect, but I am going to make the suggestion that this Bill be made an annual Bill.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, 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:—

2. Section two of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952, is hereby amended —

- (a) by substituting the word "year" for the word "years" appearing in the tenth line thereof; and
- (b) by substituting the words "and thereafter" for the words "to one thousand nine hundred and fifty exclusive."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, do you see that the Government does not have the courtesy to reply to the speeches made? That is as much as to say, let us do without the Opposition. We are fast evolving into a dictatorship system. [LOUD ASIDE: You are talking blasted nonsense!] Who said that I am talking blasted nonsense! Mr. Chairman, you should not allow those words to be used in this Chamber. There was no reply made by the Government to the speeches made although very good reasons and certain facts were put forward for objection to this Bill.

The honourable junior member for the City has rightly brought to the notice of this Chamber that if at this stage you are not so clear in your mind as to what you should do, (and the Minister of Trade spoke of all the evils to this matter and said that this was the lesser evil) why should you put this Bill on the Statute Book for all time if it contains all those evils? This is a Bill which you want to put on the Statute Book for all time; you do not want to deal with it from year to year as it was done up to now.

I think this is the sort of legislation which you should not want to put on the Statute Book for all time. Which Minister can tell you, unless he went up and had a talk with the prophets, he knows that this is the sort of legislation which needs no more review by him; therefore, there is no need to deal with it annually. Does he know what will be the economic situation of the island next year? Is he saying that it will be the same as it is now, therefore, you will need to subsidise sugar to keep it at the same price?

Then on top of that, you have this vulgar phrase that you are talking a type of nonsense. Some members think that they can subject other members by the most vile and vulgar language. They think we have reached the stage where we are children. I am too old to be a child, therefore, the day any member refers to me with a vulgar phrase I will reply. We come here to debate a matter. Why should we not debate the matter on its merits? Did any one say that the Hon. Minister of Trade was talking nonsense? You hear from the Government

Bench every now and then somebody saying that the debates of this House have lowered; and it is from those very seats that use of these vulgar phrases are made to honourable members.

I feel, Sir, that this Bill should not be put on the Statute Book for all times. If we vote for this to-day, we are saying that you should subsidise sugar at 7½ cents per pound for all times. Why should we vote for it for all times without there being any question of raising the price? The Hon. Minister of Trade has not told us that the reason why they are putting it on the Statute Book for all times is because they know that it represents such a substantial portion of a man's budget that he cannot afford to pay more for it. He says that the bakers and mauby sellers use it but he does not say how much of it is used by them. Mr. Chairman, as you have said, certain people in the country districts never get the 7½ cents per pound sugar at all from January to December because of the number of shops at which this grade sugar is distributed, some do not get it at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep to the Section.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You made a first-class point on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you keep to the Section?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe you had the opportunity of reading this Bill carefully enough. If you read Section 2 you will see that it says that Section 2 of the Act is hereby amended by substituting the word "year" for the word "years" appearing in the tenth line thereof; and that means that you are subsidising this sugar not for a year as it was before but for years to come. I am saying that when you state that, it will mean that the same shops which you said could not get this grade sugar as a result of which some people could not get it, will be condemned to this system for all the years to follow. I again say that this is the type of Bill which you will not need to put on the Statute Book for ever. It is the sort of Bill which should be reviewed annually.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The honourable member is labouring under the impression that the amendments to this Act mean that this will be scheduled perpetually. It does not mean that. From 1952 we have been carrying on this system.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I said that this Bill seeks to amend the Act so as to continue in operation the Act indefinitely thereby obviating the necessity for amending the Act each year.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is that although we have brought in this Bill so that the Act will not be an annual Act, that does not mean that we will not review the matter from time to time. All it means is that if next year we decide to continue this levy so as to subsidise sugar locally consumed we will not come down with this Bill but if we do away with this system we will come down with a Bill to that effect. We may do what the honourable junior member for Christ Church suggested, (I did not say we will) in which case we will continue with the system and apply the money in another way. I do not think it makes sense to come down with a Bill every year to do the same thing.

5.45 p.m.

I cannot predict what will happen next year. An honourable member of the Opposition has predicted what will happen to me! No one knows what will happen in a matter of this kind. We will do

away with the system altogether but I wanted to correct the honourable member on this point.

Mr. LEWIS: I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister will explain whether this is going to be an annual Bill so that we would be in a position of being able to review it. It is not a waste of debate if you have discussion on a matter. If the Government say they are not going to consider it, I feel it is far more difficult to get down to an amendment or whether or not they are repealing the Act, because before you consider it you have to find out all the experiences you have had and say I will do it this way. I am not saying the method of subsidising cannot be altered, because it has nothing to do with the actual method of subsidising; I am only saying that this money will be used for this purpose and the Governor-in-Executive Committee are the people to say how it is going to be used, whether it is to subsidise so much sugar, so many tons, and spread it over a year or for a particular type of sugar, and that is what they have to decide; but I do like the idea of reviewing the situation ever year and coming to the Legislature for that purpose.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to report the passing of the Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be read a third time.

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

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

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

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

SUGAR INDUSTRY BILL

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. R. G. Mapp, Second reading of a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization) Act 1947.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As the Addendum reads:

Under section 3 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, all levies raised under the Act are required to be paid by the 31st of July of the year to which they relate; whereas it is not always possible to determine the rate of levy and make the necessary Order by that date. This Bill seeks therefore to amend the section so as to require levies to be paid by such date as may be specified in the Order, or if no date is specified then by the 31st July. What happens now, Sir, is where we do not know the rate of levy, we will have to come back down with another Bill after the 31st July. This Bill seeks to make it possible not to do that, but just to amend the section so that the levies may be paid by such date as specified in the Order. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help rising to congratulate the Government on bringing this Bill today. Last year owing to the Agreement with the sugar producers the prices had never been fixed; but apparently now from this, we will be able

to settle the prices of sugar and pay for canes at a proper time, as we used to pay for them from September to October. Last year we never were able to pay until it was close to the end of November; not only the preference money but the balance due in back payments. I am only hoping that this amendment will ease this situation and that the appropriate Minister will be able to deal with the regulations at a proper time each year. I very much welcome it, Sir.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the honourable member will accept some sort of amendment and at least let us have a maximum time. The other thing I would suggest is in the form of a question. If you are waiting until the 31st July in the hope that we will make an Order and they make it on the 1st day of August, we will be in difficulty just the same, and I think you should make an Order that would extend it longer than the 31st July. You will have to make the Order before the 31st July. I am wondering how this amendment is really going to help.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. At present, Mr. Chairman, the Order made for the 31st July is valid, but it is not enforceable; so that all this is saying is that you have a date—31st July—on which to pay the levies, and another date so that if you do not know by the 31st July what levy will be raised, you would not have to come back with another Order under this amended Act.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member will appreciate my difficulty, since his explanation is not in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. What I am saying is this: If you have to do something by the 31st July, and you are admitting now that it is difficult for you to do it by that date, the very Order you are making must be made after the 31st July. I do not see that this amendment is really helping the position, because as the honourable member says, you are prolonging a penalty. You must allow a person to make an Order which will include what you must do and when you should do it. Can you make an Order with the information that it is difficult to get something done before the 31st July? I have not studied this question fully; it does seem to me that you have to make this Order, and put in it this information that you cannot do this thing because of that difficulty.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: What happens is that sometimes you have to come down with this matter after the 31st July, and you cannot do it under the present legislation. The note by the Legal Draughtsman says that all levies will be made by Order under the 1947 Act, and the practise of raising extraordinary levies adopted in earlier years will cease. It may be necessary to pass more than one Order in any year. I think that that explanation will meet the honourable member's point.

Mr. BARROW: I really do not understand how the Government could arrive at the amendment which appears in this Bill. As the honourable junior member for the City has pointed out, the 1947 Act refers to payments being made to the Sugar Production and Export Control Board, under Section 3 (2) of the Act, which has not been repealed. When you are making amendments, you have to make sure that they make sense in relation to the Act which you are amending. If you are altering the provisions of the Act in any one particular section, you should be consistent with the general tenor of the Act.

In the 1947 Act, Section 3 (3) states: "Every producer of produce shall pay any levy imposed on such produce by or under this Act not later than

the thirty-first day of July in the year in which such produce was manufactured."

If we are going to say that every producer of produce shall pay any levy imposed on such produce by or under this Act by such date as may be specified in the Order so if no such date has been specified, then not later the 31st day of July in the year in which such produce was manufactured, if that is going to be the future practice, then it would appear to me to be much more reasonable to leave the date at the 31st of July, unless this date was extended. The Order should be made and published not in the way advertisements in the daily Press not later than the month of August in the particular year in which the sugar is manufactured.

I think that an amendment of this kind has far-reaching repercussions and it is a matter which would probably be better dealt with by reference to a Select Committee. I am not making any definite proposals in that regard, but Your Honour will appreciate that when the Government is introducing legislation like this on the very day on which the legislation is being considered, hon. members are put in a very peculiar position *vis-a-vis* in the interest of the constituents and the particular legislation being dealt with. We know that it is the practice of the Government to do things in a hurry, in an unorthodox and, in many cases, a hasty manner; but I do not think that things should be done in such a manner. I am asking the Hon. Minister to scrutinise the relevant legislation with a great deal more care than is evident from the introductory speeches which are made from that side of the House.

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. R. G. MAPP, 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.

6.05 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called it reads as follows:—

Subsection (3) of section three of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "this Act" the words "by such date as may be specified in the Order or if no such date has been specified then."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I am just letting the honourable member in charge of this Bill know that it is not quite clear to me where it is difficult to decide on the allocation of money and therefore it is difficult to know what levy should be raised before the 31st July what sort of order in that respect to make. Will you make an Order to extend the time? I may tell the Honourable Minister that my difficulty is that you have said that by the 31st July it is sometimes very difficult to determine the rate of levy. You do not have all the relevant facts by that time. I take it that you are not extending the time because at any time you can make an order to extend that. If you are saying that it is difficult to know before the 31st July what Order to make I am saying that the 31st July will pass and then you will bring in an Order to say that you have extended it. [A VOICE: As soon as you see that you cannot do it by that time you will bring in the order]. If in the Order you are to say that the amount of 12/- is to be paid in and the relevant facts are not before you by the 31st July, how can you say that? If the Order is to say how much should be the levy and you are saying that you may

not know before the 31st July, how can you make an order until after the 31st July? That is my difficulty.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have just one particular point to put before the Hon. Minister in charge of this Section which we are discussing—Section 2—which amends sub-section 3 of Section 2 of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947. I want to get that straight so that the Minister of Trade will be able to follow me. I will try to use words of monosyllables for his benefit. Section 2 states that that Section of the Act is hereby amended by inserting after the words “this Act” the words “by such date as may be specified in the order or if no such date has been specified then.”

If you look at the Principal Act in the interpretation Clause there is no reference of the word “Order” at all. Now, the first reference of the word “Order” is found in Section 4, Sub-section 3 of the Principal Act and it reads as follows:—

“All moneys received by the Sugar Production and Export Control Board under the provisions of this Act by way of levy on produce during any year subsequent to the year one thousand nine hundred and forty seven shall be paid by the said Board to the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Board, the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Reserve Board and the Governor-in-Executive Committee in such proportions as shall be fixed in respect of that year by order of the Governor-in-Executive Committee with the approval of the two Houses of the Legislature”.

You will see that there is no question of dates under that sub-section or the Executive Committee being given any power to make the order as to the dates on which they are to be paid. The order that the Executive Committee makes is in relation to the proportions which will be allocated to the three different funds. I want to make this point clear: there is no mention of what an order is in the Interpretation Clause which is Clause 2 of the Act. We come in this Year of Grace—nine years later—and refer to the word “Order”. Which “Order” are we referring to? You cannot amend an Act and say “in the order” unless it is in the Interpretation Clause. If you look through the Act you will see that the order is only made in relation to proportions. The Executive Committee has no power to make any orders as to date. It can be done but it will have to be done in a different way. You will have to state in Clause 3 that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall have power to make an Order as to date and you will have to specify how that order is to be promulgated.

I said before, when this Bill was being considered at a different stage that the method of publication for the kind of information should be entirely different from merely laying it on the Table of both Houses of the Legislature. That is not a satisfactory way of publishing the date. It should be done by advertisement in the Press. The confusion arises because people go in for legislation in an *ad hoc* or piecemeal manner without any continuity of system or ideas.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think the last hon. member said we should do something we are doing. I do not know if he is mixing up the Bill with the Order. He said that having raised a levy or made an Order by 31st July you cannot make an Order today and we would have to put in the existing Bill a proviso to give the Government the power

to do so. If you do not know by the 31st July what the levy would be, we have the power in the existing Act to come back at a further date to make an Order which is enforceable with the power of penal provision. If we did not bring in this Bill we could make an Order for the 31st July, the penal provision would not apply. We cannot penalise a manufacturer. I have already had legal opinion but the hon. member may have a legal opinion of his own, but I am guided by the legal opinion of the Government.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I attempted just now to use words of one syllable for the benefit of the Hon. Minister. I was trying to assist him, but there is a certain level of condescension below which I refuse to fall. I do not want to be condescending to the Minister but I would like to explain like the alphabet. The 1947-13 Act, says, there would be a levy: Section 3 says, when the levy is to be paid; Section 4 says that after the levy is paid in that the Governor-in-Executive Committee makes an Order with the approval of the two Houses of the Legislature which is a cumbersome bit of machinery. Anyhow the money is paid in to the Governor-in-Executive Committee who make an order specifying the different amounts or proportions in which this fund should be allocated to the three funds. Now, Sir, I wonder if the Minister has followed me so far.

Now, you have a levy then you pay money to the Sugar Production Board and then after the money is paid in the Governor-in-Executive Committee has the power to make an Order. Now, in this Bill which he brings today, he says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee in making an Order shall specify the day when the money is to be paid in. If I could go to the extravagances of the senior member for St. Joseph I would say a boy in fourth standard, (but I would say a boy in second standard) would understand you cannot make an Order before the money is paid in. You cannot make an Order until the money is paid in, as otherwise, as the saying is, somebody would not get any. In other words they will find themselves in a serious position because the money has not been paid in. Therefore, that is my suggestion to the Minister; because after all, I am a Barbadian and I do not want to see my constituents suffer by a Clause in this Act. The Order is to fix the proportion or to fix the date or both, and in section 3, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby authorised to make an Order not later than the 31st July each year specifying the date on which such levy should be in the fund.

I will repeat for the benefit of the Minister, the Act repeals the Order on the levy, Section 3 says when the money is to be paid to the Sugar Production Board and Section 4, after the money is paid in the Governor-in-Executive Committee makes an Order. It is clear to all except the blind when the money is to be paid in; but perhaps, Sir, you might be kind enough to get one side after the House has been adjourned and try to simplify things a little for him.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr CHAIRMAN reported the passing of a Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

The Order Paper having been fixed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 8th May, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.

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.
6.20 p.m.

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th May, 1956.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, 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. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Documents:—

Statement of Accounts for the half year ended 31st March, 1956, from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. George.

Statement of Accounts for the half year ended 31st March, 1956, from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. George in connection with tenantry roads.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. James, for the half year ended 31st March, 1956.

Messrs. BRYAN and TUDOR entered the House and took their seats.

ILLNESS OF THE CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Medical Cer-

tificate on behalf of the Clerk of this House that he is still unable to perform his duties and will be unable to resume his duties until the 1st June, 1956.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On the last occasion, there was a Medical Certificate on behalf of the Clerk granting him ten days' leave, and that period has not yet expired.

Mr. SPEAKER: This a further Certificate.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If it is your wish, Sir that I should move that the Clerk be granted an extension of leave, I beg to move that he be granted an extension of leave until the 31st May, 1956.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk until the 31st May, 1956.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be appointed to act as Clerk until the 31st May, 1956.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier): Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier): Resolution to place the sum of \$8,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 4, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier): Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

QUESTIONS

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER

To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour:—

Is Government aware of the dissatisfaction existing amongst Her Majesty's Customs Guards in respect of their conditions of employment and rates of pay?

2. Will Government state:—

(a) How many working hours per Guard per week?

(b) How many working days per Guard per Week?

(c) What is the rate of overtime pay per hour?

And (d) How many hours overtime each of these men is required to perform within a working week?

Mr. T. O. BRYAN

To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:—

In view of the reply to question 42, *re* Erection of Communal Baths and Latrines in Jackson, St. Michael; which reply states that Government had recently allocated funds from the Rural Amenities Fund to erect in collaboration with the several Vestries a limited number of Communal Baths and Latrines in the rural areas:

2. Will the Minister state what action if any has been taken in connection with

(a) the selection

(b) the site and,

(c) the erection of the required Baths and Latrines in Jackson, St. Michael.

Mr. T. O. BRYAN

To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:—

Is the Government aware of the hardships endured by the hawkers permitted to peddle their wares at the Baggage Warehouse, through exposure to the elements?

2. Will Government give immediate consideration to the erection of some shelter for their protection?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

ORDER PRECEDING GOVERNMENT BUSINESS POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, in connection with the Order which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael above that of Government business, I have intimated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that in view of the absence of the Premier at today's sitting, I should ask leave for further postponement.

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

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY IN RESPECT OF DR. HYACINTH MORGAN

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds with its next business, it is with deep regret that I seek Your Honour's permission to move

a Resolution of Sympathy in connection with the death of Dr. Hyacinth Morgan. The late Dr. Morgan, as Your Honour well knows, is a very distinguished West Indian. He was born in Grenada 70 years ago, not of wealthy family; he was able to proceed to the University of Glasgow at the age of 20 years and he qualified as a medical practitioner.

Dr. Morgan should be close to us, not only because of the geographical position of his birth, but because he was for many years a very distinguished member of the British Labour Party. Indeed, Sir, he was a pioneer in many respects. In addition to being a pioneer, he was one of the few West Indians (I will go so far as to say he was one of the few West Indians who accepted that he was a West Indian) to sit in the House of Commons, the Mother of Parliaments. He was for many years Medical Adviser of Trade Union Congress in Great Britain; as a matter of fact, he was world-wide renowned as a specialist in industrial diseases.

I think, Sir, that I need not say much more relating to Dr. Morgan, except for the fact that he was a pioneer; and it is only fitting that the constituency which he represented, Rochdale, should have been the birthplace of the Co-operative Movement.

Dr. Morgan resigned from the House of Commons last year owing to ill health. I must confess that although he had reached the allotted span of life, his passing touches me perhaps more closely than any member of this Honourable Chamber, because for a few years he was a neighbour of mine in the district of Hampstead in London. He was not only my neighbour but also my friend; and very many other West Indians who were in the same position as myself who needed advice from time to time whether they were students or workers could always find ready, willing and capable assistance from the direction of Dr. Morgan.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, rise to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the House of Assembly place on record its regret of the death of Hyacinth Morgan, former member of the Commons; and

Resolved further that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to his surviving relatives.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a neighbour of Dr. Morgan his wife lived with him, but I am not quite sure if she has predeceased him. However, I am sure that information can be easily got and this Resolution be transmitted to his wife or other relatives.

I am sure if the hon. senior member for St. Joseph were in his place he would probably be able to add something or, perhaps, he would have moved this Resolution himself. I also know that Your Honour had the privilege of meeting Dr. Morgan and no doubt Your Honour would join in this expression of sympathy.

3.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In seconding that Resolution, I really had no intimation of the death of Dr. Morgan until the hon. senior member for St. George spoke. I think, Sir, that I can add very little to what the hon. senior member has said, except that I think it is fitting that we on this side of the Table and of the whole House should take advantage of this opportunity to express to the widow of the late Dr. Morgan our deep regret at his passing. I myself had the honour of knowing Dr. Morgan. As the hon. senior member said, he was not only a distinguished politician but an honest and earnest parliamentarian. He was a West Indian, and he at all times, and on all occasions took opportunity to raise questions relating to the West Indies on the floor of the House whether they concerned Barbados, St. Kitts or anywhere else. Sir, as the hon. member has said he was a friend to

all West Indians who happened to find themselves in Great Britain; and he would always lend a willing hand to anything he could do to make the lot of the West Indian people resident in England better.

I do beg to second the motion moved by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, from our side of the Table I would also like to express our sympathy to the relatives of the late Dr. Morgan who died very recently. Unfortunately, I only just saw the notice in the paper. I am unable to say much more except what I know of Dr. Morgan as a politician. He as we all know represented a constituency in England on the labour side for many years. Having a West Indian in the Mother Parliament is always a great thing for the colonies, because I have been told that only very recently when colonial matters come up in Parliament, these matters were just discussed among a few Parliamentarians.

Dr. Morgan was always one of those people to say what he knew of conditions in the West Indies, and to keep the West Indies before the public's mind. He is one of the few West Indians who have been selected to the Mother Parliament and for that we are always grateful. He has done his bit. The most that we can do is to pay tribute to his past work and to express our sympathy. I join with other members in this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to associate myself with the kind remarks expressed by the hon. senior member for St. George, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Social Services. I too have had the honour of meeting and knowing Dr. Morgan. I can say he impressed me as a great West Indian. Any West Indian who had the opportunity of meeting him in London could tell what a good friend he was to West Indians. I can only associate myself with the Resolution the House is about to pass, in honour of this great West Indian. All members will now stand.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, honourable members standing in their places.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services; to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE PROPERTY AT BECKLES ROAD

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am sure honourable members will be glad to learn that the Government has taken steps to clear up the entrance to the Government Headquarters in Bay Street from Beckles Road, by its intention, with the approval of the Legislature, to purchase the property known as Drakes property at the corner of Beckles Road and Bay Street. No doubt, Sir, you will agree with me that this building is a hazard to all motorists and vehicular traffic.

Now, Sir, it is very difficult for motorists to negotiate with the major road traffic at that corner. One has to actually put one's vehicle half way in the

road from the Beckles Road side on to Bay Street, before one can get clearance to proceed on the Bay Street Road. It should also be remembered that the Housing Board some years ago wrote the Government recommending to Government the purchase of this property with a view to demolishing it, for the purpose of lending easy vision to the corner. The Gov- \$24,380.

I should add that before we reach that stage, the owner was asking more for the property and Government got valuers to value the property. They valued it at the amount now stated in the Addendum to the Resolution. The balance between \$24,380 and \$25,204.70 is to pay all legal expenses connected with the purchase of this property.

There is hardly anything more to be said at this stage. I think members are well aware of the fact that it is the intention of the Government, by a process of gradualness, to remove all those houses at least on the northern side of the Government Headquarters from time to time.

This is the beginning, Sir, to clean up that area; and as I said to improve on the vision at that junction. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this site is one that members of this House knew about years ago and asked the Government to acquire for the purpose of cleaning up that area, and also to improve traffic conditions that obtain on that corner. The Minister has rightly said that to get around there or to get on the Bay Street road from Beckles Road you always run the risk of having a collision with on-coming traffic; you have to point your bonnet out into the middle of the road before you can see what is coming, and many accidents of both major and minor proportions have occurred on that corner. For nothing else but to relieve traffic congestion and hazards, it is right for Government to do something there. 3.45 p.m.

Now that the Government owns the lot above, it is to be hoped that the improvement will be carried further down.

As to the price, I am happy to know that, at least in this case, the Government has been able to come to an arrangement with the owner of this property, and it has not come down with one of these Compulsory Acquisition Orders. It is true that these Orders are there for a purpose, but I think that free negotiation is much better than using these Orders; and although it may appear to be a larger sum than we would be prepared to pay for this property as a business proposition yet, for the cleaning up of the area and effecting that improvement, I do not think it is unduly in excess of what we would normally pay for the property, that is £5,000.

Now we are on this matter, (I have accepted this amount as a reasonable one to pay for this property) I am wondering what the Government has in mind to do on the other side of the road at that end. There are some chattel houses on the frontage of Bay Street, and I am wondering if an improvement on that side cannot be effected. We want to make the improvement on the corner of Beckles Road and Bay Street even better: there is only a chattel shop there and a nice clearance could be made because the traffic in this area is heavy, and it is getting heavier.

Another remarkable thing about this Resolution is that the Government is called upon to pay trade taxes for this year on this property. The amount of the taxes on this property is not a lot of

money, but it seems to be a rather strange agreement for the Government to have to pay there taxes. A person may claim that he is deprived of the business for the year, but that should be taken care off in the price which is being paid for the property.

As a matter of fact, the owner of the property is not the person who is carrying on the business at all, and it seems strange to me that the Government should have been demanded to pay the trade taxes as well as other things. Apart from that, I am happy to know that the Government is going to clear up both a traffic hazard and an eye-sore.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to point out that in the Estimates for 1956—57, at page 133, if you read the note to Item 7, "Land acquisition," under the Head "Miscellaneous" you cannot possibly fit that note into a scheme of this sort. The note to that Item says this:—

"Token provision for the purchase of land which might be required for sites of new buildings."

That is what the note says; whereas, this Resolution is for the purpose of buying a building, demolishing it and improving the area; I cannot see the connection between the two things at all. What did the Government have in mind? What have they done with the money which has been expended under this Item? Certainly, it could not be expended for a similar purpose. You cannot supplement this amount; if you supplement this amount, it means that you are buying buildings. I would really like to hear why this money which has been voted for an entirely different purpose, has been used for this purpose.

Mr. BARROW: I think that the Hon. Minister of Social Services ought to answer the query raised by the hon. junior member for the City but perhaps the hon. junior member for the City has not yet heard that they intend to build a Japanese pagoda for the Ministers to sport themselves in. My contention is that the wheels of the pagoda will be made of bread paper [Laughter]. But there is a much more serious aspect of this Resolution to which I would like to draw the attention of this House. It would appear, from the enormous amount of money involved, that the Ministerial Benches now have a slogan instead of compulsory acquisition and so creating constitutional and industrial welfare, the slogan is: "We must have a piece of land at any price." While the Government is to be commended for not having to refer or to resort to the machinery of compulsory purchase acquisition, when you realise that \$25,000 is going to be paid for \$5,000 square feet of land, we have to say that the slogan on the banner of the Ministers is this: "Get a piece of land at any price."

I would like to make it abundantly clear that for years I have been of the opinion that these pill boxes which are at the corner of Beckles Road and Bay Street should be demolished. As the hon. junior member for Christ Church has so rightly pointed out, there is a danger both to traffic and pedestrians, and this particular building is not a very sightly one. My support of this Resolution is rather from the utilitarian than the aesthetic point of view. I do not want to enhance the architectural grace and proportions in the new Ministerial Buildings, but I would like to see that obstruction removed.

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether, in view of the very high price which is being paid for 5,000 square feet of land on which no other building is going to be erected, it would not have been much better to have acquired this land under the compulsory purchase acquisition which it is in his power to do.

3.55 p.m.

As regards the Japanese pagoda, perhaps the beauty of the spot can be enhanced in some way without disturbing the view of the traffic. You can have shelter in the garden for people who want to sit there and see the Ministers drive in. I wish to say again that I had to look very closely at the Resolution when I received it with the Addendum stating that the sum of \$10,250 was part of the price to be paid for it. I was wondering whether it would not be better if Government purchase it under compulsory acquisition.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is one point which I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. When Government purchases this land will there be any land intervening Government Headquarters and the site proposed to be purchased. I notice that there are some small houses between the building and Government Headquarters. I want to know if those houses are included in that area which is to be bought. I would like to get some information on that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, first of all I will answer the hon. senior member for St. George by saying that I do not believe there is any one who deplores the present practice of valuing land and properties more than I. Indeed, I have been for sometime making suggestions, which I hope will soon bear fruit, that the Government should have its own valuers or valuer attached to the Government in order to value land and property for the Government throughout the Island. I am much astounded at times to see the fantastic prices which are quoted for land and also for properties when Government expresses its intention to purchase land or property. However, we are faced with this situation; it appears that every valuer has his eye or mind on his having something to be valued in the very near future; and that being so, valuation will always be very high.

I, myself, after seeing this valuation expressed the opinion that it was very high for that property with such an old building. I know from experience that we have attempted on more than one occasion, after appointing valuers in the first instance and they made the valuation, to appoint a second lot who pushed up the valuation of the former valuers. So you will see that in that case, there is absolutely no alternative.

As I have been made to understand, the two gentlemen who gave this valuation are conversant with valuing properties in this island; and I feel they have done a bit better than some would have done if they had been asked to value this property. In this case, I want to assure the hon. member that I do not feel if we had to purchase it under the Compulsory Land Acquisition Act that we would be better off; in fact, I think we would be worse off.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition enquired as to whether the Government was prepared to remove the building on the northern side of Beckles Road. I have been considering the question with the Director of Highways and Transport and there is the possibility of our removing that building; as a matter of fact, I said when I was introducing this Resolution that it was the intention of the Government to clean up that whole area after removing this building. In the process of time we are going to remove all those unsightly houses at the corner of Beckles Road and surrounding the Government Headquarters.

As regards the question raised by the hon. junior member for St. Philip, as far as I have been able to gather, this property is the only one on that site, the others are situated on land owned by this Government. If we purchase this property, the Government

will seek to remove the whole lot of houses on that side.

The hon. junior member for the City has doubts as to whether this is the appropriate item which should be supplemented to purchase this land. I appreciate his point. But I think he will agree with me when I say that ever since the Five Year Plan was put before the House in 1952-53, it was made clear then that at some time or the other the Government's intention was to erect Parliament Buildings somewhere near the area; and therefore it was felt that this item would be the appropriate item to supplement it. While it is true that we are purchasing a building for the purpose of demolishing it, the hon. member will appreciate the fact that it is the land at which we are aiming and not the building. The building is of little or no use. In order to purchase the land we have to purchase the building. We will have to demolish the building in order to get the land for development of the area.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is obviously in difficulty, and could just have admitted that, because the speech he has made cannot do him any good. You want the land and you have to buy the building. If the land were acquired and they wanted to get the building down, there would not be the hurry. What I am saying is, you have something in your Estimates for land acquisition, and I would like to remind him that when the Five Year Plan came here, he was the only person who knew that Parliament Buildings would be erected there. The idea of Bay Street did not come until Capt. Tomlin came. We all knew that the Parliament Buildings were to be erected on the lands at Government House. So far as the Five Year Plan is concerned, nobody knew about building parliament buildings up there.

I am saying you cannot come in here for this under land acquisition because this is what it is: you are buying the building. Bringing down a special Resolution for the purpose could be done. Even like acquiring land for cutting out blind corners. You have had to do that; anything like that which has a main reason to it, but if you merely say your project is to get hold of the land, do not forget you are buying the land at £1 per square foot. It is five thousand square feet of land and you are paying £1 per square foot for it. Did you buy the Bay Estate for that? You did not buy the Bay Estate for anything near that.

I feel that when you want to buy some land for building, whether it be for housing or any other project, you are going to have to come for money for that, to keep your Five Year Plan within reason. You have already spent £10,000 more than you set out to spend on this Head. However, Sir, I must say that I agree that the person getting it has to be thankful for the good price and also to get the Government for the first time to pay Parochial taxes. But I take it that you are robbing the man of his livelihood, for business, and all that has to be taken into consideration. I hope the honourable members do not go and agree with having Government valuers to value or purchase land, because all they have to do is to pay good salaries or bribe them to say the property is only worth so much. You are getting at the people valuing the land, you are getting at the valuation. You have to decide on these people. The Government themselves appoint the valuers every year, they must look out for men who own properties themselves, because they feel a person who has no property is capable of making a valuation. This is the qualifications for Government choosing them and publishing their names in the Official Gazette as valuers.

I would like to remind honourable members that on the last occasion when you were discussing this particular item, I asked in the House whether there was any intention to purchase this property. All the Government Ministers sat down and could not say a word. In the course of a week the Resolution for the building of Ministerial Offices went to the Other Place and the Colonial Secretary could tell non-elected members of the Legislature that their Government is considering buying that place. I wonder if he thinks this is satisfactory! Let him take the debates and look them up; I think they were published then.

The Natural Gas Corporation could be taken somewhere inland; carry it at the Pine. The Resolution left here and went to the Other Place and the Chief Secretary could say that Government is considering buying the place at Bay Street. It is not good enough. They should not fail to dispose of information to the people's representation which is neither a state secret, a military secret or any other secret.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, what the Government really should learn as a result of this, is that the time to acquire these properties for development is in the initial stage where they are going to develop an area. The Government bought the Bay years ago. They started to develop by putting down more houses and the traffic on that road increased. It was evident to them at that time that this building had to be bought, therefore when they contemplated erecting the Government Buildings on its present site, they must have realised then that this would have to be bought.

As soon as you put up a half million dollar structure above this building, it raised the value of this building. They should have bought this at least five years ago before they started the construction of the Government Building, and they probably would have got it at half this price. What has increased the value of this property but development around that area? Government must not look on themselves different from how a business would run or operate.

If you were going to develop in Tweedside Road and you are putting down a Gasoline station, you look for elbow room. If you have any big ideas about expansion you do not want to go and buy the minimum area and after establishing yourself, you find you want room and have to pay more for it because no matter how poor the person is next door and they realise that you want their property, you will have to pay for it. Government is no different from businesses that are developing. It should be a warning to them that if they have in mind to develop an area, make overall plans in the beginning and see what they will require before they start to acquire it. If they go and develop and then want to acquire these things, they are going to have to pay. No matter what valuers you have, they will have to take into account all developing factors around that site. If you appoint your Government valuers or impartial valuers these are the things they look on.

What makes that building now, is that it is a commercial building; and they have every right to expect that the business that will be done there will be greater today now that Government Buildings are above. It should be a warning to Government. Let them in future decide what they want and acquire it before they start to develop.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$10,250 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.15 p.m.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read a first and second time and agreed to.

PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr Speaker, — This Bill is an Amendment to the Public Health Act, 1908, and the purpose of it is to reduce the minimum area of a lot of land to be let or sold from 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet. The Act says that the minimum size of such a lot is to be 2,400 square feet. The General Board of Health and the Government have been somewhat concerned within the past few years as to whether this size of 2,400 square feet should remain as it is, or whether it should be reduced. In view of the fact that the population is increasing and we are not getting any more land, Barbados is not getting any bigger, it has been decided by the General Board of Health that the size of a lot of land to be let or sold should be reduced to 1,800 square feet.

One might wonder why the Government should, at this stage, come down with this Amendment, when the new Public Health Act has not been put into force. However, it is hoped that this new Act will come into force next year when the Local Government Act comes into force. Meanwhile land is being sold out and the object for which this Amendment is sought, will be defeated if we continue to wait until the Public Health Act becomes Law. The Sections of the Act which are being amended by this Bill are Sections 52 (ii) and 54 (i). I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Minister of Social Services has omitted to make it clear that the General Board of Health was against the reduction of the size of a house spot. I do not think that the Public Health Officers of the Government are in favour of this reduction. It is most unfortunate that a Bill of this sort should be brought forward at a time when the public is deprived of the opportunity of seeing what is being enacted. A Bill of this nature under normal conditions, would have appeared in the *Official Gazette* and people apart from members of the Legislature who may know a great deal about this Bill, would have had the opportunity of discussing it and probably assisting the Government greatly in this issue which is a very important issue.

Another unfortunate lot of circumstances is that we are now without the services of the daily newspaper in which, I am quite sure, the *pros and cons* of an important issue like this would have been put before the Public in the correspondence columns of that newspaper. Sir, I do not know what the Government hopes to get out of merely saying that only one-third of the land must be covered; that would confine the erection of houses to very small ones. I do not know whose advice they have taken, but all the Public Health people have discussed this matter and they are of the opinion that the size of the house spots should not be reduced.

I do not know why we have come to this decision that the population is growing so large that there is no land available on which to put houses. No scientific survey has been made of this Island to show whether that is so, that you have reached or you are coming near to saturation point where houses are concerned. You can certainly drive through the country for many miles along the front roads without seeing a house, and I do not know whether the Government has given the most careful consideration to this matter.

They have access to a newspaper which is still being printed, and I would like to see the *pros and cons* of this matter discussed so that the Government would see something about it before making it law. There may be people who would like to see more land used for houses, and therefore they would like a Bill of this sort. This Bill may have the tendency of increasing the price of land, a thing which the Government has deplored. If you can build more houses on the land, the price of the land would tend to go up and make it impossible for poor people to own the land on which they would want to erect their houses.

As the honourable junior member for St. Michael is always saying, we may be enacting Legislation to further enhance the coffers of the land sharks. I have not discussed this matter, or heard it discussed at the meetings of the General Board of Health at which they are present persons who know about Public Health, persons who were trained in it, and who have the opportunity of going around and seeing people when they are ill.

4.25 p.m.

I have no special knowledge of the subject, but, Sir, I have heard people describe these house-spots as tennis courts. The Government is bent on reducing the area, therefore, I do not think anything which I or any other honourable member may say would prevent them from doing it. I have not gathered from them that it was discussed with that knowledge. From my intimate knowledge of the Board of Health and by the opinions of people who have recently been advising the Government in sanitation and the good health of the people, I do not think it is a right thing to do, therefore, I cannot give it my blessing.

I think that land on which the Government has erected one-storied buildings that they should have built two-storied buildings to house the people properly but they have refused to do it. Certainly the Government had land at Bay Street where they could have erected two-storied buildings and they failed to do it. Now they are disagreeing with what is the considered opinion of trained experts that 2,400 square feet of land is the minimum on which to allow a man to build a house to raise a family.

What is a matter of concern also, is that they have brought in this Bill at a time when they can get the least criticism, and the least opportunity of getting expert advice. Somebody came to this Island recently who has had experience of this matter and could have fortified the Government on what it was doing, or could have shown them that this was really a wrong way of going about it, but that type of criticism has gone; at least for a while.

Then, this Bill is a matter for publication in the *Official Gazette* so as to let the people know what laws are to be enacted. But there has been no publication of the *Official Gazette* recently. As it appears to me, this is now more a dictatorship than ever. I am not particularly able today to go into lengthy debate on the matter. I can only deplore the circumstances under which this Bill is to be made law.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I believe this Bill has come about because the Government has a

found some difficulty in developing their lands economically into house spots, owing to the minimum size of a house spot, which is according to the regulations of the Board of Health, 2,400 square feet. There was a time when the house spots were as small as 1,200 square feet. Then, I think they were increased to 1,600 square feet, and another further regulation came into force which directed that the minimum size of a plot, as it is today, is to be 2,400 square feet. The Government in developing the Fine and the Bay Estates has found that 2,400 square feet on which to put a house is to them unnecessarily large. They want to reduce that size so that they can get more house spots on an acre of land. I think other developers of land have to maintain that standard of a minimum of 2,400 square feet; and I am sure that they cannot go to the Board of Health with an application to cut up land in plots of less than that size.

To my mind, one of the most important things about the regulations in this respect is the minimum frontage. As you know 2,400 square feet of land can be acquired in different ways. It can be either 40' x 60', that is a frontage of 40 feet or it can have a frontage of sixty feet by 40 feet deep. If land is cut up with a frontage of less than 40 feet, that would put houses more closely together; and of course, if you have a minimum frontage of 40 feet that would also be helpful for reducing the size of a plot to 1,800 square feet inasmuch as you can make it 45 feet deep.

I know that the General Board of Health has had discussions with the Housing Authority on this matter. The Housing Authority has taken Committees to the Bay Estate and shown them areas of land which are 2,400 and what it can do to reduce that size. But the Committees have not been convinced that that size should be reduced to 1,800 square feet, although the Housing Authority has told them that Puerto Rico and other places in the Caribbean have now reduced that minimum size of 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet. With all that information we feel it is wrong to do so in Barbados, and to my mind it is a wrong thing to do. We feel that if Government wants to make a greater use of its land for development purposes instead of building one-storied houses, they can go upstairs so as to get more people to live in an acre of land. We feel that to cut up land in plots of less than 2,400 square feet is going to create problems. Not only would we have to allow private enterprise to do it, but we may not yet have full control of future development of lands as it is in other countries; therefore, although you may say that not more than one-third of the minimum of 1,800 square feet is to be covered by the house, everyone who knows the ways of family development in this country knows that it cannot work well.

4.35 p.m.

Any one who knows the ways of family development in Barbados will realise that another house is added when another child gets married or creates a family, and we have nothing to control it in Barbados. I do not know whether it would be controlled under the Town and Country Planning Bill. We have the Board of Health and this has been brought in against the desires of the Board of Health, because they refuse to cut land up in smaller lots. It has been like that; but this has been brought down here to accommodate the Housing Authorities of the Government. They are the ones pressing for this. But what we fear is, even if they can control it under Government auspices, it cannot be controlled under private investors who are cutting up land.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is a fallacy underlying the premises of this Bill. That fallacy

is that in Barbados we are short of land for building, that is, land which is not of an agricultural nature, and that unless we crowd more people in a smaller space, the economy of the island will suffer because the agricultural land will be taken up by dwelling houses.

Now, that is not, Mr. Speaker, any supposition of mine; that is a sentiment which I have actually heard express from the Ministerial Benches, perhaps not in these precise terms, but certainly in the same strain. Now, there are approximately 106,000 acres of land in Barbados plus or minus 2,000 acres. Out of that 106,000 acres of land, approximately 97,000 acres are arable; that is, suitable for agricultural production. What has happened in Barbados up to now, Mr. Speaker, is that in many cases, localities where there has been what is popularly known as raw land available for building development, people have been allowed to use good agricultural land for subdivision into lots under the Public Health Act of 1908 without any restriction on the utilisation of that land for building purposes, provided that the subdivision and sale complied with the Public Health Act. That is a sale complied with the Public Health Act. That is the process going on to-day. The result is that we have areas of fertile agricultural land such as Maxwell, a long stretch of land of about two miles on either side. On the main highway to Seawell Airport we have land on either side of the highway; going to the northern parishes which Your Honour has the good fortune to be representing and where we have greater development of good agricultural land, in the same locality with proper zoning and proper Town and Country Planning Legislation, settlement could be made on land which is not suitable for agriculture. And so the myth has been created that there is a shortage of building land in Barbados; but from my investigation, Sir, I can assure you that it would take another hundred years at our present rate of population growth before the question of agriculture land being taken up for building sites becomes a real problem in this country. That is provided, we enact as soon as possible and with as little delay as possible, proper Town and Country Planning Legislation.

It is rather regrettable only now after five years of the present Government, that we hear any reference or promise made of such legislation in the speech of the Officer administering the Government of this colony. Now, I would like the Minister who is in charge of this Bill to go a little further than I have gone, and produce figures for the benefit of members of this Chamber to demonstrate that the total acreage taken up with building sites is now encroaching upon 97,000 acres as a quantity, not in any particular locality, but encroaching upon 97,000 acres that we have for agricultural production.

There is one other aspect of this amendment to the Public Health Act to which I would particularly like to draw Your Honour's attention, and that is this: the whole rationality of Housing Schemes and slum clearance is to provide for the inhabitants of the country who are not in the position to build elaborate mansions or even commodious dwelling houses.

Now, are we setting our targets at such a low level that we are now going on record as approving a lot 30' x 60' as adequate for a man, his wife and family to live on, to give them living room? I myself consider that 2,400 sq.-ft. the present minimum size of a lot under subsection 52 of 1908 Public Health Act as itself inadequate. I would like to see the restrictions under the Public Health Act set the minimum lot at 5,000 sq. ft. and not at 2,400 sq. ft. But I would go on to say this: what we should limit is the area between one house and the other; so that if the Government in their Housing Schemes elects to build sky

scrapers, as long as there is a garden belt around the particular apartments, (terraces as they are fond of calling them) we would have no objection to that sort of thing under Government aided schemes.

4.45 p.m.

The people of Barbados already live under conditions of severe overcrowding and congestion. A lot of the cases which reach the Law Court of this Island are due to main defects in our social system *vis-a-vis* housing; and these two defects are that the houses are too close to each other, and we have no right with standposts in the roads from which people have to get water. There is not one single house which I have seen under the Aided Self-Help Scheme, there is not one House at the Bay Estate which contains water-borne sanitation. I believe that provision was made in the "Terraced Houses", as they call them, for that system; but in the other case, there is a pipe in the yard. We have Government Schemes to-day in the Clinketts area where a pipe is 300 yards from the house. You get a lot of law court cases because when people are rushing to do, I forget what they call it, but you put your bucket on top of mine, and I put my bucket on top of yours, and we are getting these rows. The Government has done nothing to put a stop to that sort of thing in our country to-day.

Far from affording the working classes greater living room, we are trying to congest them now, and we are trying to do it on the excuse that building sites are getting scarce. But all that one has to do is to drive around and see the colossal amount of rab land where we can have properly zone villages with all the needed facilities, and that in itself would be a convenience and saving to thousands of people of this Island; where they can have the people of this Island in village communities so that some kind of spirit can be developed amongst the inhabitants. Not only that, but it would be much easier to instal water, electricity and gas if you have compact villages than if you have this sort of spread-eagle development.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, for some time now, this Amendment which we have before us now has been discussed. I believe I was a member of the Housing Board when the matter first came up. It was argued then that due to the shortage of house spots and the possibility of having to use more of the agricultural land, there might have to be a reduction in the size of house spots. I have had some experience in dealing with this matter: I have never agreed with the size of 1,800 square feet of land for a house spot, because I felt that 2,400 feet would be a better size.

When the idea of the size of 2,400 square feet first came up, the proposal was to make house spots as far as possible 60 feet deep and 40 feet wide. It seems to me that, after discussing this matter, it would be better for the Government to make these house spots 2,000 square feet in size; that would be a width of 40 feet and a depth of 50 feet.

I have listened very carefully to the Hon. Leader of the House, and I quite agree with him that Barbadians develop their homes accordingly as their families increase. Therefore, I cannot see how, in this country, you are going by one step to change your system of housing, by going up into the air and have this reduction to 1,800 square feet; I cannot see how that could be of any advantage to the majority of the inhabitants of this Colony; because according to their standard of housing, people usually go to the back and build on. That is what they do as soon as their families grow or as they progress in life.

In this Bill, the plan has been laid out according to a particular scale, but I am suggesting that it is not only much easier but also more convenient and advantageous to people if the size of house spots were made 2,000 square feet instead of 1,800 square feet. I feel that under the new development where you are developing land which is not in tenantry... I digress here to say that where there is land in tenantry already, tremendous difficulties would be created in dealing with such land. In the City of Bridgetown, there were areas of 800 square feet, then it went to 1,200 square feet, to 1,600 square feet and so on.

I do not think that there could be any serious opposition to the Amendment which is now being made to the Act, but when we go into Committee on this Bill, I am going to move a further amendment. This matter has been discussed by the Housing Board, it has been put before the General Board of Health who turned it down, and I think that the Hon. Minister of Social Services was a member of the Board when the matter was turned down. You have the Housing Board with many years' experience, you have the General Board of Health with the Hon. Minister of Social Services who was a member of the Board, having discussed this matter at length, and it was turned down. I, at that time, offered a compromise of 2,000 square feet as the size of a house spot from a practical point of view.

4.55 p.m.

Suddenly, because somebody else has come in, because some authority from the Housing Board brings a recommendation to the Government, you get this. Forget the Board of Health altogether. This is not a recommendation of the Board of Health; it has nothing to do with the Board of Health. This is a recommendation which some new adviser of the Housing Board has seen fit to recommend to the Government. As far as I know, the Acting Director of Medical Services nor Medical Officers have not changed their view on this matter; yet and as you know, your Board of Health is still comprised mainly of medical men.

I wonder if this matter has been discussed again with them. I remember that there was a joint Committee of these two authorities which discussed this matter and the Board of Health turned it down. I suggest to the Government that merely because you are building a type of house such as that of your Aided Self-Help Housing Scheme which can be accommodated on 1,800 square feet, that you should not insist on a minimum plot of less than 2,000 square feet generally.

Let me say at once that the Government will never be able to build houses to house all the people in this Island who want houses. I suggest to Government to look at this matter in a broad way. Seeing that you cannot house all the people in this Island, and seeing that the majority of people will still have to improve their housing conditions gradually, I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister of Housing that an amendment to a minimum plot of 2,000 square feet would meet the situation. If the Government were to amend the law that it can cut up its land in plots of 1,800 square feet and other people can only cut up theirs in plots of 2,000 square feet, that will not work. I do know that the type of house which the Government is erecting, such as that being put up in the Aided Self-Help Scheme, cannot be put up by the average man. The average man must go gradually.

There is the question of improvement. Even despite the question of improvement, sooner or later it is going to come about in this country that you

are putting certain people in houses, where if you were to review that situation, you will find that more than 20 per cent does not qualify; because, they are actually receiving more money than would entitle them to live in such houses. Of course, that is not the fault of the Government.

Do you know what happens in big countries? As soon as you make more money than is called for to live in tenement houses of the Government, you are asked to vacate. Do you think it is fair that as soon as a man becomes a Police Sergeant he should be allowed to stay in one of the Government owned houses! I think a compromise is essential in this matter. I think the size spot of 40 feet x 50 feet is good enough in laying out any area. I have been discussing it with a surveyor who thinks it is a practical thing to do.

I am therefore suggesting to the Hon. Minister of Health to accept an amendment of 2,000 square feet. I am wondering whether he will say he will have to go back to the Executive with that. I am going to move that the section be amended to 2,000 square feet when this Bill is being dealt with in Committee.

As I was saying, the Government sent this amendment to the General Board of Health but the Board turned it down. Now it seems as if the all-powerful Housing Authority has said that it has to be done. That shows that it only takes certain people to tell the Government what to do and it has to be done. When the Premier was Chairman of the Housing Board, the Board of Health turned down this proposal. However, I think, Sir, that 2,000 square feet is a very reasonable sized plot. I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister of Health that he accepts the amendment; and for the reasons given by previous honourable members, principally that as Barbadian people advanced in life and their families grow in size, they add to the size of their houses.

As to the amendment to the Section which deals with space, that section should be amended many years ago. As a matter of fact, there are very many ways under the Public Health Act to get around it and the people do get around it. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendments as offered by the Government in this Bill provided that the words "eighteen hundred" be further amended to read "two thousand". There is nothing unreasonable about that.

5.05 p.m.

This is alright if you are saying that with the limited areas that Government has under control, Government would like to use 1,800 square feet; or if you are going to use the three-storey building with the waterborne-system, then you do not need anything else. But where you have peasantries in this country where people depend on eggs, milk and pigs to supplement their incomes I would suggest that you look at it broadly and see when you give a man 1,800 square feet you leave no room for his fowls, pigs, sheep, cows and goats. That is the danger, and remember this is a sort of bank to these people, and to those of us who benefit from them because we do not keep them. It would not pay some of us to keep pigs, goats, cows and sheep. They who in turn keep them, you should not be limiting them to 1,800 square feet. It does not apply to Bridgetown only, but to St. Andrew, St. Lucy, St. Thomas in fact all the parishes; and soon as you limit it to 1,800 square feet that is what you are doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Minister that if the system of the houses they are going

to build is the two-storey self contained flats, they can build on 1,600 square feet; but if they are going to build houses without the water-borne system of flats then you cannot make it that way. It must be known to the Minister that after you amend this and individuals make applications to build houses, then they are regulations to adhere to with the proper type of sanitation. Therefore, it can be amended for the purpose of putting up two-storey buildings. I am suggesting that you amend it to give 2,000 square feet to these people.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am adding that it is an easy matter for anybody to accept to fix the minimum amount of land which can be used as a house spot. I mean, you can get an expert to say 1,800 square feet are enough, another one to say 2,000, and another to say 2,400 square feet; and I am one to make a case to prove each is right. But in a matter of this sort, Sir, in an island like Barbados, I am of the opinion that a matter like this is best regulated according to the development of the social services of the colony. Now, originally the minimum amount was 2,400 square feet; that was the amount fixed in the days when the conservative planters and merchants ran the country.

Now, if I were to suggest that these planters and merchants had the interest of the people of this country greater at heart than the honourable members opposite, they would be the first to go hysterical.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if reactionary planters wanted to place on record 2,400 square feet as the minimum amount of land on which a family should have a house, it does appear peculiar that people, allegedly with a more highly developed social conscience, should want to reduce the amount by as much as 33 1/3%. It does appear as more than passing strange that in 1928 the authorities recorded 2,400 square feet as a minimum, and 28 years after, in 1956, we allegedly of a more highly developed social conscience, want to reduce the amount to 1,800 square feet.

What we have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, is that in the rural areas where these people would be given a minimum of 1,800 square feet for a house and a yard, they also want to keep some stock, a pig or a goat or a cow; and as they have not got a water-borne system applied to their houses, they have to put their sanitary convenience somewhere distant from the house. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if you are going to say that the minimum should be 1,800 square feet and that the dwelling house on that spot should not occupy more than one-third of the area, then they are going to put their kitchen and their sanitary convenience almost on top of each other and have very little room, and less than what you would require for raising stocks of some sort, which in nine out of ten cases, are the Savings Bank for the dwellers in the rural area.

I see no reason, Sir, if 2,400 square feet were regarded as the minimum area 28 years ago, now that we are trying to improve conditions of living for the workers throughout the island to entitle them to build bigger houses and encourage them to have families in different rooms, rather than all in the same room, plus proper sanitary facilities in the house, why instead of extending the space we are decreasing it. [Mr. Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair]. When it was fixed at 2,400 square feet none of the people who fixed it was imbued with any special desire to make more of the land available to the people. To the contrary; they were more concerned with reserving as much as they could for agriculture, and even then pushing them in the least valuable parts of the estates on which they live; and except in cases, Sir, where you

are actually building more than one storey, there can be no definite reason for attempting to reduce rather than to increase the amount of land to be made available for a house.

It is not, Sir, I submit, merely a question of scientific experts saying 2,000 square feet or 2,400 square feet; it is to a large extent the manner in which the people who are fixing this minimum look at the matter. In other words, the extent to which interests in the welfare of their fellowmen. Now, I understand, Sir, that the hon. members would like to make an adjournment at this stage and therefore with their approval I beg to move.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would not like the hon. member to be under the impression.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had the direct intimation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member might know more about it than I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In accordance with the intimation, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

PUBLIC HEALTH (AMENDMENT) BILL C'd.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was discussing the motion for the second reading of a Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908. The honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD did not rise to continue speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this amended Bill is an example of what is regarded as specific; and without much thought, it has become general. This Amendment seeks to reduce the area of a house spot specified in the Act from 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet; but behind all that, it was never the intention of any Government of Barbados really to reduce the area of land for a house spot. The origin of this Amendment stems from the fact that after the Government bought the Bay Estate and started to lay out land for housing purposes as a housing project, the Government found that they, as a Housing Authority, could utilise 1,800 square feet of land as the basis on which they would build houses. It was never the intention that all land in Barbados should be reduced to a minimum of 1,800 square feet for a house spot, because other persons who is building houses like the Government could build them. You therefore restricted the size of a house spot to that minimum because the Secretary of State for the Colonies brought out to the Government how to make greater utilisation of the land from the point of view of providing more house spots.

What is serious about this matter is this: I do not mind of what political complexion you are as a Government, you cannot change this year, 1956. The social and economic aspirations of the Government and the nation are such that you cannot politely reduce living standards like this; this is a way of reducing the living standards of the community without being cognisant of what you are doing. You are perpetuating the plantation economy out of which we are trying to get; you are not saying that this Act is going to be amended for the purpose of giving the Government or such other Housing Authority the right that where you become a Housing Authority

like the Government, you can build some houses upstairs and some like how they are built at the Bay Estate.

After a period of nearly 20 years, there were certain sections in the community, in the very section in which I am living, where before the size of 2,400 square feet of land for a house spot was passed, you could go into Bank Hall and find that if you opened your window first, then the other person could not open his. To stop that sort of thing, it became necessary to increase the size of a house spot from 1,600 square feet to 2,400 square feet. It was felt that you should not have people living on 1,600 square feet of land, and that Amendment was made. Now that the population growth has increased and people will become more crowded, what are you going to say? Are you going to say that you have areas of land to be let in lots on the basis of the Carrington's Village area? Imagine this legislation being passed in respect of the Carrington's Village area! If this Amendment were on the Statute Book, it would have meant that more money would have been put into the pockets of the owners of Carrington's Village. What people would have to pay for 1,800 square feet of land, they would have to pay for 2,400 square feet of land.

Apart from the question of health, what I am surprised about is to see that this Amendment is for Government purposes, but not for all and sundry. The Government has a portion of land for building, they lay out how they can construct their building programme, and it is different from when you just draw out an area of land and tell a man that he can build a house on it. If you are really thinking of the economic development and advancement of the people, you cannot relegate your people to an everlasting state of having houses 18 ft. x 9 ft. or a house spot of 1,800 square feet as a living standard. Now we are coming in 1956 and reducing the size of a house spot from 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet! It seems to me that your whole mental approach in this matter is to try to restrict a man to the type of living which we should want to improve. This Amendment will mean that you want to restrict a man to this limited area which you now regard as being idealistic. If anybody says that you are doing this in order to get more housing accommodation, I would say that it is like asking for a division of the salaries which you are now paying people, and giving people 12c. a day so that you will employ everybody.

You cannot utilise all of the land which is used for productive purposes and therefore you cannot turn all of the land into a working area. If Barbados is to produce anything, then you should control certain areas which have to be used for productive purposes. I maintain that this size of 1,800 square feet was for the purpose of Government projects within certain Government areas, because the Government had a large area of land, but that is different from where you have a large area of land and you are cutting it up and allowing people to live on it.

When you give people house spots of 1,800 square feet, a reduction of 600 square feet from the present standard, do you know what it means? That is another way of increasing the price of land for people. When you had the size of 2,400 square feet, you paid the price for that; but in order to get that size now you would have to buy two spots. Therefore you cannot have 2,400 square feet of land as such; you have to buy two house spots which would be 3,600 square feet.

6.05 p.m.
That means the normal development of the people will be retarded. As the honourable senior member for the City has said, the wages level has been increasing and if you are getting better wages for the

working class people, (those are the people who are going to make use of these spots because these are not the types of spots which the middle-class people use) they will want these plots of land for their chattel houses. The normal development of these people is that they build an 18' x 10' house and as they get children they put on a shedroof. As soon as the children grow up they move back the shedroof and put on another roof, and when anybody in the family gets married they push back the shedroof again and put on another roof. That is the normal development which takes place in the life of a family in Barbados; that is how the industrial people of this country have built houses. I am not referring to those people who wait to get a wall house. I am referring to the poor industrial people; and those are the people who mean something to this community.

Now, Sir, not only from that point of view, but from the point of view of the sanitary conveniences of their people, your size plot should not be less than 2,400 square feet. You have passed an Act stating the distance which a pig-pen should be away from a house. If you go and make these small house spots of 1,800 square feet when you know at the same time that these people have no water-borne system but that there is the pig-pen and the ordinary white-washed toilet in the yard, you are asking the people to huddle together in this day. The Government is building houses for the people but the houses which they are building have a water-borne system. What the Government can spend on housing, the ordinary man cannot spend. The ordinary man cannot go to the Pine and put a house with all the facilities that the Government puts in its houses.

What about the other areas such as Grazettes or Carrington's Village? If you go to those places you will see the latrine systems because the people cannot afford to put in a water-borne system. The ordinary man does not have the capital expenditure to put in all the conveniences which the Government has in its housing; so he is forced to do without those things. Of course, with a water-borne system it is easy for the Government to build on the basis it has set out in this Bill; but because it will suit the Government, it does not mean it will suit all the people. It is just like an expert coming from England where everything is done to suit a cold climate, and you ask him to build a bus and he goes ahead and builds a bus to suit a cold climate when you want it for a place where the average temperature is around 82 degrees. We are living in a tropical climate, so we will need more space than people living in cold climates.

I will go further and say: how is it that members of this Government who profess social philosophy can make an amendment such as this to be a general standard in 1956. You have just had a Committee of I.L.O. making recommendations as regards plantation territories. This is for all practical purposes something to do with plantation territories. The Hon. Premier is one of the members of the I.L.O. Expert Committee, and here it is in Barbados with a redundant population, over-crowded as it is, you are cutting up land in size plots which are not conducive to good health. You are going to introduce a method that will cause more tuberculosis, a disease of which all your doctors have spoken adversely. You are now introducing a Bill for the reduction of living space which is less than the minimum standard for people.

The way I look at this, is that it would be a betrayal of the trust of people who have reposed in you their responsibility of advancing their lives. I am sure that this would never have seen the light of day were it not that it is for the convenience of the Gov-

ernment. If it is on the basis that it is convenient for the Government, let the Crown Law Officers make provision for special circumstances and for those buildings which you intend to erect on small spots of land. What you are saying now is that an area of 1,800 square feet is sufficient for the needs of the ordinary Barbadian and therefore you are reducing it to 1,800 square feet.

I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Philip when he said that if one had got up and praised the Conservatives for introducing a thing as this, one would be termed as crazy. What amazes me about this matter is that you do not say what you really need. Does the Government seriously mean that the area of land suitable for house-spots in Barbados must in 1956 be reduced from 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet, when the very aspiration of the Government is that people should live in bigger houses? The normal aspiration is not to go smaller or to retrogress, the normal aspiration is to progress and you cannot progress on a reduction of land like this. I say again, let us give Government the authority to do this for themselves, but do not let us say that land all over the island should be reduced to 1,800 square feet, because the average man cannot build a house on the basis which Government is building them. The Housing Authority cannot dictate to people how all the houses are to be built because Government cannot build all the houses in Barbados.

6.15 p.m.

Another serious thing which you should realise is that the Government does not possess land to give the people free house-spots.

The suggestion that the Government is buying land in all the parishes for the purpose of housing areas is only an indication of a trickle of the housing needs. They will never be able to substitute for what the agricultural workers is going to buy for himself. He is going to build his house even if you give him a small area of land to build on. You cannot put in all the conveniences one time, and we know this: from the point of view of social development, water and light and the water-borne system is essential, and it will take another twenty-five years to get water in certain areas where there is no water now. You go around the country and it is amazing to find that water is not in some areas, like at Foul Bay; they are now laying pipes there, so you know it will take about twenty-five years for certain conditions to develop.

I cannot understand therefore for all that, why we should agree with the Government to having these 1,800 square feet spots. I am opposed to making legislation for the Government and not for somebody else. The building authorities or building co-operatives can build houses of certain pattern like in the Pine, but to reduce the land area in Barbados to 1,800 square feet, you will find places where the windows cannot open and you can go in one house, and the owners from one house can be as prevalent in one as in the other. It seems to me that when you reduce the space on which people must live, you are returning to the old age pattern that the people who live in the agricultural society must be content to live next door to poverty. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would be very diffident. I could not support a measure of this sort, at this stage of my own development to a reduction in the living space in Barbados from 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, what I do see here is the fact that there should be a limit to the frontage of the house. We all build on 40ft. x 50ft., but there is no limit in this Bill stating how these houses should

be built. As the hon. member who has just sat down said of these houses, you can look from one into the other, because you can put this number of square feet either in a long strip or in a square.

My idea is that some notation should be put that the minimum for the frontage should be so much, say 40 feet; in which case, I think, and I am going to support all the opinions of the previous speakers, I certainly agree that 1,800 square feet is just on the small side; the extra 200 square feet would be of great help and the occupier would have more room to turn around and it would not be quite so close.

I am very keen on seeing this minimum frontage. I think it should appeal to the Hon. Minister of Social Services that as a Doctor, air would be able to pass more freely between houses if they are spaced. I am putting it to him to see if he can put that frontage in as well as the size. It is far more hygienic to know houses have a certain space between them. Obviously it is nothing that we can fumble over; it is a necessary improvement. I would support the 2,000 square feet and also suggest a minimum frontage of 40 feet.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I differ somewhat from some hon. members who have spoken on this Bill, and I differ this way: that permitting a smaller house spot brings the ownership of such house spots within the reach of a greater number of people. The argument which some hon. members are putting up would be all right if we had sufficient land area in the colony, and it was possible for a greater majority of the population to own their house spots than now own them; but in view of the fact, Sir, that more people are unable even to purchase as much land as would be covered by a handkerchief, the reduction of the area of the house spots makes it more available to those poor people who would like to own house spots but who cannot find it possible to get the money to purchase such.

I know some hardship has been created on some families in the past when the limit was 2,400 square feet, and it came as a result of this: sometimes the parents own a house but the daughter is married; and she likes to own her own house and so sets about to frame one. She does not have the means to acquire the spot elsewhere and therefore she would like to be able to use the same spot which her family uses; but due to the regulations demanding 2,400 square feet, she has either had to forego building that house or put herself to further expense in acquiring a spot elsewhere. Many times, she was met with great difficulty in doing so.

I do not see, Mr. Speaker, where a Bill of this sort should cause any controversy. The amendment to that Act states the minimum size of the house spot and it does not make provision for a maximum; and nothing prevents a person from acquiring one, two or three small spots if in his opinion the 1,800 square feet is not sufficient to accommodate the family. I want hon. members to study that. It does not say if 1,800 square feet are not enough that you cannot get two or three; and it does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that all people who sell land would be cutting it up in 1,800 square feet spots. But it gives the small man an opportunity to own his own spot with greater ease, because a man who can find the money to buy one foot might not be able to buy one and a half feet, and it goes up the scale. In my opinion it is making it possible for more people to become owners of their house spots.

I do not say that where there is space between houses that it is not conducive to better health, but even in large cities you find tenement houses where some occupants do not see sunlight — New York City, parts of England and elsewhere, Sir, I would

say that it is time that people who are about to set up houses be encouraged to build upwards towards the sky, instead of spreading out according to our limited land area. I notice that the Government has started with these blocks and flats at the Pine. There is nothing which I think could prevent a person if a spot is too small and he wants to extend the house, putting one roof on top of the other instead of stretching it backwards.

6.25 p.m.

There is another point which I would like to suggest to the Government, a point which we have discussed at a meeting of the Board of Agriculture, and it is this: we import a lot of fruit from the neighbouring Colonies, the Customs Report shows that thousands of pounds are spent on the importation of fruit which is common to Barbados, and that is because people have not been taught the necessity of producing their own fruit. I know that some hon. members may not agree with the suggestion which I am going to make, but if you can enact legislation for the purpose of remedying one evil, then you can also enact legislation to remedy another evil. We are now suggesting that the size of a house spot should not be less than 1,800 square feet, and that shows the justification of my argument. I suggest that in any housing scheme or in any regulation controlling such a scheme, there should be a stipulation compelling every householder to have on his premises one or two fruit-bearing trees according to the area of land contained in house spot.

That suggestion might sound farcical to some hon. members, but I feel that some time ago the bucket system was used and the General Board of Health came along and said that that system must be discarded and pits must be dug. That was done. The Board afterwards came along and said that privies must have a solid groundsel; that was also done; and if these regulations were adhered to compulsorily, I feel that the suggestion to compel every householder to plant a fruit-bearing tree of whatever kind he likes, any tree which would develop growth in the particular soil in the area, would not be unreasonable or could not be considered as being punitive. I am hoping that a suggestion such as that would have some influence on the Hon. Minister of Social Services, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing. I feel that the three of them should discuss this matter among themselves; from the point of view of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, when fruit is easily available, that helps people to build up a resistance to disease and things of that sort; it also improves the appearance of the districts in which these houses are situated and it also assists the economy of the householders.

I hope that that suggestion will not fall on deaf ears, and that before long we will see the Government taking up such a matter. It cannot do anything but improve the health of the Colony. I want to repeat that I am not against those who are able to buy more land, and they are doing so; but where you get the majority of people who are not in a position to own one square foot of land, a reduction in the number of square feet per house spot being inserted in the Housing regulations, is a progressive step because, from my personal experience, the cost of land is what prevents more people from being able to own their houses.

Too much of the cost of providing a home is taken up in the acquisition of the land. There are some people who, when they have finished purchasing the land, they cannot begin to build their houses. If you reduce the number of square feet per house spot, that cannot be taken

would lead people in the community to own their own houses and house spots.

Mr. MILLER: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the authorities who were more or less in search of economies in existing areas have decided to reduce the areas of house spots; but for one reason or another, always the question of safety first. If the authorities have decided to reduce the size of house spots from 2,400 square feet to 1,800 square feet. I am wondering if they thought of water-borne services. What are you going to develop in certain areas where much of the land is rab land with stone pockets?

We have had the speech of the hon. senior member for St. John about making house spots available for people but that is beside the point; because if you have 1,800 square feet, you can give 100 square feet to each one of eighteen people! [Laughter]. Obviously, you will have a system of toilets in this reduction in the size of house spots; and that will certainly entail more Hospitals, more Doctors, and without saying it, more Alms-houses, and it will rob people of more working hours. That is the sort of thing with which you are faced in this idea. Originally, the idea was to have a house spot of 2,400 square feet, 60 x 40 ft.; but you are now thinking of the 18 x 12 house or the 16 x 8 house, and there is the little shed-roof and white-washed toilet, but the pig must be under the cellar.

6.35 p.m.

You have to think in terms of the soil in the areas which can be regarded as fruit bearing areas. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister of Health has paid enough thought, not as regards the minimum size plot itself and it being possible to put another ten or twenty houses in a given area, but as regards to whether it is expected to pay dividends in health or whether it would contribute to the happiness of the Community. I am asking the Hon. Minister not to be too rigid about getting this Bill passed, as it is, because it is his duty, but that he should examine it further.

Now, Sir, you have proposed that the minimum area for a house spot should be 1,800 square feet. According to the regulations of the Board of Health, pig pens are restricted to not less than 20 feet away from the house. If as you have proposed, your area of land should be 40 feet x 45 feet, that cannot be done. No matter how you try you will not be able to place that pig pen within 20 feet from the house.

I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to see some light in my criticism. Even if he has not regarded it as wisdom, he should examine it. You are asking landlords and people in our communities to think in terms of compression of several houses in small and dense areas. This question of getting more houses on a given area of land is not in itself the argument which can be used in its favour because, as I have said before you also have to bear in mind the question of the health of the community.

There is an hon. member of this Chamber who is a member of the Board of Health. He has said that the Board does not allow any one to sell land in house spots of less than 2,400 square feet. You cannot make legislation to suit particular areas, or areas which you want to develop yourself, and not to affect the community generally. Again, I am asking the Hon. Minister of Health to re-examine this measure. Let me repeat that you are going to come up against various hazards of health when you adopt these spots of 1,800 square feet where the people will have to build a house on the front part of it and put a pig pen and toilet on the quarter aback of it. [A VOICE: What about fire] I am not even thinking of the fire hazard because we have an up-to-date Fire Station.

It is a fact that when you go to some country districts, you see tenantry houses one on top of the other; but that should not be the reason why you should go back to these small house spots. You do get some ruthless land lords who are willing to stick houses and toilets together in one area, but that is not good enough for the Government in its planning for the community. I am asking the Hon. Minister of Health to re-examine this measure and I am sure when he does that he will see how difficult it is to get a two-gabled house and a toilet and pig-pen on an area of 40 feet x 45 feet.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are I think certain characteristics and qualities which should always distinguish people in public life. One such characteristic, I think, might well be called the awareness of the absurd. I am afraid that in the introductory speech made on this Bill before the House, the Hon. Minister of Health has shown no awareness of how absurd his and his Government's position is in this matter. I think that obtrusiveness and bluntness have come from the fact that in common with most people who think as they do, they largely run their politics openly, ignoring harsh political realities.

The Bill which is before this House is one to amend the Public Health Act of 1908. The amendment is to an Act which was passed in this House 41 years ago. [A VOICE: It was amended since then]. Well, 21 years ago. When the principal Act was passed and when the earlier amendments to it were made, people like us were not in this Chamber. There were people with a different conception of politics, and indeed a different outlook on life, who were making the laws of this Island; and they were making them for the majority of persons who were not even voters, and therefore could not upset the legislative process. Indeed, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said *sotto voce* the greater part of them was located labourers.

6.45 p.m.

But even now, looking back on all that, we have to admit, that in comparison with those who govern us today and particularly on an issue like this, we are not only most liberal as politicians but most humane as men. If the situation which we now reach in the House this evening is what conservatives and reactionaries of the generation and a half ago which was considered good enough for people who were then their social and racial inferiors, is now thought to be too good for people who in theory at any rate are our equal, because they have the same vote as we do, that is the supreme irony of this situation. Twenty-four hundred square feet was thought to be the very minimum upon which a house should rest. Now, we have the Minister and those who think as he does, telling us that 1,800 square feet would do just as well.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, you can use arithmetic to prove anything; not only to prove, but to demonstrate: and the argument now is that because the population of this island has increased since 1931 or since 1908 and since they are more people now, therefore, that is the argument for making house spots less.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a certain amount of horror and disappointment to the hon. senior member for St. John who led the argument with considerable force that the opportunity which this measure gives to more people to own land, and therefore to have house spots of their own, was better, because as I understood him it was in itself a good thing. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, everyone sitting around this Table no matter what he might think privately, must admit publicly that it is our earnest desire that the majority of people in this island should wherever possible own their houses and

the land on which these houses rest. But if you follow that argument, and it has much to commend it from a humane point of view, you will see that there is literally no limit therefore to the smallness of a particular house spot.

What is the argument they would use against a person who says 1,700 square feet, 1,500 square feet? He would use your own argument with telling effect against you, because he would say you are now saying that it is the rise in population which might possibly justify the reduction. There is no limit therefore, to the number of arguments that can be raised for a further reduction. Then, Mr. Speaker, you have to take this into account: those hon. members on that side of this House who without even a qualm of conscience can suggest a measure like this, are indicating to us that clear thinking is now forever beyond them, because it must be almost in front of their eyes to see that the smaller the house spot you have, the less facilities both sanitary and otherwise you will have.

Even if we agree with the hon. senior member for St. John that it might be desirable to have fruit trees in your yard even on the smaller house spots, as the house spots get smaller and smaller, the fruit trees will give place to the bleaching spots, because it is certain that given the choice between somewhere to assist in keeping clothes clean and somewhere to plant trees that might not bear fruit for a year or two the choice will be made on the former. That is not the sort of measure, Mr. Speaker, that I can support, I feel it is an injustice to the people of this island and I feel they ought to be ashamed of themselves for thinking about it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, we have listened to quite a few speeches, most of which is baseless ranting. Now, the population of this little place is increasing at the rate of 4,000 a year. I do not think that 4,000 a year die, statistics do not prove that; therefore we have a long term view of providing houses for these 4,000 a year. We who are figures of the Government have to provide on that basis now of 800 houses a year.

The twenty-four hundred square feet may allow about fifteen houses per acre, and 1,800 square feet may allow between 19 or 20 per acre; and of course, we only say one acre, but if we multiply by 10 or 20 as the case may be we get so many houses of four or five. Therefore, the population as I said has to be housed and we did it with the view of providing a term basis housing for our future population.

Now, there are only one or two points to be answered, Sir. No hon member has looked at it from the commonsense basis as the hon. senior member for St. John. This amendment provides the minimum; but if you can buy 5,000 or 10,000 or a half acre nobody will prevent you. The hon. senior member for the City has made a useful contribution which I will take into consideration. [A VOICE: For once!] Not for once. If we pass the second reading tonight and go into Committee, I propose that after passing the first section, to ask for postponement and go and refer back the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for the City.

The hon junior member for the City is a member of the board of Health and he say the Board opposed it, but I see here on the files it has been said by the Clerk that the Board will not withhold the reduction on the 2,400 square feet stipulation in the case of Government developing housing areas. [A VOICE: Who said that?] Your colleague the hon. junior member for the City said that the Board of Health was not in favour of it. I have just read

here from a letter from their Clerk which says that they would not be opposed to the reduction of the 2,400 square feet. This was on the 13th October, last year.

Mr. LEWIS: Would the hon. member go on and read a little further? I said as far as Government development is concerned they would not do it. 6.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Amendment is merely to cater to people in the Government scheme. [MEMBERS: Well say so.] That is the primary object of this Amendment. The Government is at present engaged in purchasing areas of land island-wide for development purposes with the object in view of seeing that the land goes around as far as possible. We want to cater to this ever-increasing population which must be housed. The Government has gone into this question very clearly and has taken into account the fact that right now in the Bridgetown area the size of 1,600 square feet per house spot has proved to be successful. That being so, the Government can therefore be justified in adopting the basis of 1,800 square feet as a house spot.

As far as building lots are concerned, it was suggested by the hon. senior member for St. John that as much land can be bought as you need; but in a building area, the land is sold out in lots of 1,800 square feet.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of explanation. I did not say that land is sold out in lots when a large area is cut up for sale; I said that if any one wanted a portion of land, and he could not get what he required in one spot, he could say: "Give me two spots." If you are selling spots of land adjacent to each other and one spot is not big enough for the requirements of the potential buyer, what is there to prevent the owner of the land from selling him two spots?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has gone beyond the point of explanation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In certain areas you find that lots are of a standard size and there are divided in order to meet the varying requirements of the prospective buyers; whereas in a building scheme where people are capable of purchasing such areas, you will find building lots of 5,000 square feet, 10,000 square feet or 15,000 square feet in accordance with the means of the prospective purchaser. No building area is envisaged here; for the working class people, the lots will be of a standard area. You will not have lots of varying areas. I am not here to reopen debate on this matter, but the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew does not seem to have very much in it.

Land is sold by the square foot, at so much a square foot and not so much a lot. Therefore you find that if a reduction in the size of a house spot takes place, as the Hon. Minister of Social Services has suggested, we will consider the points which have been raised by all hon. members. The point which has been raised by the hon. senior member for the City has been gone into and the dangers involved in the present standard of sanitation will be taken care of.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs HOLDER, BRYAN and ALLDER—10.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, LEWIS, F. L. WALCOTT, GODDARD and E. D. MOTTLEY—7.
7.05 p.m.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, 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:—

Subsection (II) of Section fiftytwo of the principal Act is hereby amended by deleting the words "twenty-four hundred" Occurring therein and substituting therefor the words "eighteen hundred."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I intimated earlier that at this stage I was going to ask for the postponement. I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION Re DEATH OF H. C. SEALY

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker I was not here at the beginning of the meeting and I think it must have slipped hon. members to pay tribute to the late Mr. Herbert Campbell Sealy who was at one time Deputy Clerk of this Honourable Chamber and who on several occasions acted as Clerk. With your permission, I am taking this opportunity to do so.

Sir, I think there is very little we can say today in respect of the late Mr. Sealy more than we regret the passing of one who has been an Officer of this House, and who although may have had different views from most of us who are in this Chamber today yet was one who had the interest of Barbados at heart. Although the services which he performed in this Chamber was performed long before our time, I think it is quite fitting that we should pay our respect to his passing.

The late Mr. Herbert Campbell Sealy was also closely connected with the political life of this colony. He was the Revising Officer for many years and he acted as King's Solicitor at one time.

I therefore beg to move that the following Resolution of Sympathy be sent to his widow:—

Resolved that the House of Assembly place on record its regret at the death of the late Mr. Herbert Campbell Sealy who many years was the Deputy Clerk of this Honourable House;

RESOLVED FURTHER that a copy of the Resolution be transmitted to his sorrowing widow."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the text and terms of the speech just made by the hon. senior member for the City and to second the Resolution of Sympathy which he has moved. I think that this House has been singularly fortunate by being well served with Clerks. It is an actual pity that we only pay tribute to them after they leave us on occasions like this to record our appreciation of their services and appreciations of the time they spent with us. The late Herbert Campbell Sealy was for many years very closely associated not only with the political life of the Island but with this ancient and Honourable Chamber. I think it is only fitting that this Honourable Chamber should remind itself of his services by concurring in the Resolution which was moved by the hon. senior member for the City and which I have great pleasure in seconding.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker it is extremely kind of the present hon. members of this Chamber to pay reverence to such a person as the late Mr. Herbert Campbell Sealy. If Your Honour would permit me to give my attitude of agreeing to the paying of such respect, which are now indulged in, I want hon. members to know that I do it because the late Mr. Herbert Campbell Sealy has adorned this Honourable Chamber sometime ago and not because of any policy or practises of his which cause us to pay such respect. I may say, Sir, that if his policy had succeeded, the presence of men such as us indulging in what we are now indulging in would not be possible. However, as a human being and because he has performed service in this Chamber with which we are now associated, I agree to the passing of some such respects. I want it to be very clear that we are paying tribute to one who has performed efficient service in this Chamber, and that we are not paying tribute to his policy.

The question was put and carried, hon. members standing in their places.

7.15 p.m.

TRADE UNION BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, In fixing the Order Paper . . .

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before that is done, there is a Private Member's Bill I gave notice of on the re-opening of the Legislature, and I notice there is a way that when Government Business is finished the House is finished. We do not give notice of a Bill for the sake of giving it. We give notice because we feel deeply about it. It is my intention to carry on with it. I want to deal with this Bill and if members of the Government are not in favour of it they may walk out. It is on the Order Paper.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If the hon. member will allow me to speak, Sir, the hon member knows that Private Members' Bills are scrutinised by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. This Bill was circulated only a few days ago. It has not been considered in Executive Committee and the Government cannot deal with it; but if you will wait until it goes before the Committee on Thursday, then the hon. member might proceed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is not a rule of the House. It is done purely at the convenience of the Government so that they may be in a position to agree or if not agree with a measure before the House.

What I want to point out is this: if when I proceed with this Bill and at some stage a matter is postponed I do not want this House to go on record, as not doing Private Members' Bills relating to Vestries. I have heard that argument raised but this is a pure and simple Private Member's measure, so I do not think you will have to await the approbation of the Government to proceed with the measure. And I would say this: if members of the Government cannot vote on this amendment they may say they are not in a position to do so, but they cannot prevent us from proceeding.

If I am permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with the measure because I have given some thought to it and I would like to do so today because Government is not crowded with much business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day No. 1, of the Private Members' Business honourable junior member for St. Peter: second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted at this stage, I would like to say a few words to the honourable junior member for St. Peter who has been a member of the Executive Committee from 1948 to 1954. I think what the Hon. Minister of Social Services said has been the policy of the Government of which he was formerly a part for a long time. That is, Sir, that when a Bill is introduced by a Private Member, it has always been the practice of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to discuss that Bill and decide what line of action Government should take. As has been pointed out, the Bill has only reached us only a few days ago. I would appeal to the honourable member to allow us to give a little thought to it before proceeding with it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is this: this Bill is an amendment to the Trade Union Act, and it has nothing to do with Government policy. All they can do is to instruct somebody not to support it if they are not in favour, but they cannot go against it. This is a settled policy of the Labour Party that there should be peaceful picketing in or near houses. I want to hear if they have to meet in Executive Committee to say they are in favour.

The Executive Committee consists of five Ministers who sit in this House, so it is purely a matter of asking for the measure to be proceed with, if it has now reached the Executive it is not my fault. It was introduced before the House died, somewhere around the 10th March. What I would say, Mr. Speaker, is this: I am prepared to proceed with the amendments and explain them, and therefore the Government would be free. Then we could postpone further debate. I would not have to make any further speech; and I would say this it is not a Bill that conflicts with any Government policy or deals with the spending of money; it is purely and simply an act that deals with amendments.

In explaining that to the Chamber, Sir, this Bill seeks to amend the Trade Union Act. I was looking for the Acts here, but we do not have them before us to bring them in line with the English Act. The present Acts in Barbados exclude peaceful picketing other than where the person resides as follows:—

“Peaceful picketing.—It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.”

In our Act, it would be necessary as I see here to make some amendment. So that after this part of my speech I would have to give notice of the amending dates. It is really Amendment Act, 1950 instead of 1949. This Act reads,

“It shall be lawful for one or more persons appointed by the trade union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person works or carries on business or happens to be other than where he resides, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.”

Sir, the difference between that and the English Act is that they have inserted the words “other than where he resides” while in the English Act it does not exclude where he resides. For obvious reasons we want to bring it up to date to deal with the local situation taking place.

The purpose of peaceful picketing in England was done on a basis that sometimes a workman could be persuaded at his own home not to go to work, because the employer normally would be placed in a more advantageous position than the worker inasmuch as the employer could send to workmen's home and he would not be excluded. The Trade Union or other workers if they could be persuaded would be regarded as legal.

7.25 p.m.

It is not that we follow the English Act in every respect, but when it comes to industrial legislation like this, this is regarded as the sort of thing which should take place.

It may be that when we come to deal with this Bill in the Committee stage, I will have to give notice of my intention to move an Amendment to Section 2, substituting the figures “1950” for the figures “1949.” I will give notice of that Amendment at the appropriate time. I say all that because this is the sort of Amendment which is not complicated; it only deals with one Section of the Trade Union Act and whether the Governor-in-Executive Committee discusses this Amendment or not, I can say that I have had the full authority of the Trade Union Organisation in Barbados to bring forward this Bill. Whether the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves of this Amendment or not, I have the approval of the Trade Union Movement in this Island, and I doubt very much that the Government of Barbados or any other Government in the Caribbean area today could claim that this Amendment needs the approbation of any Government.

I mention that so as to cover any point which arises as to the method of dealing with such matters. If there is any doubt about this matter, the English Act is there, and if it is regarded that before we pass a Bill of this sort, we need the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, that is a different matter. I am not pressing for this Bill to be dealt with in all its stages today, because when we meet next Tuesday I would like to hear if there are any reasons why this Bill should not be passed. It is purely a matter for the Other Place to decide whether they will pass it or not. I think I have done all that is necessarily to be done in a matter of this sort, and I will be prepared to answer any point which might arise when the time comes. I have explained the reasons for this Amendment; it is purely a question of bringing the Act in line with the English Act. A Trade Union must have the right to picket a man's home or the place where he resides. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

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

The question that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 15th May, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to take this opportunity of allowing the Government's members to say what is in their minds about a matter

which is of public importance and of particular importance to this Legislature. I should like to know if the Government is making any arrangements for the printing of the *Official Gazette* of this Island. If an honourable member of this House gives notice of a Bill which is a Private Bill as against a Public Bill given notice of by a private member, that Bill has to appear in the *Official Gazette* for two weeks before the second reading is proceeded with. I understand that, in addition to holding up the printing of our own debates, which is a very undesirable thing, there are many people in this Island who are being inconvenienced, people like lawyers who, on behalf of their clients cannot proceed with winding up estates and things of that sort.

This matter has not got to be elaborated so that it can be known that the *Official Gazette* is an organ the absence of which means a severe handicap and inconvenience to the people of this Island. It is

therefore the bounden duty of the Government to make some statement as to whether they would have alternative arrangements made—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I can help the honourable member. Arrangements have been made with a company of printers to print the *Official Gazette* for the time being.

Mr. LEWIS: I appreciate that, but that I did not know that the printing of the *Official Gazette* was a matter for the Printing Committee; I thought that they were concerned with the printing of the debates and otherwise of the Legislature.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 15th May, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.40 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th May, 1956

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

His Honour K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINGS, 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. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLAR, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc. and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Mr. Lewis and Mr. Alder entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meetings were not yet ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st March, 1956, of the parish of St. Thomas on tenantry roads;

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half year ended 31st March, 1956, of the parish of St. Thomas.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1956.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1956.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1956.

The Travelling Allowance (Amendment) Regulations, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1956."

Bill to amend the Currency Act, 1950.

Hon. G. H. Adams and Mr. Bryan entered the House and took their seats.

QUESTIONS

Mr. O. T. ALLDER: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:—

Is the Government aware that some householders in the parish of St. John and other parishes whose houses have been damaged by the hurricane of September 1955 have not received any assistance in the repairing of their houses?

2. If the answer to the above question is in the affirmative, will the Government cause such assistance to be given immediately?

3. If not, will the Government state why not?

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, with your permission to enquire of the appropriate Minister:—

Will the Government state its policy relative to the acquiring of land from Colleton Plantation in the parish of St. John and the setting up of Land Settlement and Housing Schemes in the said parish?

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I beg to withdraw the last question of which I just gave notice, and ask permission for some of the words to be amended. The question should read as follows:—

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:—

Will the Government state what is its intention relative to the acquiring of land from Colleton Plantation in the parish of St. John and the setting up of Land Settlement and Housing Schemes in the said parish?

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS the Bill to amend the Currency Act, 1950 was read a first time.

3 25 p.m.

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Michael: to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor thanking him for his Speech delivered at the opening of the Legislature and to promise to implement the proposals contained therein.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, at a previous meeting of the House, I gave notice of my intention to move an Address in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the final session, 1951-56. In doing so, Sir, I would like to make a few remarks on some of the items mentioned therein.

Sir, our finances remain satisfactory, and as has been mentioned, we have been blessed with excellent crops for the past six years. Our revenue has accordingly risen by about 7½ million dollars. During this period, Sir, our expenditure both current and capital has risen to the tune of \$4 million and \$3 million respectively.

Despite the charges that have been levelled against this Government for wasting the taxpayers' money and draining the Treasury, etc., we find that our funds are being so judiciously spent, we can still look forward to a surplus in our current account for the 1956-57 Budget. If another answer were needed to these charges, the programme of works which has just been completed, (the erection of the Public Works, and Highways and Transport Departments, our schools, including the Police Training School, our Fire Station, our Health Centre and our Government Buildings, all of which are today admired even by our critics) these would supply the answers; and if we come to think, Sir, of the employment that has been provided for the needed artisans, then such a programme must speak for itself. There are now in progress, Sir, several major works, like the addition now being made to our Law Courts, the building of a new school at the Bay Estate and the Christ Church Foundation School: these, Sir, added to those already mentioned must appeal to honourable members.

Mr. Speaker, we have also in the offing some new works like the Health Centre in St. Philip, the enlarging of our runway and additions to the Terminal Building, the erection of a Central Market, a new Combermere School, and a new Hospital, all of which, Sir, must be very hearty news to the general public. Sir, our roads and water extension programme continues satisfactorily to all.

I would like at this stage, Sir, to place on record our thanks to those three very efficient Public Servants, the Director of Highways and Transport, the Director of Public Works and the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks. With regard to our housing, Sir, the Housing Act, of 1955 is now in operation. The idea of coordinating our housing activities under one authority was indeed a good one: that has already been given the blessings of this House. Sir, I am hoping that the Bill which was mentioned, (the Bill to facilitate the granting of loans under the

Public Officers Housing Loan), will tend to allay the fears and anxieties which now exist among certain grades of our Civil Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, we all, I am sure, regret so far the Barbados Gulf Oil Company has failed in its search for oil in commercial quantities; but, Sir, we hope and pray for its success because we realise only too well what such a find would mean to the economy of this island.

The active functioning of the Barbados Development Board and Government's plans for more liberal Pioneer Industry Legislation are being awaited with keen interest. These are very important in so far as the industrial development of this island is concerned; and although it is true that several West Indian islands have forced ahead, (and I know that Jamaica has recently added her concessions) yet we await with interest the functions of this Board and with confidence that it will mean a lot to the distribution of fish throughout the Island.

Sir, I understand the success of the Pig Subsidy Scheme is remarkable. I would suggest to the Minister that detailed information outlining the substance of this scheme would be welcome information to the general public.

3.35 p.m.

I feel that this success should be an incentive to the Government to make a bold approach to extending and improving our Livestock Industry. We have the Government's promise of the provision of a Milk Depot, and I feel that every effort should be made to reduce the importation of condensed and powdered milk, particularly for use in our Elementary School Nutrition Scheme. The mechanisation of our Industry is paying great dividends and what I feel is necessary now is the immediate provision of cold storage facilities and a scheme for improving the distribution of fish throughout the Island.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the general public, and I venture even to include hon. members, have never realised the volume of the legislative work which has been done. The passing of 235 Bills and 406 Resolutions is an achievement of which any Government should be proud. When you look at the nature and the importance of the work and the benefits accruing to the people to whom this Government had made its promises, and on whose behalf this Government has pledged itself, I feel that the Government can lay claim to having honoured those promises on behalf of the people. I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that the programme as envisaged in the ensuing session, is in itself an indication of the Government's intention to continue the work which it is doing on behalf of the people.

With those few remarks, I now formally beg to move the passing of the following Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech:—

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for your speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the final session 1951-56.

The House have noted with satisfaction the financial condition of the Island, and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address, and beg to assure Your Excellency that these and all other matters submitted to them will be given their earnest attention and support during the ensuing session.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, if this House were only to be concerned with the grand Public Works programme then the comments of the hon. junior member for St. Michael would have been adequate, and no one would have had any need to say anything more; but I think that when all is said and done and all credit given to the Government for the spending of large sums of money of a capital nature on a Public Works programme we have said all. It is what has been left out of the speech that is more important than what has been said.

As to the public works which have been done by those three efficient Officers, as things go in Barbados and in the West Indies, I will say that the work has been efficiently done at reasonable cost. But it is a Public Works programme which anyone could easily have fulfilled from a Government's point of view. What I wish to be concerned most of all with today, and to draw to the attention of the House, is the great regret in respect of those things which have been left out or no mention made of them at all.

The first thing to which I would like to draw the attention of this House is that no mention was made in the Governor's Speech that this session is to be the final session of the Legislature, although the hon. junior member for St. Michael in his proposed Reply has inferred and implied that this is the final session of the Legislature. As rumours go, I think the Government must have heard those rumours, about the extension of the life of the House, I think some mention of this matter in the Governor's Speech should have been made so as to allay those fears.

I am going to take this opportunity of asking why should the Government want to extend the life of this House beyond five years? I hope that somebody will rise to reply to me and lay our fears at rest as to whether there is going to be an extension of this House or not. I do not know any reason why the life of this House should be extended beyond five years.

The next point which I wish to make is this: why should the Governor, knowing that unrest is being felt by the public, make no mention in his Speech of the question of transport in this Colony? It is time that a statement be made in this connection. Do not let us hide behind any matter, be it *sub judice* or otherwise; it time that we know what the Government's policy is as regards transport. The price of the buses need not be stated, but anyone who knows the condition of motor transport in this Island will know there is a blot, and it is getting worse: it is on the verge of collapse, because people cannot get the buses after they have finished their work. Even school children are left by the wayside or at the schools and no attempt is made to get them home. Complaints are reaching me from all quarters, from all those who have to use buses in this Island: and the position is getting worse.

3.45 p.m.

Government has been running the service for eight months. The rainy season is coming; and I predict unless something is done immediately, when the rains come the buses will be at a stand still either on the roads or in the yard of the Transport Board and the people will be left on the pavements. I hope that a full statement will be made of the policy of the Government on the Transport System, and that Government will let us know what is their intention towards it. Certainly you are not going forward as regards your running it.

The honourable junior member for St. Michael in his reply desires that this House thank His Excellency for the speech he delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the final session

1951-56. In His Excellency's speech he said they had a great privilege in drawing attention to the 235 Bills and 406 Resolutions which had been passed in the last three sessions. Most of this Legislation is with respect to the grand Public Works programme which we have; neither one of those Resolutions contained anything which would assist the wealth of Barbados. I would like some honourable member to point out if it is so.

For the last three years our national income was the same amount. It has not risen to a million dollars in the last three years. As a matter of fact, I think it has dropped by one million in those three years, while our expenses are increasing and nobody can stop them. The Cost of Living is continuing to rise because of the manner which we have adopted in our Fiscal Policy.

Mr. Speaker, you are drawing out by taxations large sums out of the people. If Government thinks that they can keep the prices of foodstuff or the necessary things down by what they are doing, I tell them that they cannot. They can only do it by increasing the national income. We are importing 90% of our foodstuff and other things we need; and we are the worst among the exporters of what the requirements of the world markets are. It should be the concern and duty of the Government to see that there should be an increase amount of money coming into the island to pay for these goods; we should not depend on the one-crop economy which we have. Government does not concern itself in trying to do something else to increase the island's economy; it is only thinking that the Federation of the British West Indies will soon be formed, because they know in that Federation the brains from the other colonies will be brought in to show them how to do it. Certainly, that brains cannot be found here, because this Government will not take advice from the side which they should take it. The policy of the Government is of such a nature that they do not know where to look for direction.

I hope in the absence now of any change of policy by our Government as indicated in the speech of His Excellency, that its outlook will be changed somewhat when we join in Federation with other colonies which have a more forward outlook. We can follow at least the example of those colonies that have been grabbing all the industries and going ahead, while we are waiting for a regional survey before we attempt to hold out our hands to industries abroad to come in and do something in our island.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned just now that what is holding back this colony is the high rate of taxation on all things. Taxation in Barbados is higher than in any other West Indian colony. And I have figures to prove that. Our allowances are less in the sister colonies of Trinidad and Jamaica. I will quote some of the figures:—

With respect to the income tax on a married man with three children in the £300 bracket it is as follows: In Jamaica, he pays £4; In Trinidad, he pays £8; in British Guiana, he pays £8; and in Barbados he pays £8.

With respect to the Income Tax on a married man with three children in the £800 bracket, it is as follows:—In Jamaica, he pays £20; in Trinidad, he pays £20; in British Guiana he pays £25; and in Barbados he pays £30.

With respect to the Income Tax on a married man with three children in the £1,000 bracket, it is as follows:—In Jamaica he pays, £47, in Trinidad he pays £39; in British Guiana he pays £49; and in Barbados he pays £65.

With respect to the Income Tax on a married man with three children in the £1,500 bracket (of course that is the bracket of the Ministers of this Government) it is as follows:—In Jamaica he pays £181; in Trinidad, he pays £133; in British Guiana, he pays £142; and in Barbados, he pays £208.

You can see that in each and every case, we are above the other three colonies in the West Indies. As regards the little islands they are far below that.

Now, Sir, Sir Sidney Caine in his Fiscal Report on the Federation, stated that one of the first duties of the Governments of the West Indies should be to bring into line their rates of income tax. I do not know if the other colonies will be bringing their rates up to ours, but I do hope that in the meantime this Government will realise that it is essential that ours should be brought down to the rate of the others.

Let me say that businesses in Barbados are more heavily taxed than in any other West Indian colony. It is because we have here a system which is the paying of a separate tax apart from paying Income Tax. That system does not operate in any other part of the world. Now, as it is in other parts of the world, you have a State Tax and a Federal Tax. The Local Government tax is 15% in St. Michael now; and in the other parishes it is above that percentage. However, our services must be run and they have to be paid for. These two taxes — the Local Government tax and the Central Government Tax—altogether come to 49% of the profits of any business in Bridgetown.

3.55 p.m.

Now, if any business can afford the luxury of such a large tax and still put aside reserves, they are really very fortunate indeed. This island depends on a one-crop economy. We are spending today to our limit; and when I say "we" I mean businesses and individuals. There are a few of us who can put aside adequate reserves; and if we continue in this way, we will be spending in this decade all that we have. When the next decade comes and there should be anything of a recession, there will be no reserves, nothing to look to; and I think the Minister might know what a retrenchment means. If there is no money there to spend, "we have had it" as the Americans would say. Look for holes and let somebody else run the Government.

This high taxation is tied up with the demands by Civil Servants and all the classes of workers, for an increase in wages and salaries. Later on today we will be discussing a Resolution to bring out a Commissioner from England to review the salary scales of the Civil Establishment; and Government is worried because it is only another rung in our competition with the other colonies like Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica.

We are depending on this one and single crop economy; but those colonies have other things to supplement their national revenue. We are trying to keep up the race; but what most of them are dissatisfied with, (and I am speaking of the top notch Civil Servant) is the high rate of income tax he is called on to pay. They are dissatisfied with the excessively high income tax rate that exists in Barbados. It is far and above almost any other colony; and I will go beyond the British West Indies, it is very much less in other Commonwealth territories.

The Government should find some means whereby we should try and develop the economy of this island more. They have been most fortunate in these last seven years in having crops that are unknown to any Barbadian alive. Seven years; and it looks as though we will have another. May it go on as long as they are there. The Lord help us if we have a drought, which we must expect some day. With our high costs and our dwindling national income that

will result from a dry year, the reserves that they boast of will be swallowed up in a matter of months; and with our grand programme that is facing us, we will be really wobbly and about to take the count.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as this Reply goes, it is couched in very polite terms. But as I said, the criticism of it is more on what has been left out. I do hope that some light can be thrown on the things I have raised; particularly the Public Transport that is engaging the attention of a vast majority of the public, both from a taxpayer's point of view and from the point of view of the travelling public. It is estimated by someone with a knowledge of figures that Government persist in running this system as they are doing, when the day of reckoning comes, should it come in twelve months, the taxpayers can look to put up half million dollars that will be the deficit of that transport that they have taken over. For half million dollars that could be well spent in Barbados to be used in such a disgraceful manner is a shame, that should turn any Government out; and that it should come in election year! I do hope we will have opportunity to say it is not half million dollars and that conditions are not as bad as I have said here today. I would be glad to hear that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to offer my congratulations to the hon. junior member for St. Michael for the very able speech which he has been able faithfully to remember and repeat to us, which no doubt, has been drafted for him by a more prominent member than himself of the Government's Party. In this rather impressive amount of work that he has related to us, he has forgotten this is the first Five Year Session this Legislature has had; so that if we divide some of these things by five or by two, they might not be so impressive at all.

The next thing, Sir, is that it is the Government's own fault that no previous session has been as fruitful in building results. They were party to accepting an appointment which they knew was done deliberately to go slow, while the Revenue Equalisation Fund was enacted to back up the salaries they had proposed for the top Civil Servants; therefore, the Governor and the ex-patriates saw to it that nobody could be found with proper qualifications for carrying out the Public Works Scheme in Barbados. Sir, I have said that at the beginning because I have some other things which I have made notes on, that I would like to say something on.

First of all, Sir, I would like to say that I apologise to the House for taking any part at all in what is the biggest fiasco to be enacted by the Barbados House of Assembly in its history; and it is only because it is not the first time, and it seems impossible, with any amount of criticism, to get it changed. Now, can you imagine, our having passed a Budget during the month of March, and in the middle of May we are discussing a speech from the throne that is supposed to outline Government's policy for the current and not the ensuing financial year?

That is absolutely absurd. This House should be prorogued sometime in December, recalled at the beginning of February when the Estimates should be laid and the Speech from the Throne should be given, bearing some relation on the policy of the Government for that year; but this is absolute nonsense. Not only that; if we are having our Conventions and everything else approximating what happens in England, why cannot we do what they are doing in that respect? Why can't we have it as a regularly known fact that the Legislative sessions will be annual sessions; and do not have this farce

which we have in this proposed reply that this is the final session of the Legislature for 1951—56.

This session started 1951—56; then we had 1952—56, 1953—56, and it goes on until nobody knows what it is. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that is something in which you might lend your weight and authority and try and get done. Fancy the Government presenting two annual Budgets in the course of a session! That is absolutely absurd; we are not paying any attention to these matters.

As I was saying, Sir, you have presented the Budget and you have committed the House to an expenditure up to the 31st March, 1957, then you prorogued the House and you have this Speech. You will have another session opened after Elections and therefore another Speech; are you are going to have three Speeches before the current year is out? Let us have it regulated so that you will have annual sessions of the Legislature. You can prepare your Budget in time and let the Legislature have sometime between December and February to see about the preparation of the Budget. The last Budget was a disgrace to mentally-deficient people, much more to those who have claimed to have grown up.

In so far as this draft Reply is concerned, I would suggest to the hon. member who moved the passing of it, that it is unusual to have the wording "To thank your Excellency for the Speech delivered," and the hon. member should try and get some session of the Legislature; he should not make it five years. This session should not be stated as the final session; and if you are calling His Excellency's Speech, a Speech, do not call it an Address as well. The hon. member at the end of the Address read into it something which is not in the printed copy which was handed to me. I do hope that he realises that; he has here the words "earnest attention" but not the words "and support." In so far as reference to the session is concerned, I think we should leave out the words "During the Coming session." I am making a motion that the wording should be "that these and all other matters submitted to them will be given their earnest attention and support" and leave out anything about the session.

As to the idea of this new Five Year Plan, the House has not had any opportunity of seeing any additional or any other Five Year Plan. Who knows anything about any new Five Year Plan? That is giving the impression that you have done ten years' work.

I do not think that this Government could claim that it had anything to do either with the excellent sugar crops or the Commonwealth Agreement. I wonder if we have to thank the Government for the sugar crops which we have had because the Government has done something about the rain and the Commonwealth Agreement!

As regards the Deep Water Harbour, you do not know what is happening about it. You have wasted money on two or three trips to England, and we are no better off as to knowing whether we are getting a loan or not. We are really muddled even in the little bit we are doing.

It has now struck the Government that they must put some ceiling in respect of the Revenue Equalisation Fund. Let them read the Act and they will see that they do not have to take 50% of the revenue and treat it like that. The Act allows, as far as I remember, 5% of the amount.

4.15 p.m.

There is nothing in his Excellency's Speech of any legislation of any specialty. The main spring of his speech is what you have already committed the Island to in the Current Financial Year. What we find His Excellency had to say about that, is

that the financial policy has been expounded during the recent budget session and that the Government's long term plans will be laid before us during the session now beginning. No legislation has come down with any policy in it other than the spending of money.

It is very good to say that the buildings which are completed are impressive, but as regards the Hospital building, that is undecided. So too is the rebuilding of Combermere School. While those two important questions of new buildings are undecided, the Ministers have a palatial building to reside in during the day.

As I have said, the rebuilding of a place like Combermere School is still to be decided; and as regards the teaching of the boys at that school under the present conditions you can ask some of the children that go there about the conditions. The Headmaster himself has said that is a well nigh impossible to teach the children under those conditions. Why can't you make some start on a place like that?

I see something in His Excellency's Speech as regards to His Excellency paying tribute to the wonderful generosity of kind friends of Barbados in many lands, who have contributed towards hurricane relief. What I want to say about that is, there is a rumour going around that certain people who brought relief to us had certain expenses paid by the Government. That is something which should be disclosed to this Legislature and to the public if it is true.

Reference was made in the speech by His Excellency of the reorganisation of the Barbados Light and Power Company, Ltd. What is the reorganisation? The Barbados Light and Power Company discovered that the people of Barbados were perfectly willing to invest in it if they were given the opportunity to do so. That Company could have extended its business since a couple years ago. This manoeuvre which the Government seems to be very proud of, is that two merchants of this colony, who long ago wanted to be on the directorship of that company, have got on it. That is the reorganisation of the Barbados Light and Power Company, Ltd. The Government did not take any shares in it, therefore, it has no control over it.

One would have thought that a sense of decency would have let the Government be a little more modest in their mention of emigration to the United Kingdom. The present Government of this country had to be goaded, night after night, day after day, to take proper cognisance of this emigration to the United Kingdom. Now they have come and said that emigration, mainly to the United Kingdom, is proving most valuable as an offset to the increase in population. With all that, they are still coming for more money to finance the Family Planning Association. Any semblance of honesty on the part of the Government would have caused them to say at least: "We have to thank the Opposition for causing us to see the light and advantages of it."

Reference by His Excellency to the Adoption Act is that regulations under the Act will shortly be laid in the Legislature. Since August last year this Act was passed, and the Regulations have not yet come to this Legislature. A similar Act and Regulations are in force in other islands. This Government copied this Act from similar legislation in St. Lucia and Trinidad some two or three years ago, and it has not yet got the Regulations drafted for it. Government seems to be proud of putting in the Speech that the Regulations are still to come to this Legislature.

Further down in His Excellency's speech, with reference to technical education, he has said that emi-

gration has accentuated the importance of technical training. If he means to say that the emigration to the United Kingdom has shown the necessity for technical training, I would say that is not true. The strike at the *Advocate* has caused them to start some scheme for printers. I can say so because the scheme was made public after the strike.

Imagine, Sir, you are training workers to send abroad for work, and at the same time you are failing to impress up on the employers in the United Kingdom that they should do like employers in the United States of America; that is, to pay something of the cost of the emigrants who go up there. In some of the numerous trips made by the floating Minister of Trade, he should be told to ask them if they are not ashamed of the fact that they can employ people who have been given a certain amount of training without their paying one cent towards the cost of bringing them there. They should be ashamed of their not paying something towards the cost of getting people up there to work for them.

Our people are selling out their all to finance the cost of passages to get there, and those employers up there should pay something of the cost of getting them there; but they are doing nothing of the sort except giving some of their people a trip here to do the selection.

This Government is proud that it is preparing a register of electors which can be used for the Local Government and Central Government as has been stated in His Excellency's speech. This Government should try to keep that quiet. When the Acts were published, they prepared two lists. They had to wait until they imported Mr. Lightburn to show them that they need only prepare one list. The Head of the Government is a lawyer and the Government had to wait on Mr. Lightburn to show that to them. Of course, the Hon. Premier has lost his reputation as a lawyer in here. Anybody who was taking any interest in what he is doing would have seen that.

4.25 p.m.

Now the financial provision required by the Government as seen from this Speech is to meet our share of the cost of some Committee to choose a Federal Capital. If we had played our cards correctly the Federal Government would have been decided ever since. Everybody wants it in Barbados, but nobody is willing to vote for it.

The honourable member has talked about a pig scheme, but this is a very unfortunate time to pick out a thing like that to congratulate Government on. The pig scheme is supposed to help people to supply pork and cut down the subsidisation; and with the pig scheme going to the extent of having to vote so much more for it, we should not have to increase the price of pork. The way to help the pig scheme is not by increasing the price of pork to one dollar. If you have faith in your own schemes you would not have to resort to these things.

Salary Revision. Nancy presenting an Estimate for the current year and saying you are going to have salary revision, while you have not one brass farthing in the Estimates for salary revision. What sort of financial picture of the colony can anybody get with doings like that? What can you get out of it? You are going to revise these salaries, and it is going to cost nearly a million dollars; and you will have a million dollars in expenditure that you do not have in the Estimates. You cannot do that every time and have the people standing up to this excessive taxation without protest, and without any association to speak on their behalf. You may consider half million dollars for the revision of salaries, but it will cost you much more than that. You do not know where you will get the money from, but

you are still going to revise these salaries. You can confidently say now you have got the Budget passed, that you can come and work a scheme that cost over \$1 million!

Another thing, Sir, is the Town and Country Planning Bill. Is the Government going to say that because somebody in the Government voted against it ten years ago it should be shelved? At one time they voted against the extension of the franchise. Can't the Government get a proper Town and Country Planning Bill from anywhere at all and copy it? They came in here and reduced the house spots without any proper Town and Country Planning Bill.

I think that in H.E.'s Speech, the burning question of hot meals for school children could have been mentioned as part and parcel of the Government's policy. There is nothing about it either in the Address we are considering. I think, Sir, that I am proposing a new paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the item of public transport, mentioned by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, is of sufficient importance that this House should express regret that there is no mention of it in this Speech. Sir, it is something on which the Government should express some opinion because the situation is such, as I understand, that the Government is responsible for hiring buses from the previous owners and they have to arrange the selling out of the buses. So I think, Sir, it would be more appropriate to include mention of it as Clause 2 of this Address. We should say that the House regrets that no mention is made by His Excellency the Governor about the public transport system of the Island.

It is sufficiently important that some small mention should have been made as to whether Government intends to run this as a public utility service. Nobody wants the details, but if you say it is your intention to run the transport system of the Island and that efforts to that end are being pursued, it is something which the public is very anxious to hear about.

The incident mentioned by the honourable junior member for Christ Church is very common. Often, school children are left by the way side. There are many complaints about the system. One can understand if the Government has not made up its mind whether they are going to run more buses; but getting them patched up at the workshops of the people they are buying them from, there will be a time when the public transport system will be in a rather derelict position; so that it is necessary to indicate to the Legislature its broad policy as to whether they are going to run it. It cannot cut across any court case you may have arising out of the price of the buses or taking them over. So far as taking them over is concerned that is something that concerns the Government. Our view is that this House will not vote money for the Government to take over in the first place irrespective of whether they sell at a profit or not to the Transport Board.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for the City has spoken on behalf of my Party in connection with the speech of the Officer administering the Government of this Colony, delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the final session, as they state in this Address, 1951-56. My purpose in rising, is to second the motion made by the hon. member amending the rather sycophantic Resolution which was read out by the hon. junior member for the St. Michael. I cannot join my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, in praising or complimenting the hon. junior member for St. Michael

in memorising his lines, because I had the advantage of seeing him read them in the short time he was addressing Your Honour. I can only compliment him in reading them loud enough for me to hear him from this side of the House, irrespective of who wrote them out. I am asking the hon. junior member for the City to accept a further amendment to his amendment.

We do not note with satisfaction the financial condition of the Island, as the hon. junior member for St. Michael like us to note with satisfaction. We would like to draw to His Excellency's attention that there has been no mention of His Speech within the last session. There is no mention of the national income of Barbados; whether it has risen or fallen within the last five years or what plans the Government envisages for the improvement of the standard of living of Barbados, and there is no mention, although the Government has that Report in its possession, of the grave spectre of unemployment which besets the unfortunate people of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, we in this Party, do not subscribe to the view that the sole purpose of Government is to collect as much money as possible from the unfortunate taxpayers in order to say at the end of the year that they have put up a few obvious monuments in the most conspicuous places, that they have been able to erect such and such buildings, and that they have a great deal of money left. On the contrary. We support the view that the main function and purpose of any Government in a Democratic country is to so manage, not only the Government's revenue, but also the national finances of the Colony, the national income and expenditure of the Colony itself, by ensuring the highest level of employment and the lowest level of unemployment; by ensuring that there is a minimum of social amenities below which no citizen should fall, and by a proper injection into the body politic those finances which would increase the purchasing power of the underprivileged masses of the country, and by those other devices of Socialist planning to bring about a general improvement in the lot and conditions of the people whom we represent.

It stands to reason that if the main emphasis is put not on Government's revenue, but on personal revenue before and after taxation on the revenue of the consumer in Barbados, then the Government itself in the last analysis must be a beneficiary from such a policy. That is so, because the moment we increase the effective purchasing power of the masses of this country, at that very moment the Government would be in a position to extend its services, because there is a larger national fund from which to draw; and there would be, on the other side of the picture, smaller amounts of poor relief and matters of that kind.

I am not going to encroach upon any of the detailed analyses, suggestions and criticisms made by the hon. junior member for the City; but I think that we would be entirely lacking in a sense of perspective if we allowed the Officer administering the Government of this Colony to suffer from any delusion that he can give a cold-blooded recital of Government's spending to the total dereliction of no mention at all about the national income and personal income and the general welfare of the people of this Island. I would not blame His Excellency for thinking that anything that was submitted to the representatives of the people would be any encomiums of praise and valedictory addresses. I hope I am not being prophetic, like the one which was so clearly read out by the hon. junior member for St. Michael today. One could not expect the hon. member to memorize the whole of that Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech;

that would have been a severe taxation of the hon. members powers of analysis and of memory.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should just like to remind the hon. member that there is a Rule of this House which prevents any personal reflection being made on other hon. members.

Mr. BARROW: I do not think that Your Honour needs remind of me of that Rule because I was not reflecting on any hon. member at all. I was just saying that one could not normally expect the hon. junior member for St. Michael to memorize such an Address to be repeated on the floor of this House, as the hon. junior member for the City said he had done. I do not see that there is any reflection involved there.

I think that my colleague will accept this Amendment. This Address in the second paragraph states: "The House have noted with satisfaction the financial condition of the Island." At no stage of his speech did the Officer administering the Government of this Colony make any reference to the financial condition of the Island; he made reference to the financial condition of the Treasury. It is difficult for me to follow this process of identification for the reasons which I have outlined before.

4.45 p.m.

The national income of Barbados *per capita* has nothing to do with the money paid out of the Treasury to the Ministers or to the Civil Service. That is only a modicum of the national income. It is true that they get large slices of the national cake, but what the people of Barbados want to know is something of what goes on in the minds of those who preside over their destinies.

I think it will be entirely unfitting to leave any of the words "the House have noted with satisfaction the financial condition of the Island." I cannot myself be a party to any such sycophantic expressions. The paragraph should read as follows:—

"The House of Assembly have noted the financial condition of the Island, and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address, and assure Your Excellency's Address, and that these and all submitted to them during the Session will be given their earnest attention.

The House deplores the fact that no reference has been made to the Public Transport Service of this Island." I would also like to add the words "and of the national economy on a wider basis."

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept that part of the proposed amendment. I think the amendment will need some redrafting.

The Clerk then read out the Address as moved by the hon. junior member for St. Michael which was as follows:—

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for your speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the final Session 1951-56.

The House have noted with satisfaction the financial condition of the Island, and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address, and beg to assure Your Excellency that these and all other matters submitted to them will be given their earnest attention during the ensuing session.

The Clerk then read out the amendment as moved by the hon. junior member for the City with the suggested amendment by the hon. senior member for St. George.

"The House have noted the financial condition of the Island, and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Speech, and assure Your Excellency that these and all other matters submitted to them during the session will be given their earnest attention."

The House however regrets that no mention has been made of the state of the national income in Your Excellency's Speech or of plans for the improvement of the standard of living of the people of this island or of the public transport system."

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask leave to make a slight amendment in the reading of the Address, if I am in order, now that I am replying

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to make a change in the wording of the Address.

There being no objection leave was granted to the hon. member.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, the proposed change is the deletion of the word "your" and the substitution of the word "the" in line two; the deletion of the word "final" and the substitution of the word "legislative" in line three; the deletion of "1951-56" and substituting "1956" in line three; the deletion of the word "ensuing" in the last line thereof and the insertion of the words "and support" after the word "attention" in line five of paragraph two.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is a long time since I have seen the atmosphere of this House so calm; something which I very much regret. I am not happy when the atmosphere of this House is so calm; it seems that something is wrong. My colleague was calm in his reply; and it is not like the hon. senior member for St. George to be also calm. I regret I was not present when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking; but sometimes when those hon. members are in earnest it is suggested that they are usually very calm. I am sure that the Government never like to think that the Opposition is so calm about anything they are doing. If we have been calm about many of the things we suggested during our time here, much of what I have seen in this Report or this Speech from the Throne would not have been mentioned.

It is our duty from this side of the Table with this system of Government, or any form of Government for that matter, not to shower praise upon the Government. Our duty is to show them their sins of omissions; and it is for us as far as humanly possible, constructively to criticise any Government suggestion. This, like making a speech on the Estimates gives an opportunity to members of the Opposition to express their views; not concerned merely with the Report and how nicely we should sound for the benefit of the Governor, but to say what you feel here on behalf of the people you represent.

It is very nice to have that reply worded by the hon. junior member for St. Michael in that way; and I suppose because of the calmness for which he is well noted, he was responsible for the calmness which the other hon. members adopted.

Now, Sir, reading and studying carefully the speech from the throne, a casual observer would come to the conclusion that all was well in Barbados: there was nothing to worry about and that the country was well off and everything ahead seemed rosy. I think I should admit at the beginning, since we are heading for the end of this 1951-56 Session, we have some unpardonable pride on this side of the Table that we can say we have assisted in urging Government on in many of the schemes which had been partly perfected during the Session. But we are not altogether satisfied over here at this Speech as they would have the public believe. All is not

well so that we can sit back complacently and just have things go on, and that in the economic position of the country there is no dread as to the future.

Now, Sir, one cannot take this Speech paragraph by paragraph, because I know that the Head of this Administration is noted for his very short paragraphs and sentences; but as I have it here in front of me I am going to start with page four. I am not merely concerned with writing this Reply to let him say that all is well. I believe that it is better for the Government to be able to say to the Head of the Administration what members of the Opposition think, than for the Head of the Administration to be able to hold the views of the Opposition as expressed; and so too of the Colonial Office. No doubt we have had a year unprecedented in this century due to the ravages of the hurricane.

Now, I am going to start on the page that deals with hurricane rehabilitation by the Government. I personally, Sir, and I believe all thinking people in Barbados, feel that with the damage done in this country, we were somewhat disappointed that all we have got from the British Government up to now is something like £50,000. Let me say in the vernacular of the people we represent, it is scandalous. It is regrettable, Sir, that the feeling of the general public today is that the reason why we have got no more from the Colonial Office of the British Government

is because the Premier himself has made out that we are in such a state and so rich that we do not need it. Now, that is putting it lightly
5.05 p.m.

I am expressing a view which is today throughout Barbados. If that Reply which was given to the House of Commons has been wrongly printed, I do hope to see a denial of it in the Press. I cannot think of anything more scandalous than that: this ancient colony which has been struck by a hurricane, the ravages of which will live on for years, is given £50,000; and then on the back of that, we are told that the reason for that is that we have enough of our own money with which we can get on. I feel that we should not allow an opportunity like this to pass the first opportunity which we really have to reply to something stated by the Representative of Her Majesty the Queen, without saying that we, in this ancient and loyal Colony, feel that to come to our rescue with £50,000 and ask us to take our reserves which we so badly need for our development, rather than assist us really in a manner befitting the United Kingdom Government in a democracy, is nothing short of being scandalous. I cannot think of any Reply being sent to the Head of the Administration without my mentioning that matter.

I am going to mention a lot of things whether my amendment is seconded or not. On page 4 of His Speech, His Excellency refers to Rehabilitation after the hurricane "Janet." Mention is made of repairs to houses and that is nothing to do with other damages; and now nearly nine months after the hurricane, we have been given only £50,000, and it has been said that the Premier of Barbados has said: "We do not need your help." [ASIDES] That was stated in the Press; and I expected to see a denial of it. For those of us who come in contact with the people daily, to say that we do not need any help of this nature, is not really speaking the truth.

I suppose that is so much for the hurricane, but upon that hinges the structure for the development of our economic future. Now whatever planning the Government has made for the Deep Water Harbour and the Capital Works mentioned here, when the large sum of money which we had to expend on the hurricane is considered, which must in some measure set us back.

I say that you will go through this Speech from the Throne, and when you think of all the development of which the Government has told us, when you think of the ways and means of raising loans, when you think that we have had to spend this money in unforeseen circumstances, and we are only given this assistance of £50,000 from the British Government, I say it is a scandalous state of affairs. Some people like to say that you are ungrateful when you make mention of these things; but if there is any ingratitude, it is from the side of the British Government towards the West Indies. We are only expecting to get what they took from us in the past. That is what Sir Winston Churchill has said, not exactly in those words, but that is what he meant.

I do not know how to begin to believe that if you only offer us £50,000, it could be correct to say that we have with our own money with which we can get on. As a matter of fact, you have to agree that the Capital Works mentioned in His Excellency's Speech are absolutely necessary; but it is rather short-sighted not to have pressed for what you should get as a result of the hurricane. I know that the answer is that you are borrowing money from C.D. & W.; but when you borrow money you have to repay the loan with interest. People may be doing you a favour in lending you money, but you are building up their economy.

On page 5 of His Excellency's Speech, reference is made to the Airport and this is what is stated in that regard. His Excellency says this:

"The extension and improvement of the runway, the additions to the terminal building and the reorganisation of the fire-fighting services at Seawell are keeping with present-day requirements at an important airport."

I wonder how the Head of the Administration feels or how the Government feels about this matter. The Airport in Barbados has not been improved, because it is the only Airport where it is said: "We say who must come in." This Airport is the O.B.E.; it is the Only Blessed Exception! [Laughter]. I am really wondering whether I would be true to the people of Barbados if I allowed a Speech like this to pass without offering my observations here.

I am not going to take up the time of this House to speak on this whole question today, because I am going to do so on the Reply to His Excellency's Message dealing with the entire question of the Airport. Why I am mentioning it here now is because I want to say that it is hypocrisy: it is a falsehood in your fooling people when you tell them, as was mentioned in the Governor's Speech, that the extension and improvement of the runway, the addition to the terminal buildings and the reorganisation of the fire fighting services at Seawell are in keeping with present-day requirements at an important airport. An airport which would possibly benefit Barbados would be one that is made open. If you open the Seawell Airport you would benefit from something like \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage if it is the desire of the House, I will move the adjournment of the House for half an hour.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

5.20 p.m.

REPLY TO H.E.'S SPEECH — Cont'd.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was giving consideration to the Reply to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of this Session.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When the House adjourned, Mr. Speaker, I was talking on the paragraph of His Excellency's speech dealing with the Airport. I reminded hon. members then that while later in the Session I intended to deal with the Reply to His Excellency's Message relative to the Address passed by this House on the question of American flag-bearing Airlines, that in passing I should still mention something now about the question of bringing our Airport up to date, as is contained in His Excellency's Speech, because while you are doing that, you are still denying the people of this country the right to get more fees by not having it as an open Airport.

It is nothing else less of a scandal that you are denying its use as an open airport and you are putting a sum of money in the Current Estimates to subsidise B.W.I.A. I cannot see how a Socialist Government which was so bitterly opposed to private enterprise and any monopolies, coming along in the same breath as soon as it has been elevated to power, and saying that it is giving private enterprise \$10,000 a year to run an airplane service so as to keep out other airplanes.

The Head of the Administration used the term: "My Government." That means to say that this Government has come in here with this. I say this is hypocrisy. Any time you are doing anything to prevent healthy, decent competition that is hypocrisy. I think of the days when the hon. junior member for St. George used to be all over Bridgetown talking to people, as well as other hon. members of the Government campaigning all over the country saying: "Down with the capitalists!" "Free enterprise! No! No! That strangles the economy of a country;" "let us nationalise public utilities."

Sir, as you pass on reading, you will find on the same page the Governor referring to public utilities. This is what he has to say about them: "The Public Utilities Act was proclaimed and the Public Utilities Board assumed duty on the 1st January, 1955."

Then he goes on to say: following a reorganisation, the new Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd., is undertaking a considerable expansion of services. This Company and the Barbados Telephone Co., Ltd., are to be congratulated on the rapidity with which they repaired the heavy damage done to their lines and services by the hurricane." As I have said, His Excellency refers to "My Government." He is talking about a Socialist Government which said everything against private enterprise. They said that the worse criminals are capitalists, yet that is what the Government says about the Barbados Light and Power Company, and the Barbados Telephone Company.

6.00 p.m.

He is congratulating private companies. What about the Bus Company? He cannot congratulate the Bus Company which Government has taken over. What can he say about that? Listen to this: can you imagine, Sir, the Head of the Administration putting in here about Public Utilities? Now, when we speak of Public Utilities it is with justifiable pride when we on this side of the Table, not including the other Opposition socialists, spoke about Public Utilities and we offered a compromise. Of course, we did not say private enterprise took advantage of any concern in the community and advocate that in place of nationalisation that a public utilities corporation should be set up; we advised that an Act should be passed and a Board set up for the purpose

of controlling public utilities to avoid monopolies and to avoid people from taking advantage of the country.

It is with justifiable pride we can point today to the fact that after fighting for ten years (as soon as the party system came in) the one important thing that we made out was the inevitable question of the people of pigment. In saying that the Public Utilities Act is proclaimed and established, it is alright to congratulate the organisation of the Barbados Electric Company or the Barbados Light and Power Company, the Telephone Company and the Gas Company and what not; but I say, Sir, I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has mentioned that he regrets that no statement has been made about the Transport system of the colony, which this House has given the authority by its legislation, to vest in a Board. Nothing has been said about what is being done with it; and if rumour is correct, we await, quite shortly, to deal with it. I do not want to say much more than that right now, but we shall keep that for later.

I understand that the honourable junior member for Christ Church, the Leader of the Opposition, has mentioned that very regrettably nothing has been said. What we find here is what the Governor has had to say about his Socialist Government. That I contend, Sir, is one thing that we did not have power over. Though we were in a small minority in the Assembly, it was among the things we fought for to have established in this country, and through the Governor's reference we are very proud to see it has been accepted. It is a right thing because we will watch your transport service.

There are so many things that we will have to discuss, I prefer not to trespass upon them today. My colleague the honourable junior member for the City mentioned the question of emigration. I have always said that I do think that any member of any Government could seriously set up any obstacles to emigration. I have always said that. Give everybody the benefit of that doubt.

If you want to stay in here, do nothing to prevent people from getting out of this country.

We on this side of the House are proud to think that apart from pressing the Government — I see a smile on the face of the Premier: [A VOICE: A broad grin!] May be that is too mild a word.

You should not smile, because if we had not harrangued to the Government into this and had we not pressed them, (everybody knows the attitude of the Government as regards emigration) they would not be the present emigration scheme to England. I am going to be fair; they were not opposed to it, but they were not in favour of one to England. Whether it is on an election platform or not, we can prove that. As a matter of fact when somebody suggested what was happening in Jamaica, I think they took the line that Jamaica had not been giving any assistance at the time; but we say, Sir, we are extremely proud on the part of our people.

I did not fear the small fish who thought that when we said what we were saying and we pressed it, that we knew all depended on the Premier's word at that time. We knew then there was no feeling of pushing the system for England. We all knew they would not say they were against the scheme to England, but we are satisfied beyond a shadow of a doubt with the part played by the Opposition in the scheme of emigration.

We need not refer to the obstacles and difficulties that were put in the way of the people; we need not remain silent on speeches made in this House when we said whoever thought people would not sell their

houses, land, cows, sheep and goats and everything to go to England in search of work. We therefore are very proud that we have completed our part on that scheme.

The Governor has mentioned in paragraph six, that the survey of unemployment which has just been received will be communicated to the Legislature as soon as possible.

I want to ask this question straight from the shoulder. Is it not a fact that it has been finished and for reasons has not been released to the Press or to the public? I am asking that. I know that this survey has been made and finished for sufficient time to be in the hands of the Press, public and the Legislature. We should have known about it before. I am asking if it has not been held up. For those going to England and with what has been said by M.P's in England and by other people let me ask that as a simple question. If it is not so, it is not so. You cannot help hearing these things. You should be able to say whether this is correct or not.

Maybe, I will differ somewhat from speakers on the question of education. I observe that the only mention in His Excellency's Speech on this question is that they are going to amend the Act to ensure one Scholarship award each year is reserved for girls. There is so much more that could have been referred to; but I, like other hon. members, would certainly prefer to have listened or to have read that reference could have been made that in the absence of free secondary education which I advocate, and which the Government today agrees with me, that it does not seem practicable. They advocated free secondary education and I said I did not see it practical then. Therefore, I am pleased to see that the Government has agreed with our Party, that in the light of seeing something that is not practicable to do, with other pressing needs and with the system which we have they are considering free secondary education; I say I would certainly have preferred to see rather than just mention here in passing the reservation of one place on the Barbados Scholarships for girls, that the Education Act be amended to give the rank and file more scholarships to the secondary and if you can use the term, first-grade schools. 6.10 p.m.

That is what I would much prefer to see rather than their mentioning that they will reserve a Barbados Scholarship for a girl annually. We have been saying that, not merely should there be a Scholarship for a girl, at a University, but that sixty more children should be allowed to benefit from a secondary education. That is my view. I should also like to see, in the absence of any scheme of free secondary education which they cannot finance today, that they at least follow up the system and instead of giving 150 children from Elementary Schools the benefit of secondary education, make the number 300. I feel that the Government is very short-sighted in not pursuing such a policy in the absence of free secondary education.

It may be argued that they have increased the number of Barbados Scholarships, which the Conservative Government had not done; but you must forgive me if I say it, and I make no apology for saying it, that it is not the Barbados Scholars who make the greatest contribution to this Colony, for indeed some of them contribute very little to the Colony. I have seen some of them who, after they have graduated at the expense of the Colony, rather than assist, they try to retard its progress. They have made no contribution to this Colony, and the Colony deserves such contribution. There are very few of them who have contributed anything to the

Colony. There is this idea of getting into people's heads that the Government has provided five Barbados Scholarships; however, some of the Scholars get degrees, some of them get half-baked degrees and most of them waste the money; but many people who have only been to the secondary Schools are assisting in the Civil Service of the Colony.

There is an important matter which I understand the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to and I sincerely regret from the depths of my heart, that more was not said about it today. I regret that although mention has been made of the matter today it was not given greater priority; it is the question of hospitalization in this Country. I have been a very strong critic of the set-up where health is concerned especially as regards the establishment of the Hospital. With the introduction of the system of Ministerial Government, I have had long talks with the Hon. Minister of Social Services. That there has been some improvement, nobody will deny, but we have a long way to go.

Mention has been made of new plans for a Hospital, mention has been made of the Deep Water Harbour, of School Buildings and so on; but would anybody around this table say today that the building of Combermere School, the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, the erection of Ministerial Buildings or any other Buildings are of greater importance to this colony than this question of hospitalization? When you consider that one in every five families must have some hospitalization in this Country in every year, certainly you would much prefer to see the work which has been put into the Ministerial Buildings, put into a Hospital.

As Sir Alexander Bustamante, I think it is, has said, Government business can be done even under a tree. Messrs. Walcott, Clarke and Goodman had to be in offices; they did not have the pleasure of having all the space and expensive furniture, but they ran the business. It is also true to say that there is ability in the members of the Government and they could certainly do the work until the time comes for them to go into bigger offices.

It cannot be claimed that they could not carry on the work as they did; I am not saying that the time has not come when they should have more space, because it seems to me that the space would provide them with the brains with which to do the work. [Laughter]. I think the members of the Government will agree with me that all that has been mentioned about the Hospital, is that they are getting new plans.

I am one of those persons who believe that in respect of the very persons who have had experience in big Countries in dealing with Hospital Administration, it is absolutely correct to listen to the views of such persons and see that you can improve plans which might only be set up as they are set up by a local Committee. I believe myself, that to go out of Barbados is in itself an experience.

6,20 p.m.

Every Barbadian feels that you know everything and that you have seen everything although you have not been outside of the island or as far as Pelican Island. I know that if you go outside of Barbados, that is an experience. I see nothing wrong in your having new plans if they would be an improvement on what you have; but first things first. You cannot deny, Mr. Speaker, that in the lives of people of this colony the question of hospitalisation must come to their minds often and there is that fear of it. With every man who has a family to respect, (I am not referring to the ones who have families whom they do not respect) there is that fear if they should have to carry them to the General

Hospital for treatment where they would be in a bed with somebody else. My policy is not what I can get for myself, nor what hon. members of this House can get for themselves, but what is being done for the people who put us in here. You know, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to anything to do with you at the Hospital you will be well treated because it is you. What I am saying is not a criticism of the nurses and the doctors of the General Hospital generally, but I am warning the Government that first things should come first. I am sure every hon. member will regret that the only reference made about the General Hospital is with regard to the provision made for the continuation of the programme of development at the Hospital, and that is that plans will be laid before us for the construction of a new Hospital and for the reallocation and conversion of the existing buildings so as to provide adequate tuberculosis wards and staff quarters.

I am going to suggest a further amendment to the Reply of this House to His Excellency's speech. As deals with the General Hospital I beg to move that the following paragraph be added to the Reply:—

"The House further regrets that Government has failed to appreciate the urgent necessity for increased hospital accommodation and that this matter has not been accorded the priority it deserves."

Mr. Speaker, that amendment will show that members of this House are rather apprehensive over what Government is doing as regards increase accommodation at the General Hospital, and would appreciate something being done as quickly as possible.

I do not think I will be bringing out any tales if I say that the plans for the new General Hospital have already reached Government level. I would therefore like to counsel Government that as soon as they have been passed by the Executive, that this House would appreciate that such plans should be given the highest priority in Government Capital Works in the coming Session, I consider that to be very important.

I do not believe any Minister can say with any honesty that during his term of office, he has not been receiving complaints of the lack of proper accommodation and the lack of services at the General Hospital. It is not only a question of lack of accommodation, but it is a question also of having qualified persons at the institution. I therefore beg to move the aforementioned paragraph be put at the end of the amended paragraph of the Reply.

6.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I beg to second that. Now, Mr. Speaker, normally I should consider any length of time devoted to replying to this speech at this time as a waste of energy. We in the Opposition will have so much opportunity this year to reply at length to the fallacies contained in this draft reply, that it is in my opinion a waste of time and energy to devote much attention and time to it now.

Sir, my only reason for rising is because I want to make the records straight. I would hate the impression to go abroad that the Opposition in this House in 1956 was so simple-minded as to endorse the remarks contained in the draft reply moved by the honourable junior member for St. Michael, to thank the Governor for his Speech. Incidentally, I want to congratulate the honourable member on his elevation to the Other Place, because so far as I know, that is the only branch of the Legislature in which a member is allowed to read his speech.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it absolutely clear that reading a speech is certainly a breach of the rules of this House. I did not get the impression he

was reading his speech; as a matter of fact, I thought it was a copy of the Governor's Address. If I had the impression he was reading his speech, I would have called him to Order. Your Honour can rest assured that I cast no aspersions in Your Honour's direction when I say the honourable member did it so cleverly, even Your Honour failed to see he was doing so. Be that as it may, Sir, it is bad enough for the honourable member to have made it appear earlier that the original speech was inspired, but now to have gone to the head of the spring for a reply makes it worse.

Sir, I did not want it to go on record that the Opposition could support this reply and thank the Governor for his speech. After all, Mr. Speaker, this is 1956 and what are we told in a speech written presumably either by, or with the connivance of the Government? We are told there has been a tremendous increase in the revenue of the island. The revenue has risen from \$91½ million six years ago to over \$17 million now; but how has this revenue risen? It has risen thanks mainly to excellent sugar crops and the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, an elected Government in a West Indian colony which finds itself with increased revenue not by any contribution by the Government to the expansion of the colony's economy, but thanks mainly to good rainfalls and sugar crops and to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement in which they had to say at all in either inspiring or creating. How could we say here today that we are satisfied with that state of affairs; the Governor also might have added that much of this was due to over taxation, but he omitted that.

Mr. Speaker, with all the West Indies around us advancing economically, even the smaller islands in the Leewards and Windwards especially with new industries bringing more revenue, in the country, why should this Government be satisfied to admit that we have done nothing at all to improve the economy of this island, and any revenue is due to the fact that the island had good rainfall. That is not good enough. People coming into this country whom I have talked with, (I have talked with experts in one field or another) have all criticised the manner in which Barbados is standing still while the other colonies are going on. Trinidad had fifty new industries in five years. With regard to Jamaica, there was a report in a big London newspaper about three weeks ago to the effect that new industries are growing up in Jamaica.

I am amazed at the amount of them; and this is no attempt at a detailed list of what is taking place. I merely want to let the infants on the Government's Bench realise that if they are satisfied that we have increased our revenue because of the British Sugar Agreement, we are not. The country is not. And the country will show that it is not satisfied before the year is out.

No Barbadian is so stupid or politically unintelligent today as to sit down and allow this country to remain dependent on economic advancement purely through circumstances over which we have no control, and through occasional emigration. That is all we are living by. Look at the record of the Government.

I do not really intend to waste my time and energy exposing failures, but, Mr. Speaker, to give an idea and to show you how simple-minded, illogical and how short-sighted the Government of this country is, I merely want to refer briefly in passing to page five of the Governor's speech where reference is made to development. It says there: "The Barba-

dos Development Act of 1955 recognised the vital importance of expanding the island's production. The Board set up under the Act is urgently seeking key staff in order that it may soon be in a position to discharge its duties."

Now, Mr. Speaker, those political infants who find themselves on the Government's Benches are talking about development and claiming that the Barbados Development Board is urgently concerned with the importance of expanding the island's production. What are the facts? In 1952 during the first year of the Five Year Plan, we included one million dollars for the Industrial Development Board. Now they are so concerned with production and expanding the island's economy, that although we gave them that, for three years they sat on their hind legs and did nothing at all about development. We gave them a million dollars in the Five Year Plan and not until 1955 did they come with a Bill to set up a Board
6.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I ask anybody outside of the Mental Hospital whether it is reasonable to assume that people who are supposed to be interested in development of the Island, who had capital for three years for a Board, should fail to take one step to establish this Board and put it into operation. We passed the Act last year and now they are telling us that they are looking for key men to staff the Board. In all your experience in legislative progress in any part of the world, have you ever found anything like it, Mr. Speaker? Do you mean to say that we gave them money in 1952 to establish the Board and now three years after they are still looking for key men to staff the Board?

I merely mention that single item to show that I am not prepared to sit down and agree that the facts outlined in this nonsense are something for which to thank the Governor. The Governor may well have cause to be thankful that we are so undeveloped that we have to rest on the bounty of the British Government, (regardless of the sugar we produce) for our revenue. So long as we continue to be beholding to the British Government in one direction, so long shall we be beholding to them in others.

If the Government can view with equanimity the present economic position in which the Island finds itself, I cannot do that. I am not prepared to fool the Government or the Governor, or the public that I am satisfied with the state of affairs existing at present.

Sir, there are one or two other points to which brief reference could be made in passing. On page two of the Government's Speech, we are told that it is important that we should make full use of the C.D. & W. funds allocated to us. I would like to say that this is the only island in the West Indies which has never obtained appropriate assistance from C.D. & W.; mainly due to the policy of the present Government. I can prove that.

We have got less assistance from C.D. & W. than other islands in the West Indies because the Leader of the Government has succumbed to the blandishments of certain Englishmen in Barbados who always advise this Government to make their requests for aid from C.D. & W. as small as possible. All the other West Indian Islands have been proportionately getting more from C.D. & W. than we have been getting. After a disastrous hurricane, we have been only given £50,000 by the British Government, and the Government now wants to bestir itself and see if it can recoup itself and make

up for lost time in getting substantial grants from C.D. & W. They will not get it. The other West Indian colony severely damaged by hurricane has received \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is true Grenada had more damage from the hurricane "Janet" than we had, proportionately speaking, but it is also true to say that having regard to the number of houses damaged and the general ravages suffered by this colony, we are entitled to a sum far in excess of what we got from the British Government. But the local Government has been leaving undone the things they ought to have done; and on paper, the financial position of the colony is so strong that we could not make out a case for greater assistance from the British Government.

Sir, similarly on page three of the Speech, the Government has signified its intention of acquiring a little commonsense with regard to the manner in which the Revenue Equalisation Fund is operated. They are now prepared to embark particularly on a policy which has been recommended to them for the last three years by the Opposition in this Chamber. They are now attempting to lock the door almost when the horse is out! If that policy had been followed before, it is possible we would have got more assistance at the time of the hurricane, and we would have been able to justify claims to C.D. & W.

Sir, somewhere in his speech, the Governor made reference to the acquisition by the Government of Rockley Beach; the exact reference is in connection with reserving the beach for bathers. At the time when we considered this matter, I strongly opposed it. I said that we should reserve the beach by buying a part of it, because if we bought a right of way to the sea, people would have access to the entire beach. The Government was pleased to spend \$47,000 in purchasing this land, and I said then it would be under water again.

Mr. Speaker, you can go up there now and see what the position is. The whole thing is under water; and the Government has been digging trenches for the last seven or eight days to get the water out. They could not find the money to buy "Rosegate" in St. John, but they could throw \$47,000 into the sea at Rockley. Do you expect me to come in here and support this ill advised, non-sical reply moved by the hon. junior member for St. Michael. The Government has demonstrated an amazing amount of brazenness and barefacedness in this Speech.

6.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of emigration to the United Kingdom, I would like to say if I had to make a reply, as mentioned by a previous speaker, if this Government can get up and state what great value emigration mainly to the U.K., is proving to the country, is to put it mildly, the quintessence of shamelessness; it is brazenness to the extreme. The Hon. Premier himself said that Barbadians would not leave our bright, warm sunshine to go to England, and that we could not vote money for every Tom, Dick and Harry to go to England.

Sir, on top of that, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour, after repudiating my statement that there were 300,000 jobs in England, said there were some vacancies but there were no homes in which the people could go. He is the British Minister of Housing.

The responsibility was placed on his shoulders to see about the housing conditions in England. Now, the Government has the amazing effrontery to come in here and claim that emigration mainly

to the U.K., is proving most valuable as an offset to the increase in population. Sir, if it were left to them, the thousands who are now working in Britain would have still been in Barbados, possibly eating one another, unemployed, walking the streets with nothing to do, and without any prospect of work.

Sir, because of the Government's attitude towards the question of emigration to the U.K., they would have still been in Barbados. Now the Governor, presumably with the foreknowledge of the Government, gets up and says that it is mainly because of emigration to the U.K., that so and so is the case. Well, the most that be said is that at long last they are capable of appreciating its value.

Sir, since they have taken so long to appreciate its value, they may be fool-hardy enough to fool themselves that they had some responsibility in bringing about its benefits. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that they had to be bulldozed into doing it.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous other fallacies which if I had the time or the desire I could draw to Your Honour's attention. If I may make reference to one more: reference has been made on page five of H.E.'s Speech to the Barbados Light and Power Company. His Excellency says: "Following a reorganisation, the new Barbados Light & Power Company Limited is undertaking a considerable expansion of its services."

Sir, it is in the last few words that lies the most interesting story—a story of which members of this Government have every reason to be completely ashamed or if they have any sense of shame. This company for years could not expand through them, because they threatened to nationalise it. It could not get one cent of capital through them. After some time elapsed, the least they could do was to endeavour to see that the company got the capital it needed for expansion. What do you think the people who threatened to nationalise the company did? They laid the good offices and name of Barbados upon the altar to enable to the Electric Corporation to get the capital it wanted for expansion; and far from nationalising it, they have not got a single share in it.

Sir, one would have thought that the logical thing for them to do was that they themselves would get the capital and put in the company or take their own money and put it into the company to expand it, if they claimed the ambition of nationalising the company. When the chance came along for them partially to control the company so as to get some of its profits to spend on this country, they allowed the title deeds of Barbados as well as the healthy state of the finances of the Treasury, to be used as a sort of guarantee for investment in the same company.

Mr. Speaker, we were endorsing the note so to speak; the shareholders in the company are getting all the profits and we are getting nothing. And in a speech by the Governor after this farce has been enacted, they pat themselves on the back that they had done a good job, and they have every reason to be proud of the reorganisation of the company.

Really, Sir, it is amazing; it is ridiculous, it is fantastic that people can be so child-like in their approach to a question of such vital importance.

Sir, one very notable omission in the entire Speech of His Excellency is in reference to the question of Transport. Government was apparently afraid to take the public into its confidence and admit what was happening. Was an open secret that estimates of the present operational deficit for eight

months was \$180,000; and some Government members, like Nicodemus, were travelling by night begging the former 'bus owners to take them back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the paragraph dealing with concession to industry. It is regrettable that this legislation was passed long after that in the other West Indian Colonies. The Government knows that; and they would do nothing about it. Now they tell that they are waiting on the results of the review undertaken by the Regional Economic Committee. Nobody else is doing it. The other islands are two steps ahead of us in awaiting the R.E.C.'s report, and in adopting it, they would be probably three steps ahead of us in the matter of aid to Pioneer Industries.

Sir, in the history of the Government on aid to Pioneer Industries, it would be recalled that we could have been the first island in the area to have it; but the Government was stupid enough not to see the value of it, and refused to adopt it until about five or six years after with the absurd excuse then of doing it merely to bring the colony in line with the other West Indian islands. We passed in this Island an Act to give potential investors far less concessions than they could get elsewhere; and therefore it is not to be wondered at that while the other Islands are being developed, we remain dependent on bountiful sugar crops and the Common wealth Sugar Agreement for any expansion in revenue. Sir, that is the position which the Governor and the Government expect the people of this Island and the Opposition of this Chamber to raise their hands to heaven and sing the Hallelujah Chorus for. They expect us to be unmindful of our obligations to the people of this country.

That is the position which this Government expected us to endorse in vital matters. Unfortunately sir, we must let them know now that that is the position which we expect them to adopt in this or any other matter.

7.10 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: My particular quarrel with the Speech from the Throne is in respect of what I regard as its vital and substantial omissions. Here we are at the very last lap of this Five Year race, and yet, although we have been pursuing the even tenor of our way since 1951, after reading through this Speech twice, I cannot find any reference to that of which we have spoken so often and attracted so much support during the 1951 electoral crusade; I refer to the question of providing a free hot meal for children of public Elementary Schools [Laughter].

I observe that a member of no less than Cabinet rank seems to be amused at the suggestion of providing a free hot meal for poor children attending the Elementary Schools. That demonstration, perhaps, is not surprising to most of us. As we turn over the pages of this Speech from the Throne, we see a very short paragraph referring to Education; there is no reference even to a trial scheme of the nature I have mentioned. I had expected that in this last lap of this Five Year race, there would at least have been an indication of the institution of such a trial scheme in the poorest districts of the Island. I do not mean that their political representation is poorest [Laughter]; I mean that their economic position is the most distressing.

I would be surprised if the two honourable members for St. Andrew were not to support my suggestion of this scheme in the parishes of St. Lucy and St. Andrew which are the poorest in the Island. In this paragraph there is no reference made to free Secondary Education. This paragraph simply says this:

"Legislation will be submitted to you to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act of 1949 to ensure, *inter alia*, that one award each year is reserved for a girl."

I must confess that I am not yet convinced by the explanation which has been given, as to why a Scholarship was not awarded this year in respect of the last Barbados Scholarship Examination to the young lady from Queen's College who passed in all three subjects at Advanced Level, and in one of the three with distinction. I have heard an explanation given, which is hardly plausible, and it is not good enough; but if we are making it compulsory that a girl must get one of these Scholarships at all costs, that will correct whatever difficulty there was which was alleged to have prevented Miss Bannister from being awarded a Scholarship in respect of the last Barbados Scholarship Examination.

I have found, Mr. Speaker, that if one continues long enough to force things to sink into the heads of certain people who are in authority, certain things do happen. I need not remind you, Sir, of the tiny move which is being made towards the establishment of a Government Printery. It is in the embryonic stage, it is true, but they cannot any longer deny the need for such a Printery. We have had the Grand Jury abolished, and so, after many years of agitation, I have been able to persuade those who are not living ahead of their time, to see who are not even in keeping with their time, to see what is needed for this Country. I have no doubt that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph with his humanity and sound business sense, will not dispense with the idea of the necessity of a free hot meal for Elementary School children. I am sure that that will happen in our time so long as we are allowed to live to our allotted three score and ten.

I repeat, my particular quarrel with this Speech, (I used the term in a Parliamentary sense) is the omissions. On the question of nationalisation, one wonders how any reference to such a question could have been omitted except as a result of a very deliberate act. It almost reminds me of what Sir Anthony Eden has said in connection with the case of Crabb; "I have not one more word to say about it." It was not so put by the members of the Cabinet, but the position is the same. Is silence golden on this occasion? Let me warn the Hon. Minister of Communications that no semi, or demi-semi or quasi-nationalisation scheme will ever succeed; such a scheme will succeed if you have your entire passenger service nationalised, and you have competent people running it. You want to have a proper Authority with at least one member of this Chamber on such a Board.

Can you imagine a nationalisation scheme failing if we had on the Board a member like the honourable junior member for St. Joseph or any member of his calibre and ability and with his acute sense of responsibility to the electorate of this Island and with his ear always on the ground? I have mentioned one name, but there are other honourable members of this Chamber who are quite competent, and who should obviously be put on this Board; but who chooses these people to go on these Boards, Heaven only knows!

7.20 p.m.

As you have heard, you can see that it is foredoomed to failure. People who are not successful in their own private walks of life cannot really achieve something in public life.

The outstanding feature in this Speech from the Throne is contained in the paragraph of which the marginal note reads: "Disestablishment of the

Anglican Church." I have never read anything more tepid and lukewarm than what I have read in the paragraph to that marginal note. The paragraph reads as follows:— "A sub-committee of the Executive Committee has met a Committee appointed by the Lord Bishop to discuss the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church. Discussions will proceed." Mr. Speaker, they have said that discussions will proceed. Well, for how long? How long, how long, O Lord will these discussions proceed? Is there any sign of finality in the remote and distant future? Are there frustrations that they write that discussions will proceed and that a Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee has met a Committee appointed by the Lord Bishop to discuss the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church? Will these discussions last until eternity? We know we must face honourable members on my right and left, because this House has not its classical scholars, *festina lente*.

I would like to have read a paragraph containing a greater sense of urgency than this one. We should have something more told us than that a sub-Committee of the Executive has met a Committee appointed by the Lord Bishop to discuss the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church and that discussions will proceed.

I suggest to the sub-Committee of the Executive Committee that they should treat this matter as one of greater urgency than with what I gather they are treating it. I do not know if any significance is attached to the fact that while the paragraph deals with disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church, the marginal note only speaks of disestablishment. I take it that the marginal note is concise and the two things—disestablishment and disendowment—can be regarded as inseparably intertwined.

Then there is a paragraph with reference to the Airport as regards its extension and improvement. When one hears of the extension and improvement of the runway, one looks forward to hearing something of the Federal Capital being put in Barbados. The only thing which would be of special advantage is a free open airport. So when one reads of something less discouraging, as contained in the Message from His Excellency the Governor which reached this Chamber rather belatedly, when one was looking forward to a free open Airport, not only that Pan American Airlines can come here, (although all my Barbadian friends resident in the United States asked how long are we going to take exception to Pan American running its service here) but also that K.L.M. who was the first to inaugurate an air service to this colony can land here, one cannot feel too well about it.

Then there is a paragraph with reference to Professor Richardson's Report. It says: "Legislation has been enacted to implement Professor Richardson's recommendation in regard to non-contributory Old Age Pensions. His other recommendations are being examined."

We have not followed his recommendations chapter and verse in everything. There is no reference with respect to not following his recommendation for reducing the age limit. We should reduce the age limit for Old Age Pensions to at least 65 years as a start.

I want to say something about what is called the back money that has been paid out to these pensioners. There was the usual Government's delay in paying out this money, and I know of four cases in which the old people died without receiving this back money, which was \$31.80. I trust that the Minister of the Government who is responsible for

it will consider the drafting of a little enabling legislation or, may be, he can give some instruction to the Postmaster General in respect of those people who have died without receiving it.

As they have died without wills, it will take their legal representatives some money to take out letters of Administration to pay for the present fees of solicitors and the cost of advertising in the *Official Gazette*, which, as a matter of fact, is resuming publication sometime around next week. I understand from very good authority that the cost of taking out Letters of Administration is not less than \$50 to-day; and that information has been given to me by a member of a firm of Solicitors whose fees are reasonable.

As I have said, the amount of back pay to such pensioners is \$31.50. As that money was intended to be given to them, there is no reason why Government cannot assist in releasing it so as to help the legal representatives of those persons in the settling of the undertaker's bill. The amount is small. As a matter of fact, if the Government would be prepared to waive the cost of advertising and Court fees, I am told that the amount for Solicitors' fees will be so small with a reputable firm of solicitors (at least one of them) that they would not worry to charge.

I wonder if I might risk giving the information to the President of the Assistant Court of Appeal, that the Hon. Premier who is a lawyer even though out of practice, is willing for that Court to waive the fees which would accrue to the Government, and the Court in the taking out of those Letters of Administration in respect of the four persons whom I have in mind.

7.30 p.m.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, there is this question of Hurricane Rehabilitation and the houses of course in connection with Hurricane Rehabilitation. There is also the matter of the replacing of fishpots. I do sympathise with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries that his Fishery Officer seems to himself as a "super-duper" Minister of all fisheries, and to take unto himself to decide that you must wait because he says so, and you must bide your time because he is not ready for you, and taking people "willy-nilly" because of his eccentric idea of priorities. I sympathise with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for the existence of one who regards himself as the Minister plenipotentiary of all fisheries from Barbados to Miami.

Now, Sir, then there is the paragraph dealing with water supplies. I note with pleasure that the progress made with the development of water supplies of seven million gallons a day is double the volume raised ten years ago. That reminds me of a remark made by my friend the honourable junior member for St. Michael. I am sorry he is not here at the moment, but he spoke Mr. Speaker, of the roads and water programme as envisaged in this speech as being satisfactory to all.

But, Mr. Speaker, he spoke as a representative of the Metropolitan parish. He did not speak as a spokesman of the people of Barbados, he spoke like one, who like his colleague, represents the parish of St. Michael, and in his parish alone the Road and Water Programme is satisfactory. I am sure you will not disagree with me that two or three standpipes a year in the parishes like the ones you and I have to represent could never be regarded as a programme satisfactory to all.

The whole point is this: the principle which is followed in the metropolitan area is not one by any stretch of the imagination which is satisfactory in respect of the rural areas where you have distances.

You may live somewhere in the hills of your parish, a small parish of six or eight houses, and it is argued that because there are no experts living in these houses, they have no strong claim for water; they must be satisfied to send half a mile. Therefore, when the honourable junior member for St. Michael says this is a Roads and Water Programme satisfactory to all, he speaks only on behalf of St. Michael.

I challenge any representative of any rural area to say that he agrees that it is a programme satisfactory to all. The only way any rural representative would say that, Mr. Speaker, is if he thought what is said in this House will not be printed, because of what is happening with the *Official Gazette*. You know, Sir, it is as unsatisfactory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course there is the paragraph on emigration. Again I re-emphasise that the time has passed when they should any longer be lending less than the full amount which the average person requires. Now we see it is such a first-class business proposition, if they were not convinced before that it would work so well, now that they see the people repaying the money, there is no reason for putting these people to the grave handicap to get the 25% needed to make up the money to provide them with the means to go away or of having to sell their few remaining belongings or to borrow money on their little plot of land of the people who are left behind. They have sometimes to sell the furniture and deprive those left behind of the convenience of these household things.

The Government can afford to lend the full amount, not \$360 but \$480. They are getting it back, so why withhold it? Why find it necessary to say you must find something, especially since you are satisfied that the right people are going and going as first class ambassadors of this Island? So, Mr. Speaker, as I say, an important feature of the Speech is what is left out.

The second most important feature is the very modest approach to certain other things to which reference have been made in particular. As I said earlier, to such a matter as the disendowment of the Anglican Church more details should have been given; so I think I have drawn attention to those matters which to me have appeared most important. I shall leave my comments at that, realising it is well within the competence of the Cabinet by means of the usual Supplementary Resolution to come before us with the trial scheme for the free hot meals.

Just as with aided self-help houses you put up a few in certain parishes as a trial scheme, it is simple to start such a thing in regard to the poor children, those children in need of these meals, and whose parents cannot afford it for the children in the public elementary schools of this island. We promised it to them. I was reminded forcibly of it by the hon. junior member for St. Michael who said that the Government make promises and keep them. The time is not too late, having made these promises to keep them, even to the extent of the limit of the financial resources of this colony. The time has not yet passed when they cannot keep them. So I would urge them to make these words of the honourable junior member for the metropolitan parish ring true: "the Government has made promises and the Government has kept the promises that it made."

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if all the speeches have been made. [A VOICE: What difference does that make to you?] Mr. Speaker, we have listened to many speeches this evening, most of them containing very little, some of them containing nothing at all. I am about to reply to those who

have said nothing at all. [A VOICE: You cannot reply to nothing!] Mr. Speaker, first of all the honourable junior member for the City congratulated me, sarcastically of course, on my method of memorising my speech and said it was written by some one more prominent in the Government.

7.40 p.m.

That was at once contradicted by the honourable senior member for St. George who said that he saw me actually reading the speech. This mis-statement was corroborated by the honourable senior member for St. Philip who also accused me of reading the speech. This House and the general public have, for some time now, become accustomed to that kind of thinking; this House and the general public have also become accustomed to such wild and loose mis-statements. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the House and the public have acquired the knack of ignoring these statements; they have realised the mistake which they have made in imagining that, at some time, honourable members would develop into responsible persons. The display given to-night goes to prove one thing, that is, that the irresponsibility of such honourable members is on the increase.

Much ado has been made as to the omission in the Governor's Speech as to the question of transportation. Honourable members will remember that the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, has promised that a Statement embodying all the financial and other details will be given as from the inception of the operations of the Transport Board. [MEMBERS: When?] Hon. members will also remember that there are cases, or at least one case, has already been lodged and this matter is *sub judice*. I remember that when the Resolution for a sum of money, \$117,000, I think it was, was brought before this House the amount was subsequently withdrawn and honourable members were reminded of the passage in May's Parliamentary Procedure, which precluded them from debating the matter. I think that that is why the Government has made no comment on the matter.

The question raised by the honourable senior member for the City relative to the Hospital, was mentioned in the Governor's Speech; it was said that plans for the erection of a new Hospital will be laid before the Legislature. As I have already said, the plans for the erection of a new Hospital and other plans for Capital Works mentioned in the Governor's Speech, should be heartening news to the general public, because I imagine that that would also be heartening news to honourable members.

The honourable senior member for the City also made mention of the Hospital Advisory Board. In respect of his criticisms of the Hospital, I should like to say that the honourable senior member for the City is a member of the Hospital Advisory Board, and he knows the plans that have been sent down in connection with the Hospital.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I know no such thing; no such plans have been sent down.

Mr. BRYAN: I speak subject to correction, but I believe I am right in saying that the honourable senior member for the City did make reference to some other plans.

The futile attempts made by honourable members to offer criticism of the Government's policy are, in my opinion, very complimentary to the Government's policy. Rather than being criticism, it goes to prove, as I said before, that the Government is working for and on behalf of the people to whom they have made pledges. I think that so few points

have been made which are worthy of any reply, that I do not intend to waste the time of the House in replying to them.

Mr. MILLER: The remarks I intend to make are not any defence of the honourable junior member for St. Michael, because I do not think he needs any defence. I was sitting here when the honourable member was making his speech and I followed him through to the end. I believe that that speech is the greatest speech he has made in this House. I did pause and examine the honourable member after he started to make his speech, and I say that it was a deliberate speech; one could have seen that much thought and care had been spent in the preparation of what was a very good speech. It is not true to say that the honourable member was reading his speech, and for the sake of the records I think it should be said that the honourable member did make a great speech which deserves commendation from honourable members. On this occasion, I certainly think that it was unfair to the honourable member to state that he was reading his speech; I say that in spite of my having said that the honourable member does not need any defence.

7.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind honourable members that after I have risen to put the question, no honourable member can attempt to speak.

The question is that the amendment as moved by the honourable senior member for the City do now pass.

That amendment seeks to add an additional paragraph to the amendment as moved by the honourable junior member for the City. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

[A VOICE: Divide.]

Mr. MOTTLEY: Ring the bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will draw the honourable member's attention to Rule 143 which reads as follows:—

"No member shall be entitled to vote in any division unless he was present in the House when the question was put, and the vote of any member who was not so present will be disallowed."

The division is ordered and any member who comes in now will be disallowed to vote.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, may I be permitted to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot stand now.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: [sitting] I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we said "ring the bell" before the division was ordered. The division having been called for, immediately after that we asked that the bell be rung. Then Your Honour ruled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, take the division.

The division taken, the question was resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—6.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SMITH, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the amendment as moved by the honourable junior member for the City do now pass.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Ring the bell.

The bell was rung.

8.00 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. You will notice that the side note to that Rule says that the question is put before the division

is called. There may be some confusion there with the Rule.

The question that the amendment of the hon. junior member for the City stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—8.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SMITH, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—10.

The question that the Address as moved and amended by the hon. junior member for St. Michael do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SMITH, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—10.

Noes: Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—8.

STATEMENT ON OCEANOGRAPHIC STATION

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking Your Honour's indulgence to make a Government Ministerial Statement as to Government's policy in the light of a statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. It would be utterly wrong if I were to remain quiet and let the hon. member's statement go unchallenged, when there is not a word of truth in what the hon. member said.

Mr. LEWIS: I am rising on a point of order. How can the hon. member come and make a statement, that cannot be debated, on something which has taken place in a debate and on which a vote has already been taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the practice wherever a Ministerial System obtains, that Ministers are allowed after notifying the Speaker, to make a statement. It is also known that that statement cannot ever be debated. Those are two things that are well established. There is no reply permitted ever. I have said that more than once in this Chamber. [While Mr. SPEAKER was making this ruling several hon. members rose from their seats wanting to speak.] Hon. members are breaking the Rules of the House. Hon. members must sit.

Mr. LEWIS: I am drawing Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Hon. Minister is making a statement on something that has taken place in a debate; and when Your Honour asked if there was anybody who wanted to speak, he sat there and said nothing. We were criticising the Government and they sat quiet. I am warning you to accept a statement from at least seven members of this House. 8.10 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. senior member for St. Philip has made a very serious charge which, of necessity, if this Government were to remain silent about it—[Asides]

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members must remember that we are still in Parliament; hon. members must contain themselves.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to a point of Order. I feel that the Hon. Premier must, of necessity, get the leave of the House in order to make that Statement; and he must let us know the nature of the Statement which he is going to make. Otherwise it is in hon. members' minds that he is making a Statement after a debate, in a cowardly manner, on a question which has just been debated. If the Hon.

Premier will say what the nature of the Statement is, then that will be alright, but he must get permission to make the Statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order. Can the hon. member be permitted to make a Statement now when I have no right to reply to it? He is apparently all the members of the House; therefore I have no right here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any Minister can make a Statement at any time—

Mr. CRAWFORD: What Rule is that?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a Rule; it is just following ordinary procedure.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If that is the case, all a Minister has to do is to refuse to answer—

Mr. SPEAKER: More than one Minister has been given that opportunity since I have been Speaker of this House and since the operation of the Ministerial System. I have given more than one Minister that privilege already.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not after a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not matter when.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I should be the last person to flout Your Honour's ruling. [Laughter] Do not mind the hyenas about this Chamber. [A MEMBER: Do not be unparliamentary]. I have said do not mind the hyenas about this Chamber not in this Chamber. It is true to say that Your Honour has granted that right to Ministers since you have been Speaker of this House. However, what I am worried about is this: we were debating the Reply to His Excellency's Speech, and it seems to me to be unfair for the members of the Government to sit down and wait until everything has been said and then try to take advantage of Your Honour's position.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree with the hon. member.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Your Honour has already ruled that we have no chance of replying to the Statement. If there is no chance of our replying, why should hon. members of the Ministerial Bench not have taken the opportunity to reply and knock to shreds what the Opposition has said? But the Hon. Premier is taking advantage of the Opposition when he wants permission to make a Statement. A debate has taken place and he is about to take advantage of a man's position.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is not taking any advantage of anybody's position. It has always been the privilege of hon. members to give notice of a motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss any matter.

Mr. LEWIS: That will bring down a debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In a Democracy, all a Minister has to do is to keep quiet during a debate, and then when the debate is finished, claim the right to make a Statement! The Minister can reply to points made during the debate at a time when the persons who have made the points cannot reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the case; I do not know what the Statement is.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am making a Statement on Government policy, which it is my duty to make. As far as the Oceanographic Survey is concerned, the British Government has not put any obstruction in the way of it. If that is stated on the floor of this House, one can easily see the possible international complications. I have had some difficult work in dealing with this matter. [Mr. CRAWFORD: You do not know what you are talking]. I am making a Statement on which there cannot be any question of debate.

The Oceanographic Survey operations have been carried out as a result of Agreement between the

British and American Governments, which have taken place in other parts of the world as well. I think the last operations done were in the Bahamas and Bermuda. It is not right to suggest that the British Government is standing in the way of the United States Government; the British Government has given land to America, and it is utterly wrong to make the suggestion that either this Government or the British Government is in any way putting anything in the way of the United States Government.

The matter has come before this House, and exactly the reverse is true; the Attorney General and myself have drafted some things in which we are demanding more of the American Government than any other British Colony in which this Survey is taking place. Things have been asked of and told to America more strongly than this Legislature has said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not had notice of any such motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: A motion for the adjournment of the House can be made at any time—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always ruled that when the motion for the adjournment of the House is for a specific purpose, honourable members will always be given the courtesy of making such a motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Rule says that a motion for the adjournment of the House can be made any time after 2 o'clock; and then at the penultimate sitting of this House during the last session, the honourable junior member for the City, the honourable senior member for the City and myself moved three distinct motions for the adjournment of the House without previous notification given to the House, and discussed matters. The honourable senior member for the City raised the question about Pan American Airways landing here—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member did give me due notice of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not give any notice; I made the motion and proceeded to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sticking to the question of previous notice being given. Otherwise honourable members will get out of hand.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to submit two things. The first is, that it is unfair for a Statement to be made by the honourable senior member objecting to and categorically denying something which I have said, and I have no opportunity to reply to it—

Mr. SPEAKER: I tell the honourable member that he can give due notice of making the motion. I am now ruling that due notice must be given of his intention to make the motion.

8.20 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling, but I want to remind the House of this fact that throughout the entire life and history of this Honourable Chamber, members have been entitled to get up and make a motion for the adjournment of the House.

I want to remind the House that when the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who was then the junior member for St. Joseph had been downright rude and was named, the late Christopher Brathwaite made a motion for the adjournment of the House in order that the House might adjourn, and in the meantime tempers could be cooled; and were it not for that fact, the hon. member would have been read out before. But the House adjourned and on re-assembling the hon. member came back in and was still

rude. He was named. [A VOICE: That is different from this]

MR. SPEAKER: I am acting quite rightly on this occasion. I am not allowing that motion now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am giving notice now of my intention to move the adjournment of the House at its next meeting to discuss this matter.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the colony.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by HON. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 4

Salaries Commissioner

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$8,500. As hon. members will see from the Addendum the Government has proposed to appoint a Salary Commissioner. Actually, in a discussion with Colonial Office just before I returned from England, it has been found possible that a very good man can be got to come here in a short time, possibly by next month. We want therefore to be able to tell Colonial Office in passing on the offer, that the Legislature has given its approval.

Hon. members will see that the terms of reference of the Salaries Commissioner are as follows:—

“To enquire into the remuneration of all Public Officers and Government employees and to make recommendations for the remuneration of such officers and employees having regard to:—

- (i) the economy of the Island in relation to neighbouring territories;
- (ii) the need to retain and attract suitably qualified officers for appointment to senior professional and technical posts;
- (iii) the need to maintain an efficient, economical and contented Public Service;
- (iv) any other relevant considerations.”

Now, I was informed by Colonial Office that it is usual on such occasions (I suppose this has happened with Commissioner G. H. Adams, C.B.E.,) to pay for this type of work at £150 per month. It is generally assumed that it will take three to four months to do this survey. The person whom we have in mind has recently done two such surveys for other colonies. He may be able to reach here in about a month's time.

As regards subsistence allowance and passage expenses, they have been set out: those are the usual terms. We are saying in the Addendum that the survey will take five months, but we hope it will not take that time. Three to four months is the time which the Government thinks it will be done in. We want it to be understood that he will be carrying out an extensive survey; and to be on the safe side we are saying five months.

As regards the item “Incidentals,” there may be a certain amount of travelling for the Commissioner. Naturally, he will do most of his work in Bridgetown. This sum is put at \$1,500 to be on the safe side. I do assure hon. members that this is normal. If hon. members look it up, they will see that we had put Commissioner Adams at the same rate.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

8.30 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both hon. members must sit.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Lucy was on the floor.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it is needless to compliment you on following the established convention of the Mother of Parliament in that whosoever catches Your Honour's eye first, that member is permitted to speak. I am intrigued by the Addendum to this Resolution. We are informed, Sir, as to the reasons why this enquiry is to be made; and I say at once, Sir, that I favour such an enquiry and the fact that the passage expenses amount to \$1,600 is an indication that the person is not from Trinidad or a neighbouring British place; but, Sir, there are four reasons given in respect of the terms of reference.

Now, while it is true, Mr. Chairman, that No. 4 is comprehensive, it is also too vague. I feel there should be another specific term of reference, viz., having regard to No. 2, “the need to retain and attract suitably qualified officers for appointment to senior professional and technical posts; No. 3, the need to maintain an efficient, economical and contented Public Service.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that No. 4 should be the need to ensure that no one receives less than a reasonable living wage. In other words in making the recommendations to this Commissioner, we should consider not only the economy of the island, not only the need to attract and retain suitably qualified officers, not only an economical and contented Public Service, but also the need of the man at the bottom. To ensure in whatever recommendations are made in increase of salary, that the Commissioner is apprised of the view of the Legislature of the need to ensure nobody receives less than a reasonable living wage.

It is no use telling me it is contained in the general wide recommendation. I want it to be impressed on the Salaries Commissioner that we are concerned mostly with the person at the bottom; and to ensure that whatever recommendations he makes, he starts off by ensuring that the person at the bottom gets an increase to enable him to meet the increased cost of living and enable him to maintain himself and his family. If after we start from the bottom and go right up, and the economy of the island considering No. 1 term allows those right at the top to get something more, then of course no one will deny them the right to get something more; but we have to consider first the man and woman at the bottom of the scale, whom as we know today is not getting an adequate or proper living wage. They are saying they get these increases every year that it is expected to be an election year, and now that election is once in five years their increases are too few and too small.

Sir, it is as well to let the Salaries Commissioner know in advance that this House is very much aware and alive to the need to ensure that no public employee receives less than a reasonably adequate living wage, having regard to the cost of living in this island today; and although it is not specifically mentioned that is what is meant by term of reference No. 4 which speaks of relevant considerations.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I think this is my opportunity now, Sir, although I should consider

it tact and decency not to say certain things relative to several who are seeking after an opportunity. However, Sir, it is very commendable to see the Government at last has decided to go into the revision of the salary scales of all of its servants. What worries me, Sir, is that now we are on the threshold of Federation, we are finding ourselves looking so far afield to get a man to come here to tell us what a cantonnier should get as a living wage, or what an Accountant General deserves for the service he renders to the community. I feel it is unnecessary. I feel Sir, that the last time we went into these salaries, we did not go so far afield. We stopped at a neighbouring colony, and found a man who turned out to be more suitable to do the same thing for us, so that we saved considerable sums of money.

We are now proposing to sanction the bringing from England a man to do the same thing for which we can get a West Indian. If you did not agree to have someone from Barbados, it is not impossible for you get somebody equally as suitable from Trinidad or one of the other neighbouring colonies: I want to impress upon the Hon. Premier, how is it we are telling the world we are capable of sailing our ship in a Federal set-up, and everyday we preach that the West Indies produce capable and scholarly men, yet with a small scheme of revision of salaries and wages, we still have to go to England and bring somebody out here who would cost us considerably more than a man in the West Indies, with possibly equal ability or more, would cost us? That is all I have to say.

I agree and appreciate the decision of the Government to go into these salaries and wages, etc., but I think it is stupid, Mr. Chairman, for us to be going so far to bring a man to do so little, comparatively speaking, when we have men here and elsewhere in neighbouring colonies who are capable, quite capable of doing in connection with this revision. Before I sit, Sir, I hope that the Hon. Premier and his Ministers will impress that upon such a man; I do not know if he is directly coming from England; it is not possible for the Government to change its decision as regards where the man should come from.

The only thing that went wrong the last time we went into revision of salaries and wages, was that you appointed Civil Servants led by Mr. Turner, who saw fit to treat themselves more handsomely than the workers in the lower scale of Government. That is all that went wrong.

8.40 p.m.

When they said that they must get \$80 and \$100 more and the Key Scale workers and the Cantonniers must only get a penny more, that is all that went wrong. The mistake was not the incapability of the local men to go into the question of the revision of salaries and wages; the difficulty arose because of the fact that gross discrimination was practised as regards the senior employees in the Government Service and the junior employees at the various Departments. We need not go overseas in order to get these persons; we have a sufficient number of retired Accountants and Auditors. There are Civil Servants who are here on the retired list and they could be mixed with a couple of local persons whom we know are capable of going into these details. If they were used, it would not cost us these expensive passages. I am sure about that.

As a Socialist Government which would want to do justice to the most deserving people, they should start from the bottom and go up, not from the top and come down, in dealing with these increases. These increases, whatever they are going to be, are expected to be more in the interest of the most deserving of the Government employees, and that can only mean those employees who are

getting from \$10 to \$24 per week. I hope that I will not be presented with any scheme which makes provision for an increase of \$50, \$100 or \$200 per month for Heads of Departments and persons in that category. As a matter of fact, if I were the Government, having a view of the high cost of living and the unwillingness of such a Government to raise taxation unduly, which will fall hardest on people in the small income groups, I would say that I am only going into a revision of salaries and wages which will affect only the Scavenger and Long Grade Clerk. If I had to go any further, I would say that I would consider only those technical and specialist people whom we cannot get locally, and therefore we must make things attractive enough for them. I cannot see the economy of this Island permitting any handsome increases anywhere past the middle section of the Civil Service. We still have to guard against the building up of an autocratic system whereby certain Civil Servants must be cushioned and protected at the expense of thousands of unemployed individuals in this community and other persons who may be employed, but whose salaries and wages are considerably low.

What ever you give your Civil Servants, it is only that which is taken from the labourer who buys a yard of calico or a pint of milk. I want the Government to come here with a scheme which will meet the approval of the least Socialist minded of the general public. I do not want the Government to feel that people in the higher brackets of the Civil Service are really deserving of an increase as some of them have been trying to make out; whatever you do, you must consider the economy of the Island to carry such increases.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that this Resolution had always been expected, and the terms of reference of the Salaries Commission have been given. I am inclined to agree with bringing down some person who is disinterested and unbiassed, because such a person would do a much better job than if he were otherwise. It seems to me that it would be much better to bring down somebody with some experience to do this job. That is what I have to recommend to the Government if they will accept it.

This Commissioner is to enquire into the remuneration of all Public Officers and Government Employees and to make recommendations for the remuneration of such Officers and employees with regard to (1) the economy of the Island in relation to neighbouring territories. I can never agree with anybody who feels that because Trinidad can pay so much a year for their Chief Justice, therefore we would have to pay that amount, or we could not get that type of person. Paragraph (2) of the terms of reference says this: "The need to retain and attract suitably qualified Officers for appointment to senior professional and technical posts."

I think that when this Commissioner comes out here, one thing which it is absolutely necessary to regard is this: if you went through your Civil Service, you will find that there are young men with natural ability, educational qualification and a flair in a particular line, but no attempt has been made in Barbados to try and get these youngsters trained in a scheme which will benefit this Island. I do not know whose fault that is, but that training has been denied our young men. The few who had friends at Court, and the few who could pull strings would get sent out.

8.50 p.m.

A tremendous lot of youngsters with the ability have not been given the opportunity. If you are giving a salary in relation to the neigh-

bouring colonies you can never attract a man for your service; therefore, that must be borne very carefully in mind.

No. (iii) of the terms of reference refers to the need to maintain an efficient, economical and contented Public Service. I can see your willingness of trying to maintain an efficient and economical Public Service but I would rather love to see your maintaining a contented Public Service. That is going to be our difficulty. I am sure when you finish you are going to have some discontentment.

No. (iv) refers to any other relevant considerations.

Now, Sir, of the four terms of reference, No. 1 is very important and all of them must be in relation to the cost of living of the community. It must not only be in relation to attracting and retaining suitably qualified officers, it must be in relation to the cost of living of this colony.

Sir, I have no further comment to make to the Government. I agree that someone outside of the West Indian territory would be more suitable. That is based on my recollection of past experience. There is something which I would like the Hon. Premier to bear in mind: it is very difficult although an Englishman might come out to the colonies with an unbiassed view on matters, for him to retain it. Speaking in broad terms, before this Commissioner comes out here, he must have facts and figures of what prevail in the neighbouring colonies.

So often we find out that when an Englishman comes here and gets into contact with two or four members of the Civil Service of a certain type, they cause him to make up his mind a certain way. I am wondering if it would not be better now that you are going to have a single commissioner to carry out this survey, to include on the Commission one or two representatives recommended by the Civil Service Association so as to avoid the difficulty of the Commissioner from England coming here and being biased.

As I have said it is better that he should come from England than from the West Indies. Why I say so is because you may select a type of person to work with him which might cause him to make up his mind, say, that when it comes to the salary of a local man to say that such and such a salary is all that he can recommend for the local man in the top grade, and as a result cause that salary to be the standard. It is for that reason I am wondering if it would not be wise for the Government rather than to have a one-man commission, to have two or three members. After all, the final decision still rests with the Government.

I am therefore suggesting when this Commissioner comes out from England that the Civil Service Association should be given the opportunity to make recommendations of two persons to serve as its representatives on the commission. That does not mean that those representatives will have to be members from the inside of the Civil Service. The Civil Service Association might have retired members of the Civil Service, (not necessary Barbadians) whom they would like to appoint on a Commission of this sort; so that you might have a more evenly balanced commission. I therefore throw that out to the Government.

As I have said, not only is there the need to maintain an efficient and economical Public Service but you should do everything possible to have a more contented Public Service. If you follow my suggestion, you will be giving the opportunity to the Civil Service Association not only to say something as regards the increase of certain posts, but the Associa-

tion will be able to say that it had the opportunity of putting two representatives on the Commission.

I observe from the Addendum that the fees to the Salaries Commissioner is at the rate of \$720 per month. Then the subsistence allowance is at the rate of \$12 per day. The Hon. Premier said that that is the usual Colonial Office allowance. That seems to me parsimonious. [A VOICE: What are you talking?] It is parsimonious, but I am thinking that the amount of \$1,500 for incidentals is too much. The Hon. Premier said that the Commissioner will have to do some travelling.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: No, no, it is not for travelling alone; it is for stationery and transport.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr Chairman. I give this Resolution my blessing. I hope the Government will give consideration to my suggestion of giving the Civil Service Association the opportunity of nominating two of its members to serve on this commission. It will be of greater grace and I am sure the Civil Service will appreciate the opportunity. As the hon. senior member for St. John has said, it is the people in the lower bracket of the service to whom must be given greater consideration. You see they have the suspicion that you will be dealing with salaries of those in higher positions.

Mr. Chairman, I think at this stage you should report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. I am therefore moving that motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you seconding the motion?

9.00 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going to second the motion for adjournment. Before I do that, Sir, I want to say that I regard this Resolution as a waste of money. The Civil Servants have an Association; we have Ministerial Government which we are told is the best Constitution in the Empire. I do not care who you bring here to make this report, their recommendations have to be gone into by the Executive. The Ministry is going to spend weeks going through them, and in any case what they want will be the figures acted upon. In other words, if they do not agree with the Salaries Commissioner, they are going to revise these salaries and the money could be spent to increase the salaries of people who most deserve it.

Do you want to tell me that in a small colony with less than a thousand public servants you want to spend \$8,500 to bring an Englishman down here to say what increase they should get; then for the Minister of Finance to say we are going to spend so much money, and you have to make your recommendations fit into the amount of money you are going to spend? That is all they always do. Juke did it once, then you had Dos Santos; then Turner went into the salaries of certain officers; but they are putting the responsibility on somebody else knowing full well in the final analysis what they want to do they will do.

In so far as the estimated expense is concerned, if the Commissioner comes in June and spends five months, it will mean we will get the Report in November; and by the time the Executive goes into it and plays the fool and so on, it will be the end of the year. They are trying to fool the public that they did not intend to give the people this money before the end of the year.

Everybody knows this is an election stunt. The people could have had the money last year, but it has been kept back until election year; so why say 150 days from June and five months to prepare the Report and everything. But I do say the people will not get the money before election.

As a matter of fact, even after election they will get it. All things considered, it is an absolute waste of good hard cash to bring somebody down here.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, anybody who speaks now must necessarily speak on reporting progress. I am asking whether you are going to put the question, or whether the motion is going to be withdrawn and let us get ahead with debating the Resolution. Anyhow Sir, if you are willing to allow debate, I have one or two things to say.

As I see it, this is an election stunt, so a lot of members will want to speak. There is no note in the Estimates as to how much they are going to spend. The next thing, Sir, is after all, if you are merely getting somebody out to say what increase you can give, he is going to make his recommendations in relation to other places. If they are going to do that, the Government might pay salaries similar to those at least paid in British Guiana.

We are only going into salaries. It is a very dangerous thing to tell anybody that you will wait on them for five months for this type of report. It is unnecessary. This should have been got ready to put in the hands of the Commissioner when he comes, and we have no right to wait until he comes to do this. Not only that, I thought that he would take the opportunity—[A VOICE: Put the question.] You hear that, Sir, they do not want to learn any sense at all.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to enquire into the structure and organisation of our Civil Establishment; that is what we want, and you have not got that here. If you are going into it, then you should quote it in the terms of reference. It is a dangerous thing to tell this man that you will wait for five months for the Report. It will take that long if you make it a matter of election business. And mind you, he is not telling you whether you have too many in this Department and

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but let him read reference No. 3.

Mr. LEWIS: So long as you have efficient people. . . .

Well, Sir, if that is how they read that, what do you expect.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I have to take the directly opposite views to the one taken by my colleagues. I am sorry to see that whenever money is voted to bring anybody here, he becomes excited. I prefer an Englishman to come here and investigate the salaries than any West Indian. The West Indian has an outlook of a limited life for a person of a certain class; and I know that any West Indian recommending a raise in salaries for the lower brackets of the service is sure to recommend too small a raise.

The Englishman has a bigger outlook. Where wages for the unestablished staff are concerned, we have the experience here with English people coming here and paying \$30 a week to their servants, while our people tell them they are mad. [A VOICE: Stop all that nonsense.] That is a fact. I saw families come here to pay big salaries, and our people prevented them. [A VOICE: Name one of the English families.] So the idea of not getting an Englishman is the wrong idea. Let a stranger come and investigate; that is a sure ground on which we can raise proper salaries of any West Indians about here.
9.10 p.m.

Mr. BRYAN: I want to take this opportunity of making an appeal to the Government on the behalf of the Pensioners. Clause 4 of the terms of

reference of this Salaries Commissioner says this: "Any other relevant considerations." I once gave notice of a question asking that some consideration be given to these Government Pensioners. The Government seems to experience some difficulty in deciding where Pensioners should begin, but subsequently an addition was made to the Cost of Living Allowance of these Pensioners. If you will look through the scale, Mr. Chairman, you will see that there are some Pensioners who are at a ridiculously low figure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member stick to the Resolution. [Laughter]

Mr. BRYAN: Clause 4 of the terms of reference of the Commissioner says this: "Any other relevant considerations."

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

Mr. GODDARD: On the last occasion when we had the revision of salaries and wages, the most surprising thing to me was that they left hanging in the air, a doubt as to whether a Cost of Living Allowance should be paid or not. I am hoping that this Commissioner will consolidate all Cost of Living Allowances in the basic salaries and wages; let that be established and bring salaries and wages up to date. The Cost of Living Allowances which are being paid today were in existence before the then Commissioner made his recommendations, and those Allowances were still added to the basic salaries and wages. I think that the Cost of Living has been increasing, and it shows no signs whatever of coming down; for that reason the Cost of Living allowances should be consolidated at the time when the Commissioner makes recommendations.

The Government has not stated when it is their intention to implement the Report of the Commissioner; are they prepared tonight to say when the Report will be implemented? [Hon. M. E. COX: As soon as possible]. I do hope that the Commissioner will bring things up to date and that all existing Cost of Living Allowances will be consolidated into the true Cost of Living at the time when he makes his recommendations.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply, was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 22nd May, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 22nd May, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd May, 1956.

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

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. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have the honour to lay the Annual Report of the Barbados Regiment for the year 1954-55.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have the honour to lay a statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 29th February, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Exportation (Drawback of Duties on Cylinders containing Locally Manufactured Gases) Regulations, 1955."

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to

supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57 No. 5 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Bill:—

Bill to exempt the Bellairs Investment Trust Limited from the payment in income tax in respect of the year of assessment 1955.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr Speaker I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider this Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:—

Whether Government has given consideration to the following question submitted by me during the last Session:—

1. Is the Government aware that a Petition was forwarded in December, 1952 and again sometime later this year to the Secretariat from certain Government Pensioners, praying that Government take the necessary steps with a view of effecting an increase of their pensions?

2. In view of the apparent present high cost of living and the meagreness of the amount of their pensions, will Government take the necessary action to provide for a reasonable increase to these pensioners?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to exempt the Bellairs Investment Trust Limited from the payment of income tax in respect of the year of assessment 1955, be now read a first time.

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

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 12

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to move the passing of the following Resolution:— Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1956."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve Order No. 12, the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment), 1956, which provides for the replacement to the Post of Manager of the Laundry at the General Hospital. As the honourable member on my left (The Minister of Social Services) knows more about it, I will merely move it while he can second it and explain it further to the House. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Order, the facts are these. The gentleman who occupied the Post at the General Hospital for some time has since been appointed to the Post of Works Manager as set out here. In the first instance, it is true that a similar Order came to this House not very long ago and was passed; but at that time, we did not know the facts because they were not explained.

The facts are, he was sent to Trinidad to observe the working of the Laundry there; and he is now to take charge of the Laundry and the staff of the Laundry, in addition to the post which he held formerly of Clerk of Works. Sir, he is also General Store Keeper at the General Hospital.

Formerly, the stores were sent out from two or three different places, but they are now placed in one building under his charge. He has more work to do. And as I said in the first instance, all of these other duties were not explained to us. In the former case in the Order which was passed by this House, I think he got only about \$10 or \$12 raise. Only after it was brought to our notice, we thought that in his own interest and the interest of the General Hospital, we should change the title and grade his salary accordingly. These are the facts as set out.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to know that the Government has taken steps to correct the error. It is very distressing to think that a Civil Establishment Order can go through the process which one would expect it to go through, and the Hon. Minister not knowing the facts of the case. That is a very serious thing to admit.

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 13

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also 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) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1956."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Resolution is to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1956." This Order provides for the re-establishment of the Post of Laboratory Attendant in the Scale (\$480-816) for the Health Centre, St. Michael, and also for the creation of other Posts. As in the case of the last Resolution, I will ask the Hon. Minister of Social Services to make the necessary explanation. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that. First of all, with regard to this Post of Laboratory Attendant, it was thought at first that we would have been able to do without this Post at the Health Centre, St. Michael. As a matter of fact, earlier this year, during the consideration of the Estimates, this Post was deleted. However, what has subsequently happened is there is such a vast amount of work at the "Enmore" Health Centre since it has been established, that we have to come back to this

House and get this Post re-established. It was thought that a Messenger could have helped out in this case, but it is impossible for a Messenger to perform the work of this Laboratory Attendant.

There is also the question of the Medical Officer of Health. It is necessary to establish this Post for the Health Centre which it is proposed to construct at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip; and there will also be a Senior Health Nurse and three Junior Health Nurses. It will be remembered that during the consideration of the Estimates, these Posts were moved in the Estimates, and it was stated that we would come back with the Establishment Order later on. This is the Order which seeks to establish these Posts at the St. Philip Health Centre when it is built.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw the Hon. Minister's attention to the fact that these Posts are usually put down in the singular. This Order seems to have been drawn up a little different from the others; you have one Medical Officer of Health, one Senior Health Nurse, and three Junior Health Nurses. So far as I remember, these Posts are usually put down in the singular with the Establishment number outside; the name of the Post and the Salary are usually put down and the number of people you appoint is put somewhere else, so that all you need to do is to change the number or reduce the number if you want to alter it. Perhaps the Hon. Minister can explain why these Posts are put down in this manner on this occasion. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me whether this is going to be the form in these matters in future or not.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In the file which I have before me, these Posts appear in this way: "Junior Health Nurses, R.S.I., 3."

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 14

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also 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) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1956."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1956." The Order provides for the creation of certain Posts for the Technical Institute; I do not think it is necessary for me to remind hon. members that we have gone through every line in respect of the Technical Institute already. We are making provision for the following Posts as set out in the Addendum to the Resolution:

1 Senior Technical Teacher	\$2,160—3,840
1 Junior Technical Teacher	1,296—2,280
1 Secretary	888—2,160
1 Messenger	480—816

It is expected that teaching at the Technical Institute will commence on an expanded scale during the current year and that it will not be very long before the Institute is catering for a maximum of 500 students a week. The success of technical education in Barbados will depend a great deal upon the quality of the teaching staff of the Technical Institute.

It is proposed that the remaining technical staff should be comprised of four competent and experienced Technical Instructors and the assistance of the Crown Agents is being invoked in obtaining the services of persons with the requisite qualifications. As soon as the terms and conditions of service on

which these Technical Instructors can be obtained have been settled satisfactorily a Resolution will be submitted to the Legislature for the provision of the necessary funds.

The subjects which it is proposed to teach at the Technical Institute include mechanical and electrical engineering, woodwork, building construction and automobile mechanics.

3.35 p.m.

Government, for instance, has been asking the Colonial Office and the Crown Agents to get persons of the sort recommended both by the Acting Head of the Institute and by the Board, which technically speaking, has now become the Governing Body of the Institute. We cannot get any promise of anybody taking these posts at the salary which we had intended to put in this Establishment Order. We have been instructed that we cannot get anybody at a salary less than £1,200 a year. The Colonial Office and Crown Agents recently have informed us that with the courses and the subjects approved by this Legislature, they would try at all costs to get somebody on contract.

We have decided that we will get somebody in any event on contract, because the Salaries Commissioner is coming out here soon. If we put a salary of £1,200 down for these posts, we will be starting before the Salaries Commissioner has begun his work. In effect, we will be saying that this is the salary scale in which those persons shall be placed, and then you will hear the masters at Harrison College and the other Schools saying that they are getting considerably less than these Technical Instructors; therefore, the Government has come to inform the House what is the position in its establishing these posts.

As I have said, we have been trying to get these instructors before this Order was made. Now, we have reached the stage where it seems quite impossible to get anybody in the £750, £900 or even £1,000 class; therefore, we have had to tell the Crown Agents to get the person on contract and we will in the meanwhile establish the other posts. I do not think any hon. member would object to this knowing how absolutely essential it is to get the Technical Institute working immediately. We have promises from persons associated with the Institute including local people who were trained as engineers in England and Scotland.

We hope that the possibility of persuading somebody or getting somebody to come out for the next three years at least will materialise. We are asking the Crown Agents to do the best they can for us as regards the top posts. As I have said, we hope to start in September. We have only two of the senior officers. Until we can get more, it has been considered advisable that we should begin with them.

I have some figures here which show a salary of \$4,800 rising to \$5,760 for the acting Principal on contract. If there is any information that hon. members want that they do not possess, or found means of possessing I will give it to them. Frankly, I do hope no hon. member would ask me anything when it comes to the Bill or Regulations. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the Hon. Premier say that it is most important that we do get on with the technical training of our boys. This Resolution is of such a nature, he admits that there are limitations in recruiting suitable staff for these posts. That has been made very clear to us by the Principal or Head of the Evening Institute. He has told us that technical training is a most expensive training. We all know that every

country today is paying special attention to technical training. Very recently, Great Britain has added tremendously to its salary scales of that section of its educational scheme. It has been giving very large grants to its public schools to undertake this sort of training in its educational system. We must get this thing done. It is expensive, but it is important that we recruit our best brains from our best schools to form the basis of instruction for the pupils. Do not let us think that we are just going to train carpenters and masons; we want the top notch as well.

I am glad to see that the Education Department has made a beginning by approaching the Governing Body of Harrison College to see their attitude towards the adoption of technical training as part of the School's curriculum. I had a talk with a member of the Governing Body and he emphasised the importance and the expense of technical training. What I want to ask the Hon. Premier is, if he has given thought to that memorandum presented to the Education Department by the Governing Body of Harrison College, and if he is aware that if Harrison College adopts technical training as part of its curriculum, it would mean that they would have to get more buildings at the school; they would have to provide four more class-rooms and four more masters. It would be cheaper in the long run to have the boys of Harrison College or Lodge School trained at the Technical Institute than to have boys elsewhere, because boys from those two schools have the foundation of their science class and their higher mathematical teaching class which are already established in their schools. As I have said, it will call for more buildings, more class-rooms and more teachers if those schools are to adopt technical training as part of their curriculum.

3.45 p.m.

When I see that they envisage as many as five hundred people in the near future, I am really amazed at that, because I do not know who is going to teach them. I do not think the Staff at the Technical Institute is so large as yet. I do not know how many they have there, but this training is personal training; and five hundred is a very large number to envisage in the next couple of years. But what I wish Government to understand and realise, is that this is a very worthwhile beginning. Let them understand you have to have top-notch teachers, who are in great demand throughout the world; and they are asking for large salaries. This scale will not attract anyone at all. This is only something put down on paper, but it looks as though you will have to have somebody recruited to make a beginning.

Once you are aware of that, you are going to waste the time of the men you appoint here. Unless you give the assistance he needs, he is going to be frustrated, put up his back and leave. It is important, and I am glad to note that you hope to get it started this September.

I would like to know what decision your Department has made on the memorandum from Harrison College towards the introduction of technical training at Harrison College; whether you have accepted it, or if you feel it should be modified. Do not let us go into it unless you are prepared to give the minimum that they have asked for, including more class rooms and more teachers at Harrison College too.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to compliment the Government for recognising the great need of technical training in this island today. But I would like to suggest to the Hon. Premier that he should give some consideration to include aeronautical training in this Institute. Air dynamics is one of the greatest needs of the hour. I

am sure every developed country of the world can use men with a knowledge of aeroplane construction and maintenance.

I hope that the Hon. Premier (along with the other subjects — electrical engineering, building construction and automobile mechanics) — will consider including in the curriculum of this Institution, air dynamics so as to acquaint the young boys who would like to engage in that field of engineering development.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I sympathise with the Government for the difficulty they will find themselves in, in staffing an institution like this; but I am wondering whether an appeal has been made to any International Organisation that might be able to render assistance. Is there any organisation connected with your dealings inside the United Nations that can assist us in getting someone to technically train the young people of the island? At present if we had technically trained people, they would be going in greater numbers to the United Kingdom and as long as that avenue of emigration keeps up, we would be training them not for our own service but for theirs. I am wondering whether the matter has been put to them in that light and whether some one could not assist us; standing some of the expense, I mean.

I know of the proposed Colombo Plan for the West Indies and all that; but I do not know if it bears any relation to your point one, two, three or four programme to be worked into this scheme. I think with the training of our technicians and our unskilled labour emigrating elsewhere, some of these places should come to our assistance and should send somebody here for a short while and assist with the expense. I wonder if they could not come to our assistance for three or five years. I am sure with this training, our young people would catch on very quickly; and after a number of years training, I am sure one or two of them would be able to assist others coming on. Probably, it would not take so long, and I wonder if that avenue has been explored in getting someone to assist.

I notice here, Sir, that it said, or the hon. junior member for Christ Church is of the opinion, that they will have five hundred students, but I notice that it says five hundred a week. I do not know exactly what that means. I will be glad if I can get some enlightenment. I do not know if it means the same people coming back for the same instruction every day or in the number of classes they will hold; but I would like that explained. When I read it, I did not know whether they would have five hundred enrolled at once or fifty people coming back ten times or anything like that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: To answer the hon. member's last point first, I would say 500 a week is as far as I remember, quite conceivable, but some of the same people might be coming back. With regard to international agencies, I have tried that. There was a possibility of giving a scholarship, (the least we could do) to somebody here to go abroad under the Technical Assistance Schemes of the United Nations, and for him to specialise on the ability to spot children who would profit from technical education; but we have not reached that stage yet. Although I did pursue it, I have not given up seeking the possibilities of getting a Technical Instructor and saving at least the money for these posts. We have gone into it but so far not with any particularly rosy prospects.

As regards the point made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I have not studied the Harrison College Memorandum, but it is clear that some of it must be amended, because what was put up by the Governing Body is too costly at present. It

is a very good idea. I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church; and I hope I understand him to say so, because it came as a surprise that the hon. member feels it would be cheaper to have technical training at the Technical Institute. The preliminary training would be done at Harrison College; I think I can promise him that, although it has not yet been discussed with the Governing Body of Harrison College or with the Director of Education or the Governors of the Governing Body of the Evening Institute or Harrison College.

It looks to me as if some addition will have to be made; but it is very difficult to agree that with our present commitments and all that Harrison College has put up to us, I hope I do not weary hon. members by constantly reminding them that outside the Five Year Plan every cent we spend we have to look for; it does not come from C.D. & W. The new Hospital was not provided for; the new class rooms at Harrison College were not provided for; the Salaries' Revision was not provided for; but with the suggestion of these things, we had to consider how far we could go in doing the things the Harrison College Governing Body would like us to do, and all that we would like to do. But I do assure the hon. member for Christ Church it will be considered in the plans we are making for achievements at Harrison College.

3.55 p.m.

I hope I will not hear anything unnecessarily controversial when I say that I wish to congratulate everybody concerned; (it may be parents, teachers or Governing Body) on the change which has taken place at Harrison College. In my time to have Boy Scouts at Harrison College was *infra dig.* I am glad to see that I have lived long enough to see that we could have the beginning of Technical Education we should now be embarking on a system of Technical at so exalted a place as Harrison College.

Mr. BARROW: The demands of industry in Barbados at the present day are supplied chiefly by the grades of apprenticeship system, and there is some confusion between the apprenticeship system practised by private enterprise and the turning out of people under the Government Bursary system. The only provision which this Government makes for the training of persons along technical lines is by the Bursary system, which is very loose and disjointed at the present moment. When we therefore embark on a scheme of Technical Education, in my opinion we should first examine the industrial climate in which that Technical Education is expected to flourish. I very much regret to say that the whole rationale of the system of Technical Education today can only be further to broaden the stream of emigration at the present moment going out from this Colony; and by so broadening the stream of emigration, we are imposing a further social and financial lost on the already strained resources of our native land.

The reason why I speak along these lines must be obvious to you, Sir. No outcry has been made by the Chamber of Commerce, no clamour has emanated from the factory owners of this Island that there is an insufficiency suitably trained personnel to carry on the limited technical task which confronts the industries of this Island today. No such clamour has come, because the supply of intelligent boys and young men, and indeed, of trained unemployed artisans, is more than sufficient to meet the demands which industry imposes upon that supply. Therefore, unlike my learned friend on my right, the hon. junior member for St. Philip, I would not believe in Technical Education for the sake of Technical Education; although the true and proper meaning of the "Technical Education" is really an education in the arts. What they really mean by "Technical Edu-

education" in this context, is more in the nature of manual instruction than Technical Education. It is entirely consistent not only with the attitude of the present Government of Barbados, but with the outlook of all the people who have, so far, presided over the destinies of the unfortunate people of this Island, that in 1956, when the world is witnessing a new technological innovation in the form of automation, when the skill of the craftsman is going to be broken down into a series of unskilled manipulations, that we should now be embarking on a system of Technical Education which, by the present trend of events, is as outmoded as the method once used by the Cotton Spinning Industry. I need not remind you, Sir, that the displacement of technical workers by the new process of electronic automation is a matter which is giving concern to Governments today, and to the persons who are not employed in the manufacture of machine tools and other commodities in industrial countries.

In the whole of the British Empire, I mean the British Colonial Empire, there are 500 qualified engineers. That is a remarkable circumstance. The British Universities are turning out qualified engineers at the rate of only 5,200 per annum. Some time last year, the Ministry of Supply, I speak under correction, I think it was the Board of Trade who examined 81 qualified engineers for posts as Inspectors, and only 43 took their jobs; the other fifty per cent could get better terms and conditions in private industries as Inspectors than from technical posts in the British Civil Service. There is a large number of unfilled vacancies in the Ministry of Supply, and the British Transport Commission is short of 500 persons of similar calibre to the ones whom we seek now to enlist as an advancement in the Technical School in Barbados.

4.05 p.m.

Looking at the Addendum to this Resolution and at the Resolution itself, I see we propose to employ one senior technical teacher at a salary of \$2,160 rising to \$3,840, which is £900 a year as maximum salary. Sir, I can predict without any fear that the only kind of teacher that you will be able to get at a salary of \$3,840, will be somebody who cannot find a job because of his unsuitability in the United Kingdom. You can only get a boss carpenter or foreman engineer at that salary; and if your aim is to produce persons when the Industrial Revolution hits Barbados to work lathes, operate electronic devices and matters of that kind, plus all the technical operations involved in this machine age in the manufacture of commodities, then you will need someone who has an engineering degree to supervise the running of this Institute.

There are engineers in Barbados today working in sugar factories who have not had secondary education, but who are very good at their jobs; (I would not like to deny that at the first moment) who would be completely unfit and untrained in imparting theoretical knowledge to five students, far less five hundred students, and they get more than \$3,840 a year. I repeat, they are engineers working in factories today with no theoretical knowledge, (much practical knowledge perhaps) — who make good machine minders, who may be able to teach students a lot by watching the way they handle their machinery, but who would not be able to impart theoretical or specialised knowledge of any kind, the kind which we are now seeking to impart to youngsters, but who are getting salaries better than the salaries which we intend to pay to the senior technical teachers of this Institute. Therefore, if in Barbados the salary range is completely unrealistic, and if we are seeking to recruit qualified,

experienced teachers from abroad, we will have to pay much better salaries than those proposed in the Addendum to this Resolution, because the British Transport Commission is paying much better salaries than those. So too is the Board of Trade; and the Royal Patent Office; and those places are still 50% short of their technical personnel.

If I may revert to my original premise, and that was to restate that the problem was even if we trained the people, we do not have the jobs for them; and if we do not have the jobs, we cannot prevent them from going overseas which though laudable involves a tremendous social and financial loss to this community. Why should we spend all our primary, secondary and technical education on a young man who is not to plough back the investment which both his parents and the country have spent in his upbringing in this country, but who is going to enrich the fields of already highly industrialised countries with his talent. I am saying that that is a drain on our resources which we would not be able to sustain for much longer; and we should therefore not arrest the process of technical education at present. I am not advocating that, but we should have long ago done something about creating the jobs which these graduates would be able to choose when they become qualified.

I am wondering if it would not be cheaper for us to embark upon some joint scheme with British Industry or the British Government on training for the present time, since there is a shortage of teaching persons for training personnel or youngsters in England, and to let our youngsters go straight into jobs in England after they are trained where they would get the theoretical practical and everything else which would be necessary to turn out a good craftsman.

At the end of the last War, a British Institution offered courses in technical training, (one of twenty six weeks duration, and the other of fifty two weeks duration) and 4,000 West Indians took advantage of these courses. They were trained at a certain Government Training Centre and at other Government training establishments which had been set up. The majority of these West Indian students returned to the West Indies after they were trained, because the demand for labour of that particular type in British industry was not very much, owing to the fact that a lot of factories in England had not been rebuilt and the whole of the British Engineering trade had to be re-equipped and re-tooled in order to meet the export market. I believe that is one of the underlying causes of the present exodus of qualified West Indians from their native shores. When these ex-servicemen returned home, the people in their country did not have any jobs for them. That is a fact which cannot be denied or controverted by any one who have lived in the West Indies within the last ten years.

4.15 p.m.

Four thousand trained West Indians, trained not at the expense of the Barbados, Trinidad or Jamaican Government but at the expense of the Ministry of Labour in the United Kingdom, not 5% of them, Sir, who did not have a job before was given a chance to get a new job in the West Indies, because the Governments of the West Indies had not been thinking ahead. They had not created those opportunities for remunerative employment which they should have provided for the youth of their countries.

Now, the first job therefore, is to provide jobs for people. Then we will be able to tell the industrialists when they come in, how many people you are able to take in your plant this year or for the

next three to five years. If you do not do that, Sir, I am not laying the fault at your door; but I am saying that any West Indian Government which does not do that is merely throwing money away; and spending money to educate young men and women for other countries to benefit from their skills, because the moment a boy walks out of a technical school he wants a job. Today he is not prepared to sit down for ten years to get a job, or until Government wakes up one of these days and create the opportunity for remunerative employment he is seeking. Today, I make bold to say that there is no young man with a technical education who is prepared to wait longer than a month, before he gets on a boat and departs from these shores in search of a job. The time has passed when any Government can fool the young people of this country that God intends them to be unemployed for the rest of their lives, and that there is no point trying to seek work because unemployment is the normal state of things because they know better.

The time has passed when you can tell young men or women that England is a cold place and Barristers and Doctors and engineers when they graduate, should get back home to these balmy shores; balmy in the sense that they have balmy Governments. There is nothing balmy about the prospects of unemployment. That is the situation that is confronting not only the graduate; but the young men and women in every one of our secondary schools to-day.

Government is the largest industry in the West Indies. Government is getting larger and larger; manufacturing processes in relation to the total volume of income in the country is becoming smaller and smaller; our export trade is dwindling, and we can only be thankful that we still have a guaranteed market for our sugar. But Government is the major industry. The directorship of that major industry is becoming a major industry of politicians by attracting the biggest industry in the West Indies; and now there are attaching bathrooms to their offices; things which no director in any firm under private enterprise would have the effrontery to impose upon the shareholders of his company.

I notice a drive is being made by a member for Ipswich and other members of the House of Commons to air-condition all Government buildings in the Colonial Empire. I need say no more than that; if they have an air-conditioning plant themselves, then in the next Estimates we will see something about air-conditioning for Government Offices. It is true we generate a little more heat than light in here, but I certainly think charity begins at home; and if such is to be the natural order of things, I hope it starts right here in this Chamber. Perhaps I am dilating or going off at a tangent and I will return to my major point.

If the Officer administering the Government of this island can come next year and say we can have five hundred students a week passing through the portals of our institute, it is not good enough. I am serving this as a warning in advance. I would like to know how many big jobs in the West Indies we are going to find for these students, and how many you are going to see passing through the warehouse and getting on a boat and going to parts of England thereby involving a tremendous social and financial loss on the resources of this country. I wonder if they cannot see it.

I wonder if the whole economy of the Colonial territories is going to be a place not of producing raw materials, but of becoming a training ground at the expense of the parents and taxpayers of the colonial territories of technical machine minders for the era

of automation in the imperialists countries. I have said in this Chamber before when the Minister of Labour, whom God preserves (I notice he is no longer in his place) in this present Chamber, stated that one of his findings was although there was a large number of vacancies for skilled personnel, (and by skilled I presume he means trained personnel) there was not such a large demand for unskilled labour; and I pointed out to him then, (and that must have been well over a year or at least a year ago) that in industrial countries, skill was merely a question of time. It was merely a question of the time factor involved, because to-day everything is broken down into several compartmental manufacturing processes. Everything has become specialised and departmental; and in the final analysis every technician is a machine minder. But I was speaking then before the era of automation, which has burst upon the world at electronic speed within the last six months; in which skill is broken down into even more a series of unskilled jobs and more machine minding than there was in 1955. Well, Sir, this is a question merely of the time factor involved. The maximum period for training a man to work in a factory must be somewhere between six and nine months.

I notice in the Addendum they say they are catering for a maximum of five hundred students a week. The honourable junior member for the City has asked for enlightenment on that score, and he has not been enlightened up to now. If it is merely a question of the time factor, and that element of time is now so relative that it is being compressed even more and more due to the terrific demands made by industry, it is all the more incumbent on this Government not to waste anymore time in providing the jobs for the persons whom we are turning out of the technical institute where they will take a year or nine months, which I say at the present moment under the given conditions would be the normal time for any of the trades which are mentioned in the Addendum.

It is no longer a question, Mr. Speaker, of apprenticing a young boy to a master craftsman and not having the problem of providing a job for him seven years from now. It is different from the cathedrals which used to take one hundred years to build; because apprentices took seven or eight years to train, and then they only got half way through before they had to train other apprentices to carry on the elaborate work at that time which was typical of the architecture of those days. Those days are passed. We do not have seven years now to wait before you have to think about providing a job and paying a decent salary to the people you are training.

4.25 p.m.

Time is the essence of technical training to-day. As I said before, the period of technical training is necessarily being contracted into a very short one now; firstly, because of the tremendous demand for technical labour outside of Barbados, and secondly, because the automatic process which is now being employed in industry makes it possible to train students to carry out all that is expected of them in a short period of time. Training to-day is necessarily short for those reasons which I have advanced.

Now they are going to consult the Crown Agents for the Colonies. I must write a letter to the Minister of Production, another letter to the Board of Trade and a third letter to Her Majesty's Patent Office and tell them "Let down your buckets." Here in one office, there is a 50% shortage of technical personnel, in another, there is a 30% shortage and in the third office you cannot get them at all; and you have the wonderful Crown Agents for the Colonies next door to the Houses of Parliament, next door to your offices; and these people are able to wave a wand and perform

all sorts of miracles ! All the Crown Agents can do is to point out that there are only 500 qualified engineers in the Colonial Empire, because when West Indians and Africans and other people are able to do engineering, they cannot get jobs in their own Colonies. This Government seems to think that the term "Crown Agents for the Colonies" is a shibboleth and formula which will remind honourable members in this Chamber that there is a problem. All you have to do is to see that the Crown Agents are not looking after themselves because when they are finished looking after themselves, the taxpayers of this Colony will be suffering.

If they are able to get anybody in the bracket from \$2,160 to \$3,840 per annum as a Senior Technical Teacher, you can bet your bottom dollar that that person is being foisted upon by the Crown Agents; one who was shovelling coal in the incinerator in the Crown Agents' Offices, and they will send him here as a Teacher. It is either that he has got to the retiring age or he has Tuberculosis and he wants desperately to escape the rigours of the British climate; it is either that he has retired and is only qualified to stoke the furnace in the office of the House of Commons or that of the Crown Agents for the Colonies. At this salary, that is the type of person which you will get; I say that with some assurance because that is the type of people whom we have been getting.

With the situation as it is in England to-day, especially in the engineering fields, the wood work and building construction, I say that a man who shows such a love for educating the people of Barbados to come out here at this salary, will be a man who has a love far surpassing all human understanding. If I were an engineer qualified and had a job at £700 a year outside, I would not come out here, with Income Tax as high as it is, for £800 a year. Therefore, we have to watch with caution the type of person which the Crown Agents will foist upon us at that salary.

I would like to refer the Hon. Minister of Trade to the debate which took place in the House of Commons on the 21st July, 1955, and if he has any doubt at all as to the validity of the statements which I have been making, before he gets up and commits himself, as he usually does, and makes some rash statements, let him check up on that debate. I am an authority for West Indians because I have seen the particular trade establishments; those establishments are still empty, and I have already suggested to the Government that they approach the British Government and the British Industries with a view to utilising these trade centres for utilising West Indians who go up to the industrial areas in England. There is one in Wales, one is close to Birmingham and there is one just to the south of London, but all within easy proximity to the industrial centres where West Indians would naturally be gravitating.

Before I sit down, I want to stress again that we may be impressed—the hon. junior member for St. Philip is impressed with it, but I do not feel that there is any moment for congratulation until the Government can come back and tell us that we have jobs for every graduate that we put out at our Institute.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The hon. member who has just sat down, used the words during his speech, that sometimes hon. members of this Chamber generate more heat than light, and I think that that was quite appropriate to the speech which he has just made. The hon. member has really made a speech which, from an academic angle, may be very interesting, but as a criticism of the policy envisaged in this Resolution, it is entirely negative. If the hon. mem-

ber has made any points, what are these points? One is that technical education in Barbados can only benefit other colonies.
4.35 p.m.

He has forgotten that this colony of Barbados which is only 21 x 14 miles cannot possibly employ all the technicians; and I use that term in the limited sense. The electrical engineering, mechanical automobile, etcetra, are quite essential trades to be learnt by our youths, and Government should be congratulated for educating Barbadians in a way where they can be not only citizens of Barbados but where they can be citizens of the world. If you educate a man technically, there is nothing against your having done so just because you cannot find employment within a month or two in the country where he was educated. If you educate him so that when he goes abroad he can find employment you would have done something excellent for that citizen. It is very narrow to be opposed to technical training because a number of jobs cannot be found immediately or in the near future for those you are educating. You have done a service to the citizens of the country if you educate them to be fit for higher industrial society abroad. Your fullest responsibility to the citizen of the country is so to educate him that he can make a living any where.

If there were a lack of emigration what would we have done? Let us face this question once and for all. Emigration from Barbados is a tradition; and it must continue to be a tradition for a long time, until the population is so naturally reduced that there would be no reason at all for citizens to go abroad. We are doing the essential thing when we educate our people so that they can be employed in other countries. Indeed, we would be doing them a disservice if we fail to give them the education which would be necessary to fit them for jobs in other countries.

In this narrowing world, in this United Nations' World, we must get away from this parochialism that we should only train people to remain and to find jobs in Barbados. Let us face it now and for all times. Our educational system cannot be so narrowly limited that the products from our technical schools can find jobs in Barbados only. Barbados will never have that industrial expansion to absorb the products from our technical schools which we hope to produce in the numbers desirable. This Island is only 21 x 14 miles; we are not several thousand square miles as other countries; therefore, industry here has a possible limit to its development. Let us face that fact now if we never faced it before. We have none of the resources for any serious expansion or creation of industries in this colony. A few more may be created but we will never get industries to that extent as to absorb all the possible students from the Technical Institute.

British Guiana, Trinidad and other colonies have established their Technical Institutes and they have sound reasons for doing so. Those colonies are getting more industries, therefore, technicians leaving here may acquire jobs in any of those places. We are not educating them merely to stay here and seek jobs. That would be an absurd idea. Citizens of this country like the honourable senior member for St. George academically, are not returning to Barbados to find a job; and it is a good thing for this colony when some of them do not return.

The only other point which the honourable member made was with regard to the question of automation. There is no reason why the honourable member should cite or quote automation. Automation is a recent innovation in industry. None of us can foretell the future of industrial development, as regards technical education of the citizens towards automation.

Sir, I am at a loss indeed to appreciate the meaning of the type of speech which was just made by the honourable senior member for St. George. Does he mean to say that the Government should not embark on technical education at all, unless it can guarantee jobs for all who have been educated technically? Does he mean to say that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money to educate a man at the Technical Institute, because as a citizen of this country, he may not find a job here though he can easily find a job in England, Canada or in any of the surrounding Caribbean colonies? Certainly he cannot possibly mean anything quite so negative. That would mean he is possessed of so narrow a mind and outlook as to be undeserving of being a representative of the people. He cannot possibly mean those things. We are late in the establishment of the Technical Institute.

There is only one thing I miss from this Resolution and it is with regards to the establishment of an Agricultural School where you would be able to train boys in the scientific elements of agriculture, and the greatest productivity to be gained from the soil as well as to train boys in animal husbandry. I miss the agricultural note which is so essential to the Caribbean from this Resolution. Perhaps that part of it may come one day separately. I hope it will.

4.45 p.m.

It is the only hope. And if you say that, I would be more appreciative and more in sympathy with it. The agricultural possibilities in the British Caribbean are still many. The vast land of British Honduras and British Guiana are still to be turned into productive areas; but we cannot depend on the traditionally uneducated or agriculturally uneducated small holder of Barbados, St. Lucia or Grenada to develop these lands. We have to send out an educated peasant. We have to send out youngsters who have the basic elements of scientific agriculture in order to get the best from those still unoccupied lands.

Sir, I, like the honourable junior member for St. Philip, must congratulate the Government on this measure and to say it is long overdue. The fact that they may not get, and I believe that statement, any type of worthwhile technical teacher for the type of salary offered here, is probably true; but these salaries are not the law of the Medes and Persians; they can be and will be made higher in order to get the personnel needed.

During the honourable member's speech, he referred to factory engineers here. I do not know exactly what that means; it is a vague term to me, I do not know exactly their technical qualifications can be termed such. The term engineer by the way, Mr. Speaker, seems to carry all sorts of connotations. The word engineer in America is used more or less as the captain of industry. In Barbados it is used as engine, cleaner etc. So the variety of engineers is immensely wide.

As far as I know, the engineers in factories do work for good money, although I do not think it is above the average of \$100 a week; and the crop lasts for sixteen weeks and that is \$1,600 for a crop season. [A VOICE: That is not true.] I mean at the highest figure. Then out of crop season as far as I remember from the Labourers Statistics of the Annual Report, I do not think they work for half that money; so it is not accurate to say a factory engineer can work for the salary offered here.

Sir, purely from the angle of a broad outlook, the hon. member must be wrong. There is nothing wrong I will state in preparing a Barbadian for worthy citizenship; and that is what the technical education proposes to do. It does not confine him to employment in his 21 by 14 island. If it did, it

would not be worth the term education, far less technical education. I deplore the parochialism that could have echoed such a thought.

I am sure that many of our people who are in England today regret the absence of a technical school in their days. I am sure that had a technical school existed before the remuneration of many emigrants in England today would be much greater, because the acquisition of better jobs would have been assured. Where is the disservice in educating the citizen of Barbados to hold certain positions abroad? Where is the policy against the taxpayers when you can educate their children who not only work for themselves, but work for enough to send back here to parents who have paid taxes out of all proportion to the earning wage? How can anyone fail to congratulate this effort on the Government's part? I do not believe the hon. member was conscious or entirely so with his implied criticism to this Resolution, and I only hope and trust that there will be not undue delay in the establishment of this Institution. I can do no better than quote what this proposes:

"The subjects which it is proposed to teach at the Technical Institute include mechanical and electrical engineering, woodwork, building construction and automobile mechanics".

Either one of these properly taught and assimilated by the pupils, must be of lasting life long benefit to them despite the automation so evidently seen as some doom to industrial development, or to the technical citizen, by the last hon. member who sat down. We have all read something about automation, except those who do not read at all; but who can prophesy whether automation is another industrial revolution just around the corner to destroy any technical knowledge acquired?

Man happens to be something above and beyond his own creation. As we have found throughout history, industrial evolution machines have been made to replace men but sooner or later you discovered you had more uses for men. The more the machines were invented, the greater became the volume of employment that up to now is the history of industrial development which I defy the hon. member to deny. Who can say that automation will not release men even for greater creations than we of this twentieth century can yet envisage.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I laboured under disadvantage of not having been present to hear the Introducer of this Resolution expounding the Government's policy. I did not know whether it was the Minister of Education himself or the Minister of Trade, but I note with some satisfaction that the edge has been taken off my disappointment in that I arrived in time to hear Government's policy expounded once again by a back-bencher.

It is refreshing that twice in as many weeks, we have been favoured with expositions of Government policy by members supporting the Government although not being Ministers themselves. Only last week, we listened with pleasure to the hon. junior member for St. Michael, and now we have heard the hon. junior member for St. John. I reflect at this point that if the hon. junior member for St. George had been sitting where he is now sitting, the hon. junior member for St. John might not have had that opportunity; because when he sat on the opposite site of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, he had been passed over in favour of the hon. junior member for St. Michael. We look forward to the pleasure of hearing more Government policy expounded by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and the hon. senior member for St. James.

I have only got what has just been said by the hon. junior member for St. John to go by; and I understand, the hon. member will correct me if I am wrong, that this Government is being caught by stealth, that is to say, with all that it could possibly do for Barbados, it considers it to be such a trifle that it has now shown us that it conceals within a quiet exterior, a mountain ambition for its citizens of the world. [Mr. VAUGHAN: What is wrong with that?] Nothing is wrong with that, nothing is wrong with citizens of the world; they are not produced or manufactured, they are encouraged by the attitude they show.

Whatever arguments this Government has in favour of the extended scheme, the arguments produced are completely beside the issue. I do not believe as has been inferred by the hon. member who has just sat down, that the criticisms made by the hon. senior member for St. George showed that he was hostile to the idea of Technical Education; that is one of the criticisms which I gather the hon. junior member for St. John wanted to level against him. I did not hear all of the speech of the hon. senior member for St. George, but the part I heard convinced me that he was pointing out to the Government that what it proposes to do will not easily be done, because of certain circumstances.

First of all, as to the Technical Institute itself, I do not know how many hon. members have had the opportunity of following closely the work of the Institute, or even to have read with thoroughness its Scheme of Government; but when it was introduced in this Chamber, it caused quite a lot of debate. I myself have not been able to follow up the matter in any detailed sense, I must confess, and I do not know exactly what has been achieved; but I see from what we are asked to do here this afternoon, that we are now at the serious part of the matter. I have read that the Institute is catering for a maximum of 500 students per week, and I should like to know why the number is 500 students per week: is it that the nature of the training is such that 500 a week is sufficient, or is it just a mistake and the number is 500 a year?

I sat in the House of Commons in late March or early April this year and listened to a very interesting debate on the British Government's White Paper which was published on the necessity for expanding Technical Education in England, and the British Government, I think, proposes to spend within the next five years something like £130 million on this matter because recent developments in the world have shown that Great Britain herself is to hold her own as an industrial power with any degree of efficiency, she must now start with serious intent to train scientists and technicians. The urgency of this matter was best seen in a cartoon which appeared in the Daily Mail and the picture showed a little school girl whose parents were giving her studies in the direction of a scientific course and this little girl said: "I do not want to be a scientist, I only want to be loved." That is an indication of the seriousness which is manifest even in girls' schools.

There is a drive made in the schools, both boys' and girls' schools, to shift their intentions and their interest from the academic side to the technical subjects. If you look at any newspaper, particularly in some of the large London Dailies, you will see that by far the largest space is given to advertisements requiring technicians at all grade levels. I have been told by officials in the teaching profession that the shortage is regarded as being so serious, that in the vacation teachers of scientific subjects are required to go into the Laboratories; so soon as the pass lists are issued for the final degree, examinations which

are taken at the Universities, these lists are sent to the Industrial firms and the large manufacturing firms so that they cannot get their pick of the technicians and scientists.

Nothing that I have read here contains the assurance that this Government might feel that it would be impossible for the Crown Agents, who are not particularly energetic in these matters, and who had the same request put to them by the Governments of at least three Colonies to be expected to find qualified technical teachers for us at a week's notice. As far as my experience goes, this Government will find itself waiting for another six months before it gets the first one, of these four teachers, and that does not mean that the Crown Agents will not try; it will only mean that the personnel is so scarce that Colonies who have offered higher salaries, and who have stated their claims earlier, will most likely be served before us. That being so, it occurs to me that the Government should look around for possible alternatives. I am always bothered, whenever we are discussing these matters, about something which seems to be characteristic of the Government's approach to these matters.

5.05 p.m.

It is the reliance which they seemed to place on overseas recruitment. I would much rather like to hear them say that as an alternative to what they now propose, they would set about seeing more of our local people who possessed the necessary aptitude to be trained as qualified technical teachers. That is very important, because not only do we owe a duty to our own people to see that they are trained to fill the highest jobs, but we owe them a duty to see that they get the best jobs we have to offer.

I am going to throw out a suggestion to the Government. There is attached to the London Institute of Education a college called Garnet College which is less than 25 years old and which specialises in the training of technical teachers. It does not itself instruct pupils; it trains teachers. Experts at the London Institute of Education have discovered, apart from the subjects themselves, there is a different technique which must be employed in the teaching of technical subjects; therefore, teachers must be employed in the teaching of technical subjects; therefore, teachers must be trained in a particular way. I saw the work at the College myself. I was assured by the Principal that they do not confine themselves to the training of English teachers. They have been able to serve the Gold Coast and Nigeria very well in recent years by training people for them. All that the College insists on is that the people who come to them to be trained must possess certain qualifications, not a University degree necessarily. For instance, if a teacher of Commerce applies for training, they expect him to have the highest qualifications which the London Chamber of Commerce offers in commercial subjects. If he is pursuing a course in the teaching of arts, he must have the necessary qualifications from a college of arts. He must have the necessary qualifications required by an approved body.

I have seen reports of what that Training College has been able to achieve. It is working splendidly; so much so, that the Colonial Office has been recommending teacher students from the African colonies to be trained there. It would be worthwhile if this Government paid attention to that and ask the Colonial Office to make contact with the London Institute of Education in order to have a number of local persons trained there.

I should say that the course of training is one year. It is a very intensive course. Half of it is devoted to theoretical training and the other half to practical work; that is to say, the students at the latter half of the academic year are required to go and teach

in English technical schools. The course is very interesting and the training is very high, I recommend it to them because it might be possible for them by September this year to get four, half dozen or any number they choose to send to Garnet College for this course of training. If they do so, they would have them back by July next year. Even by July next year they would be still waiting for two or three of those persons whom they want Colonial Office to send out, because the demand for technical teachers is so great that no sooner are the people qualified, they are snatched up in industries. Even in the teaching service itself, teachers are being encouraged and enticed away from schools to enter factories.

Every year, Imperial Chemical Industries which is a vast concern, attracts the cream of universities and the most experienced of technical schools in its concerns. The Government of Barbados has little hope of being able to attract these people because the salaries paid to these people are so attractive, that what we are offering will not pay them. Even if we increase it, as the hon. junior member for St. John said we can, we are not likely to attract the skilled personnel we need.

Sir, I want to emphasise that we should concentrate on training our own people. I am dropping the hint that it can be taken up with Colonial Office. I know that it will pay. If we train our own people and get them back in a year, it is far better than to wait a year on those whom you are asking Colonial Office to get for you. If the working of the Institute is to be of any value to the students, they should have their teachers trained and promptly trained.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters connected with this Resolution which I think it would be well to explore. As I have said, I am surprised to see that the main argument on the Government's side, as expounded by the hon. junior member for St. John, seems to be that he has admitted that the number of people we will train in our Technical Institute will be more gainfully employed in Barbados. But that would not matter because they will get jobs elsewhere and that what we are really doing is training our citizens to be citizens of the world. Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly in matters educationally, we should not be narrow-minded. Any man in his senses will argue that we have a right in this island to set up educational institutions which can be used not only for Barbadians, but any other people.

I myself have spoken in this House before congratulating the Government on the decision to extend the facilities of Erdiston College. Therefore, I am very happy to see that it is possible in any educational institution we have in this Island that other people can benefit; but that is not what they are asking. Their arguments seem to be that although they admit more people will be trained than they can find jobs for, yet somehow these people will be employed outside. We all hope so, but Government's policy should not be based on such an absurd basis.

If for instance this Technical Institute were the property of the whole region, and of these 500 students 200 or 300 of them were coming from other areas in the Caribbean, well then it would be the responsibility not of the Barbados Government to provide employment for 500 people, it would be the responsibility of the regional Governments or of the Federation when it comes to see that the stream is absorbed within the region. But that would be a scientific and practical approach to the subject; but as they have expounded it to us, we are asked to believe that they have no notion of what will become with all the people they are training who they hope will be employed in the outside world. Is the Government of Barbados so generous as to train people

gratuitously at the moment with the flimsy supposition that they will be employed elsewhere if not here?

I think Government could base its policy with more clarity than that. This is not a substantial defence of what they are doing. When you reflect, Mr. Speaker, that in any community the educational system and the training given to the citizens of that community must bear some relation to the community's social and economic problems, and you listen to what has been said in the defence of this, you get the impression that the two things as far as they are concerned, are in two water-tight compartments. I do not blame them Mr. Speaker; because they are a Government who cannot truthfully say that they have done anything to expand the economy of this island. The fact they are telling that they will train large numbers of people whom on their admission they might not be able to employ here, is a left-handed way of admitting that the economic and social problem of this island are really beyond them. You have to relate what you are doing in your schools with what you are doing in the rest of the country; but even if their plans for Barbados are not sufficiently matured, and if they admitted to us that they do not know how or to what extent the wealth and prosperity of this country can be expanded, well let them take counsel with the other Governments of the region on these matters and make sure at least that the 500 Barbadians who would be turned out of this institution every year will not suffer because of the Government's lack of knowledge.

It is a very hard and cruel thing to get people to learn a trade, to learn skills, to develop their technique, and send them adrift in the world like so many wild sheep. It might well be that technical education in this island might receive a further feeling, for the people who are receiving that training could feel the training will not be useless at the end of their time. For instance, Mr. Speaker, there is a necessary connection between the school leaving age and the number of people that can be absorbed into employment in any given community. I would like therefore to hear the Government say much more about these matters. They should tell us also whether the technical education which they are providing in this Institution will itself be reckoned as secondary education and therefore be given to people only in the post primary stages. If they can tell us all that, we should know then there will be a large number of young people in this island who will still get secondary education; even although it is not of the so-called academic type which is enjoyed at Harrison College and schools of that type.

We should have to know all these things. We should have to know, too, whether they propose to raise the school leaving age and make this secondary training available to even larger numbers of people; so that at any rate, we should know within a given time what is the additional number of young persons who would be thrown on the labour market within a year from any given date. All this is part of the problem. To ignore it is not to solve it. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the House can fairly be accused of being against technical education. We know we are all too willing to see it and we want it established in the best way, but we do insist that first of all this Government, the people of Barbados have got to break away from this slavish habit of relying on the Colonial Office or the Crown Agents to fill all the gaps in our body politic. We should use our initiative of push and drive to get things done for ourselves. This is, Mr. Speaker, the case.

The shortage of technical teachers, of scientists which is universally acknowledged, is such that it

would be extremely difficult for the Government of Barbados to attract the right man for the Technical Institute. Secondly, with that being the case, it is incumbent upon this Government to take steps immediately to have local people trained. Not only for the purpose of imparting these techniques to larger numbers of young people.

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

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of the Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House for half an hour.

5.25 p.m.

On re-assembling.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise upon a question of privilege. It concerns a disquieting occurrence which took place in this Chamber immediately after the tea adjournment was taken. Before hon. members had time to vacate the Chamber, the Police arrested a person for whom it is alleged, they had a warrant. I wish to make no comment which may be construed as being out of sympathy with the Police in the execution of their duties, nor would it be proper for me to pass any verdict on the rights and wrongs of the person concerned; I nevertheless think that a grave assault has been committed upon the dignity of this House inasmuch as hon. members were forced to witness the disgraceful scuffle which ensued in the course of that arrest.

What makes it more disquieting, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that you yourself were not officially informed of what was to take place; had Your Honour been so informed, you would have been in a position to direct the Police as to the manner, consistent with the dignity of this House, in which they might have proceeded. That, to my mind, is an even greater affront to the dignity of this House inasmuch as these precincts are under Your Honour's control.

I wish to emphasize once again that questions of Law and Order and their maintenance do not arise here, since they are totally irrelevant to the question of the privileges of this House. Therefore, I wish to place on record a most energetic and violent protest against the manner in which the arrest was made and the fact that Your Honour was not previously officially consulted.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I disagree with the hon. member who has just sat down. When the time comes for me or for any of us in this Colony to cry for help, we will cry to the Police. [Cheers]. I am sorry that I have to disagree with the hon. member who has just spoken; I feel that if the Police have a warrant for the arrest of anybody, it is their duty to carry out that arrest. I do not think that any permission of this House would have to be sought in this case.

I was somewhat amazed when I drew nearer to this person and discovered that he was the very person whom the Police had been seeking. I know that it has been found by the Superintendent of the Mental Hospital that this person had been mentally unbalanced, and therefore the Police had to be very cautious in this matter. I smiled to think that we have the particular brand of Policeman which we have today, because in times past the type of Policeman would have had this person hustled out of here especially if they had a warrant for his arrest.

I say this: if it is in the House of Representatives or in the House of God, and the Police have a warrant for the arrest of anybody, I think they should execute it. I do not agree that the Police, merely on

the instructions of the Marshal of this House, should eject a stranger in the gallery because he may be nodding, or seem to be nodding, or making a gesture; I do not agree with that at all. It is only if a person insists in carrying out his obstruction that he should be ejected; if people merely nod or show from their demeanour what they think of the speeches which are made in this Chamber, you must keep them quiet.

I am one of those persons who think, (it matters not who may raise the question) that it should not be recorded that we, in this House of Assembly, have protested against the arrest of a person who is known to the Police as an undesirable; and if such a person is seen in here, we should not protest against his being arrested in here. If this had happened to one of my best friends, even if I had to put my hand in my pocket afterwards and assist him with a few shillings in paying his penalty, I would not be against that being done. I am prepared to back the Police in the execution of their duty; otherwise the Country in which we live would be a very dangerous place for us to live in. I regret that I have to clash with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I do not think that we should let go unnoticed what the hon. member has said. I repeat that wherever it is, the Police should exercise their duty.

In a famous Church in this Country, a man who had been charged with carrying away somebody's turkey was found there. This happened in your Constituency, Mr. Speaker! [Laughter.] The man thought that he would go into the Church, and the Police waited and then went into the Church and arrested him. He had been kneeling and praying. I know that this particular visitor here today, had been a patient at the Mental Hospital, and I say I support the idea of a Police Officer arresting anybody anywhere. I hope they will arrest some members of this House in the House. [MEMBERS: Shamel!] This idea of members doing whatever they like in this House is wrong [ASIDES]. You do me something and see if I am afraid of you. [Mr. TUDOR: That is a breach of privilege]. I hope that if an hon. member does anything wrong he will be arrested. The Rule however refers to one coming to and from the House, not in the House.

I must say that I am not at all attempting to say that Your Honour should not be acquainted about matters taking place when the House is in Session. I agree with that. But you will agree with me that Your Honour, having left the Chair and the House having been adjourned, the Police were only acting in the exercise of their duty. As long as a policeman has a warrant for the arrest of anybody, wherever he sees him, he should execute that warrant; if the warrant is executed in here, that is not an affront to Your Honour. We should not allow it to go on record that we opposed Police Officers when they were executing their duty. I repeat that if anything happens, the first persons to whom we have to look are the Police.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I want to register my approval and support of the action of the Police Officers. [Cheers]. I agree with the remarks which have been made by the honourable member who has just sat down. The Police officers deserve our support; their superior Officer might want to reprimand them, and therefore I should like it to go out from this House that we support their action. Suppose that man had pulled out a gun or anything of the sort? What would have happened?

6.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we as representatives of the people have to take a realistic view of what law and order stand for. I want to state now that at all times, and in all places, I am a

staunch supporter of law and order. If we give way to those unruly and disorderly elements in our midst, we will soon reach the stage in our existence when every man would have to shoulder a gun. Certainly, we do not want that. We want every man and woman in this island to understand that this is a law abiding place and we, the representatives of the people, support that.

Without any further ado, I offer my support to the Police Officer in the execution of his duty. I do hope that his superior officer would not take any action against him as a result of what was voiced in here. I agree with the motto that you should be too quick than to be too slow.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, those hon. members who have spoken in defence of the action of the Police Officer and also those who share such views have got to be reminded of one finite fact; and it is this: if there is one thing which an ancient Chamber like this should seek to uphold and defend is its dignity and standard. I saw when the occurrence took place. I felt then, and I still feel now, that something went wrong. That is my humble opinion. I am not here to condone the doing of wrong nor to offer this Honourable Chamber as a hiding place to any criminal, but what I feel about the matter which took place here this afternoon is that the action of the Police Officer was an assault on the dignity of this House; regardless of what other honourable members might feel.

I will outline the occurrence. I hope honourable members who enjoy laughter because this question is raised will change their minds when I am finished speaking. What happened was this: a man sitting in the gallery of this Chamber was sought by the Police. As soon as this House was adjourned for tea, some honourable members did not leave their seats, yet while some were filing out just a couple yards from where the incident took place, a man was arrested. Nobody up to then knew the criminal propensities of the man. But as soon as he was arrested he drew a weapon. Up to then, that man was not a dangerous man in this Chamber in the seat where he was sitting. When the Police approached him and laid their hands on him, they made him a dangerous person to be near. If that man had been allowed to sit there without hindrance, up to now nobody would know that he had criminalistic propensities, and that he was a dangerous man with dangerous weapons in his possession. The action of the Police made him what he turned out to be.

There are other means whereby a man can be arrested; and it is an affront to honourable members not to realise it. If that man was sitting in the Other Place, I hardly think that the attempt to arrest him would have been made so shortly after the adjournment of that Chamber. I am not saying that the Policeman should be punished; but they should be cautioned. I feel that Your Honour should have taken it upon yourself to draw to the notice of the Police that any action on their part must not be of such as to bring embarrassment to this hon. place and its members. The Police were waiting outside for that man; they could have been still waiting. There are only two doors through which the man would be able to leave this Chamber. They should have been able to station themselves at either door at the appropriate time before they made the arrest.

I would like to remind hon. members about this: while the man had a small knife in his hand those hon. members who were near by could have been injured, if he had used it. It could have been a firearm instead. The interference with this man, having in his possession a firearm, could have caused injury not only to members on their way out but to others

who might be in their seats as well as to the other persons in the gallery. That is where the difficulty comes in.

I still think that the Police could have waited on the steps or somewhere in the hall to make the arrest. It does not matter how long they would have to wait, because it is their duty. They should have waited until that opportune time arrived and arrested him. I feel the hon. senior member for the City would have never said, if he had waited until he had heard more speeches from hon. members. Suppose the man was in the Cathedral during divine service and the parson allowed a break in the service, the Police would not have gone into the Church and arrested him at that time. It is alright to arrest a man in Church or in a Chamber like this providing his conduct at the time merits his being taken up; but if a man is sitting down peaceably as that man was, regardless of what he had done before or after, he was a well-behaved citizen during the time he was sitting there and the Police should have told themselves that this is a Legislative Assembly. While it is true that we had adjourned for tea, members were still in its precincts, therefore the Police should have waited the opportune time when they could make the arrest.

6.30 p.m.

I want hon. members to bear this in mind that there is always and will always be, the necessity to protect the person of hon. members not only in this Chamber but outside its precincts; that there should not be the occasion for hon. members to be embarrassed by one thing or another unduly. I think that we as hon. members of this place have been fairly tolerant; we have seen where remarks from the public side are thrown embarrassingly at us. Of course, we said they are our people and we tried to ignore it. I have seen where members have to fear walking from here even to the Lobby of the House. All these things have been going on. We tolerate them because they are ours, and we would not want to be as cruel towards them as some other person who might have occupied our seat in the past. We tolerate their behaviour but there is a limit to it.

Sir, regardless of what members feel, I hope that you would pass on this information to the Police Department. Our protection rest in your hands. You could suggest to them in future when an arrest is to be made for some crime committed previously, and the person is in this House, that the Police should wait until the arrest can be made without any embarrassment to the Chamber and its members. I would like to assure the hon. junior member for St. Lucy on this occasion that he is not alone in such a feeling. Even although there might be jeers and contrary expressions to what he feels, he is upholding of the dignity of this place. He is not alone in this respect on this particular occasion. I regret and am deeply disappointed that more hon. members did not feel similarly to myself and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

We read some time last year or year before where some Puerto Ricans entered the American Senate and brandished guns and members were injured. They did the wrong thing but they did it voluntarily. If this man had a gun in his hands this evening and had let it off, and some member or members got injured, that would have been an injury inflicted not because the man wanted to injure those who might have got injured, but because he was forced to use his weapon by the Police. I am not saying that the man is right; he should be punished; I thought that Your Honour had the authority to charge him separately for brandishing a weapon in the Legislative Assembly of this colony.

I do hope they will punish him. But I cannot refrain from suggesting to hon. members that is the least they could do to assist in upholding the dignity of this Chamber which we have come along and seen; not against the Police generally, but I feel they acted thoughtlessly. An embarrassment is an embarrassment, even though some members might express appreciation of it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, nothing I say now I want to be interpreted as any reflection on what my colleague has said. [A VOICE: Why not?] It is not intended to be. The hon. senior member for the City said that he agreed to spectators being arrested because they slept.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not say anything so. The hon. member is always sleeping or not listening. I said I did not agree with spectators being arrested merely because they slept.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The hon. member said he agreed with the arrest of spectators because they slept.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say so.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I understood that he implied there was nothing harmful in suggesting—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I said I did not agree with it. The hon. member forgot I asked—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the City must allow the hon. member of the floor to speak.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Ask the Premier to shut his mouth when he is talking. I did not imply such a thing at all.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I was only saying he was not himself when the hon. member spoke.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is that all you wanted to say?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Apparently there are a few hon. members who think that because of my position I cannot say things when I want to say them. When I was at school, there was a little Latin title that was translated, "lovers quarrel to renew their love." The hon. junior member for St. John having quarrelled with the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, now finds he is in trouble too.

I have not heard such nonsense in the twenty years I have been in the House of Assembly. I think the hon. senior member for the City got pulled in another way. It is foolish to suppose that any member—

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of correction, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in his outlining remarks seems to imply that I supported everything the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said. I did not reach the question as to where, when and how members of this Chamber must or must not be arrested.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say anything like that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member is not free from arrest on a similar process, so why have we wasted such time. Before hon. members get up and make serious statements of that kind, let them go around and ask. It is only another instance of wasting time. The Police did their duty. I do not think Your Honour can seriously sit down and contemplate writing a letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now that hon. members have aired their feelings on this matter, I have the honour to inform certain other members who might have thought otherwise that I might have been associated with the raising of the privilege of enquiry. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy approached me on this subject, but I pointed out to the hon. member that in substance I could do nothing about the incident to which he was referring. The House having adjourned and Mr. Speaker having left the Chair, all

members were just present as individuals within the precincts of the House of Assembly. I would be the last man in this island to show any sign of putting an obstruction against the establishment of law and order. However, I would have preferred the Police to notify me to have the Chamber cleared after the adjournment, and not even to have strangers in the House. I would have gone as far as that. That is all I would have done. I did not consider that any offence or insult has been offered to hon. members as the arrest was made during the period of adjournment.

6.40 p.m.

C.E. LEAVE PASSAGES ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also 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 (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1956."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Resolution is to approve the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) Order. I will just remind hon. members that in the last Session of this House, we passed a Leave Passages Order, amending the provisions of the original 1952 Order. I know that some hon. members objected to the terms of that amended Order, and other hon. members certainly misconstrued it, misinterpreted it and misreported it, so much so, that in the *Trinidad Guardian*, I saw that it was reported as though this Government were drawing an unfair distinction between local people and importees; what the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would call "displaced persons." That is absolutely incorrect; what the Government did was to cut down the privileges of both local people and importees. I did not contradict the report at the time, but I am contradicting it now. In the original 1952 Order, nothing is said about the time beyond which no Leave Passages are to be granted, and Departmental persons have been granted leave and their passages paid even in the last twelve months of their service.

As I have always understood it, it was the desire of hon. members when the original discussions took place, that the object of Leave Passages was to enable a man to take a holiday abroad, and come back refreshed to do his job. For that reason, the point was raised in Executive Committee that it should be made clear that in order that Leave Passages were not to be given except to people who were giving some more of their service to the Colony. We have it in the Order that the Governor may call upon a man to take a holiday if it is in the interest of the service. When the first Order was created, the Government came to the conclusion that that should be clearly understood and we stated that in the Order which we made during the last Session of the House.

As regards persons recruited overseas, by Colonial Office Regulations in every colony, they have a right to pre-retirement leave, and we have cut that down. Instead of a general right, we have decided upon what hon. members see before them today: that these persons do not get it unless they have served for two years. In the case of Mr. Hayden, he went to Trinidad and he was there a few months, but he would have got pre-retirement leave although he had given the Colony only a few months' service. The Departmental interpretation of the Order allowed a man to go off and his passage was paid for him although when he finished his leave, his term was ended.

I start, Mr. Speaker, by completely denying that it is accurate to pretend to say that this Government has done something or to accuse this Government of doing something which would diminish the right of

local people but yet we are giving it to outsiders. In an attempt to save money, we have cut down on both local people and outsiders.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we cut down the interpretation in the original Order, and we say: "You will not get it in the last twelve months, because you are not coming back to give your service to the Colony." In the case of importees, we set out the qualification that they must have served for two years.

Article 3 of this Order stated: "Provided that no Officer shall be entitled to the payment of passages during the last twelve months of his service:

Provided also that an Officer recruited overseas who has completed not less than twenty-four of his tour of service shall be entitled, when proceeding on pre-retirement leave, to such proportion of the cost of a passage for himself and his wife, if married to his home country as the period of service so completed bears to forty-two months."

Is that not cutting down the privilege they enjoy too? I hope that the Press will give the same publicity to my contradictions as it gave to the allegation that we were treating local people unfairly while allowing expatriates to get Leave Passages. This matter went to the Other Place in the last Session, but Parliament was prorogued before it was dealt with. We did not want to hurt anybody who had been told that he would get Leave Passages, especially when we were told that somebody had bought winter clothing so as to go to England. Therefore the only thing we have done, is to put in a date when we will make the Order which will say: "In the last twelve months, you have to give us back money." We say that that will come into operation this year.

The matter has been discussed with the Civil Service Association. Let me say that it is all very well for honourable members who are not Civil Servants to say things. When this matter was put to the Civil Servants they agreed with us; whatever may be happening now, when the Government first put up the matter to the Civil Servants that nothing should be done in the last twelve months, the Civil Servants agreed with that proposal of the Government. [*Asides.*] When the proposal that the Government would not allow Leave Passages in the last twelve months was put to the Civil Servants, they agreed that it was a reasonable proposal. 6.50 p.m.

Today, they are not agreeing. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Do you mean to the first or the last?] I mean the last. I am sorry if I said the first. When it was first put up to the Civil Service that the Government was going to come down with that Resolution, they said O.K. They have changed their minds since. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When it was first put to them?] I do not remember the time. One can well understand this censure of honourable members if it had come from those who are accustomed getting up to speak but do not care whether they speak the truth or not. Those who have a higher sense of knowledge will accept what I say.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see from the Resolution that there are other slight alterations so as to prevent an injustice from being done.

"Service" now means "resident service in the Island or on duty outside the Island including service before the commencement of this Order."

We are now amending "service" to mean—

- (a) resident service at the qualifying salary in the Island or on duty outside the Island;

- (b) In addition to the service mentioned in the preceding paragraph, in the case of an officer transferred to this Island from the Public Service of a British colony, such period of service within that colony at the qualifying salary in respect of which the officer was eligible for leave corresponding to vacation leave at the date of his transfer:

Provided that such service shall only be taken into account in cases where the transfer of the officer without his first taking such leave was at the request of this Government; and includes such service before the commencement of this Order."

That is happening today and will happen again. If we want somebody and we want them urgently, and he is in a British colony where he has not got leave passage but has qualified for a certain period, he is entitled to go for vacation; and we say to him: "give up your vacation and come; we want you so urgently that we cannot afford that you take your vacation until you come here," it is only fair that we should add that qualifying period to the period served here in order that that officer might qualify for leave passage. I think the House will agree with that. Sometimes we have had to do it to a person coming here who has qualified or is qualifying for leave in the colony from which he comes. When he comes here, he brings with him that period of time even though it might have begun before this Order.

Article 4 provides for computation of an officer's leave in case of return passage. If an officer takes a return passage ticket he may get a rebate; therefore, it is only reasonable that instead of his going off on a single passage and coming back on a single passage, thereby getting more money than if he had taken a return passage, that we get for him a return passage. The other paragraph gives Government the right to extend the period outside which leave should be taken. In the original Order, an Officer, his wife and two children were entitled to leave, but the Officer must take it within six months. Sometimes some things happen which prevent an Officer from taking it within the prescribed time. The provisions contained in the amendment provide for these exceptional cases and give Government the right to extend it: (1) is in the event of serious illness to the officer, his wife or children; (2) is in the event of an alteration in the schedule under which the passages were booked; and (3) is where the Officer's departure has been delayed at the request of Government made subsequently to the booking of the passage. This has happened here already. An officer had booked his passage, and then the Governor asked him to stay for one reason or the other.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spent most of my time in putting this Order before the House and contradicting certain statements in the Press. (I would not say deliberately but with gross carelessness) attacking the Government which, if they had read the Orders or had taken down what I said, they could never have stated: that Government was cutting down the privileges of local people but was not taking them away from their expatriates.

It is not for me to repeat the argument. I would only say that the Government is very concerned with expenditure in this island. And wherever we find a case of possible economy combined with efficiency, we will put that into effect. I will forever maintain that it is wrong to give leave passages to a man in his last year, when the whole object of granting leave passages to a man is that he

may be able to go away and take a rest and come back to the island and give better service. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

7.00 p.m.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Premier said something about misrepresentation or carelessness in the Press in publishing what they did, thus making an attack on Government. I am saying that it was no carelessness or misrepresentation by me. I felt so and I said so.

Now when this Order came before this House on the last occasion, some time before the prorogation, those of us on this side of the Table argued that we did not agree with this paragraph which read:—

“Provided that no officer shall be entitled to payment of passages during the last twelve months of his service.”

We said that then, and I believe some of us still feel so today, although we entirely agree with the Government that wherever you can effect a saving without interfering with your efficiency you can do so. I would like to take the Government to task and show them several places where they can do this; but not in this. Therefore when we said on the last occasion that we did not agree with the Hon. Leader of the House it went to a division and was passed by a very small majority. It went to the Other Place; and I want to say I do not know if the Hon. Premier said this with a full knowledge of what he was saying: that as a result of the prorogation of the House this Order was not passed. That is not a statement of fact. I am sorry if I misrepresent him, but I challenge him to say it is not a statement of fact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member merely said it was not passed before prorogation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Well if he means that, it was not passed. The Hon. Premier is saying that it was not passed because of the prorogation. It passed this Chamber and had sufficient time to go to the Other Place, but it was not passed. There was a division in this Chamber and the Government won. The Hon. Premier is now saying that it was delayed as a result of the prorogation. But it went to the Other Place and was not passed. There must have been some reason for not passing it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will allow me to interrupt him. It may ease his mind if I freely said, we had to amend it by putting in a date, and give instructions to the member of the Executive Committee in the Other Place to amend it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What do you mean by having to put in a date? The honourable member did not handle this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall that the date was in. The Bill was to take effect from the 1st May, 1955. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying it was not held up because of the prorogation of the House; but the Hon. Premier said he can now freely say it was held up because a date had to be put in. We said here then that we did not agree with the passing of this Order as it stood then because it affected a large number of people. This Government insisted in passing, but we felt it would affect people who had already made applications.

The Press misrepresented neither the fact nor offered criticism against the Government for doing something that affected the local personnel. We told you then that giving this leave passage in the last year of your service affected a number of schoolmasters. We

were dealing principally with the type of worker in the Service like the school master, whom we felt then could only take the opportunity of the leave passage offered at the one time in their life; and that was the year before they retired. We gave as our reasons then: that school masters in this country work for such small salaries, that they were unable to go beyond Pelican Island because they had no opportunity of raising a loan; and while Government would give leave passages, there was no money to keep him while they were in England, United States or Canada with their wives.

They were a number of school masters then who had applications in that we knew of, and their applications had been in long before the date put here by the Government. We warned Government. The Bill was however passed and went to the Other Place, and the Chief Secretary, on whose instructions we do not know, wrote and called those people who had their applications in. That is exactly what we said in the House, although it was obvious to us that the date in the Order would have affected several people. But they held the Bill up purposely and rightly in the Other Place, and allowed them to get their passages.

I do not want to call names, but everybody knew who they were. When we said so on the floor of this House at the time, they called for a division and the Government won; but it is hardly fair to this Opposition to say then if the Press has misrepresented the facts we are responsible. We said it would affect not only school masters, but all those who applied; and especially since you dated this retrospective. Therefore the Other Place put in aside and could not pass it. It was purposely held up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said the honourable member has admitted that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Are we not allowed to discuss something before us?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I must apologise for interrupting the honourable member. I did not interrupt to say it, I interrupted to repeat it.

I started off by saying if we did not change the date, we would hurt people who were promised leave.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We told you then to postpone it and investigate it. We told you the facts, but you pressed it; and passed it. Now you come back and say what we were telling you is correct. That is not the only point, Sir. I still feel and other members on this side feel, as long as you fully acquaint yourself with the local conditions and the local personnel of your general service from top to bottom affect a number of persons employed in the Service of Barbados who have given of their best for years and years, but who were unable to get any money to take advantage of the Leave Passage which was offered any time before the year of their retirement. I have made what we said here clear.

Take your school master who has never been able to save one cent from his salary. In the last six months of his service he is going to get a gratuity, he is able to get a note backed at the Bank or raise a loan on his house, plus the passage which the Government would give to go abroad. It is surprising that Ministers who have found themselves lifted in the position of affluence cannot appreciate that argument, knowing Barbados as they do or at least should.

Mr. Deputy Speaker I contend that while Government has admitted that what the Opposition told them last time was true, and although we pressed for it to have it postponed and investigated, we are in possession of the facts that when it was sent to the Other Place they sent to call people who had their applications in and allowed them to get their meed. But now you say nobody else in Barbados, no school master who worked for \$5 a month and put in forty-

five or fifty years service, and now in the evening of his days has reached \$180 or \$200 a month, now that he is entitled to it, you are going to discriminate against him by saying you are affecting a saving. You are discriminating against local Civil Servants although not wilfully.

There is no school master with a £900 a year salary. I do not think a master at Lodge School or Harrison College worked for that. These teachers salary cannot take them beyond Pelican. Their salary went on from \$5 to \$10, \$15, \$20 until they reach the salary they now have. And these regulations which even modesty would not prevent him from seeing— (in spite of the imported Englishmen who came to this Island with forged degrees and abused the Opposition, because we did not allow leave passages to pass) — the part which the Opposition played in getting it extended is not only for imported Officials but also for the local Civil Servants. You are doing this knowingly though not willingly.

The Hon. Premier is the son of a schoolmaster. The Minister of Agriculture is also the son of a schoolmaster. They know what it is to be without lunch. They know that people have to start from scratch and from nothing. They know that people like their fathers might not be able to take leave passage even in the evening of their days and at the last minute that you would be able to give them.

7.10 p.m.

I will risk to bet that no schoolmaster who has retired after forty years got \$200 in the Bank. We are only giving such a person something which we owe to him; therefore, I cannot support the first part of Article 3 of this Order. It says: "Provided that no officer shall be entitled to the payment of passages during the last twelve months of his service." I would like the Hon. Premier to tell me what saving would Article 3 of this Order effect? We know that they were certain schoolmasters who had reached 60 years of age and who had 6 months or a year more to put in and they would go away in the last 6 months.

I should like to say that 100% of those who went away, went on the strength of the gratuity which they would receive. You cannot eat Leave Passages when you go to the United States of America or England; if you give an imported official 6 months with Leave Passages to his wife and children, would you leave out a local man within the last twelve months of his service? Do you think I would support that? When the newspaper described this matter as discriminating between imported officials and local people, that was absolutely correct.

The most important point about this matter is this: the Premier has said that when the matter was first put to the Civil Servants, they agreed. I want what I have said taken down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Everything that is said in here is taken down.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am officially and reliably informed that the statement made by the Hon. Premier is not correct [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Since I said that, have you checked on it?] I have checked on it before. There is a feeling that if you are a member of the Government and a Civil Servant says anything to you, he will be victimised. After this matter was discussed here on the last occasion, it was publicised; and I had the privilege of discussing it with members of the Civil Service Association and the Whitley Council and they said: "This matter was put to us two years ago and we opposed it."

This matter was discussed here about three months ago; the week after it was discussed here, I discussed it with the Civil Servants and they said: "When this matter was put to us two years ago, we disagreed with it, and it was pigeon-holed." They

said further: "we were most surprised to find that the matter was discussed when we saw it in the news paper; the Government has never paid us the courtesy of asking us to discuss it." After the matter got so much publicity, after two Elementary Schoolmasters had to go to the Chief Secretary's Office and protest against it, then the Resolution was pigeon-holed in the Other Place. The two schoolmasters have gone off and they are on pre-retirement leave; they went off last month. I can tell you that when we held the discussion, they were a number of people, well, we do not call their names. In the case of both these gentlemen who have left, that was the last year of their service.

You have acknowledged as a fact that you had to postpone this matter, and you had to send and call a number of people; are you still going to pass this Resolution when it affects the type of worker who can never afford to raise enough money to enjoy leave passages?

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

7.20 p.m.

I see this matter in this way: when you started off with leave passage it was started because in the colonies you could not get men competent and efficient to fill certain posts. You had to bring out men from England, Scotland and such places to fill certain posts in the colonies. The only condition under which they would come, was if you give them leave passage to go back home after a period of service. As time went on and the political complexion of this House changed, members of the Opposition felt that the chaps in Barbados were no different from those in British Guiana; the Opposition finding that leave passage was also given to the local men in British Guiana who were headmasters of the Colleges and people like them. We said that our local chaps should also get leave passages. What do you find in British Guiana? The druggist in charge of the dispensary gets it and he is a local man. What about the Barbadian? He should also get it. We said so. We all agreed that if you were given this privilege, it was no longer to be extended to the people whom you import, but to all people who reached a certain stage in the service. In doing so, you were following what was done in British Guiana.

Now, the Government of Barbados says that they have to save money. Would to God they would look in other directions and see where they can save money. Why should they withhold it from a few in the service who gave their best in their early days. Let me say that this Order does not affect one single imported official except the rascals whom we want to get rid of. This Order affects only one set of people. Barbados is no promotion to any person in the top bracket of the Colonial Service. A man is not coming here except for reasons of health.

I am not going to support this Resolution. I hope all members of the Opposition will not support it. If British Guiana can give it to their druggists, schoolmasters and people who are in charge of Departments, then we can give it to such Barbadians too. When Leave Passage Order first came to this Chamber it was held up for some time. We said that you must give it to the local people also, and you did that. Now the Government has come back to this House saying that for the sake of economy we must save some money on it. I am saying that you should not save on it at the expense of a man who has worked in this country for 45 years giving of his best.

You get men in this country starting off as an elementary school teacher possibly at the age of 13 years, and ending up as headmasters when they reach the age of 60 years. You can see that they

have put in 47 years of service. They started at \$2 a month; now they are getting \$180. Why should they not be entitled to leave passages in their last year of service? Is this the only way Barbados can save money? If you come to us, we will show you a lot of ways to save money. I am saying that this is not fair. Say what you like, this Order only affects the local people who can only get this opportunity in the last year of their service.

The Hon. Premier contradicted me and said it was pre-retirement; nevertheless, all those men who called at the Chief Secretary's Office were men to retire this very year they come back from leave. They are to retire this year. If that were an accident, it was not an accident when we made mention of it in this Chamber. We knew it as a fact.

I would like the Hon. Premier to answer one question. He said that when this matter was first put to the Civil Service (meaning the Civil Service Association) they agreed. I have contradicted that by saying that I have been officially and reliably informed (and I have got it from an Officer of the Civil Service Association) that that statement does not represent a statement of fact. When the matter was put to the Civil Service Association more than two years ago, they opposed it tooth and nail. And Government backed down on it. What I want the Hon. Premier to tell us is if they have changed their minds now.

I am in a position to say, and I hope the Civil Service Association would make me out not to be speaking the truth, that just a few weeks ago representation was made to me from the Civil Service Association that they felt that this amendment should not be put in the Order. I will go further than that and say that not only did they feel that it should not come down, but they were not even paid the courtesy of discussing this matter with them. Two years ago, you put it to them and they opposed it tooth and nail. They said: "Oh No! pigeon hole it; we will never agree to it."

I repeat that all of our local people will suffer as a result of this Order. The Government then said that they will put it aside. Now, the Hon. Premier is saying that when this was first put to the Civil Service Association they agreed with it. Somebody is misrepresenting the facts. If that is the case, I am prepared to come into this House and say that when it was brought to my attention they opposed it tooth and nail. You said that when it was first put to them they agreed with it. They are saying that that is not true; they disagreed with it and you pigeon holed it. I regret that I am unable to support this Resolution. I counsel honourable members not to support it. You will not be true to those who put you in here if you supported it.
7.30 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not be as lengthy as the last honourable member. He has put it so clearly, I think members should know where they stand. What I would like to ask Government is this: What can this save the Treasury? How much can the introduction of this be a saving to the Treasury? I would also like to know whether the regulations governing Leave Passages in Trinidad and British Guiana have been amended such as these, or if they give the same privileges they have always given up to the last year of the term?

Again, I would like to ask the Government, do they not think that at least those members of the Civil Service who for one reason or the other could not take advantage of Leave Passages during their time of office, mostly for financial reasons, should not be given an opportunity of going abroad and

enjoying the Leave Passages provided by Government? Leave Passages are looked on eventually as a part of the emoluments.

You can imagine the heart burn that some civil servants feel because certain members being better off financially, are able to take advantage of these passages every four or five years, and they have to look at them and forego them because their families might be big or because they may be embarrassed financially. They can only do so during their last year when they are going to get the gratuity.

I think it is but right that Government should extend that privilege to at least that section of the Civil Servants who could not take it earlier. You may argue that it is to bring them back in better shape, better health and better for the job; but as I said, it is part of the emoluments that civil servants expect to enjoy. They cannot all enjoy it for the reasons I have said, but at least, I think the heart-burn becomes greater when an amendment like this is made and they have to forego something they ought to get in their last days. I agree entirely with the last member who spoke. Again, I ask how much can it save the Government, if it is a saving of money they are after?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it was the honourable junior member for St. Peter who pointed out that the principle was rightly reported. That was, this is a Bill discriminating against Barbadians or West Indians recruited locally to the Barbados Civil Service. In this strain, after an interjection by the honourable senior member for St. Michael, the honourable junior member for St. Peter in February this year pointed out that overseas personnel got their passages back to the United Kingdom anyhow; not under the Leave Passages Order, but as part and parcel of their conditions of service to be repatriated. To give them Leave Passage or say you are now cutting down on their rates, is like saying you are not going to take any coal into Newcastle, because the people in Newcastle have coal, and carry home coal themselves.

I want to make the point which the honourable member for St. Peter pointed out to the Government benches absolutely clear. When the British recruited Officer finishes his period of service in Barbados, he is repatriated; having nothing to do with the Leave Passage Bill at all. He cannot get two passages for the same trip, so you are not doing him anything at all. But when you say in this amending Order, that if you have not taken your leave twelve months before retirement, you are not going to get any overseas Leave Passage, no matter what the reason you advance for giving people overseas leave paying passages, you are discriminating against locally recruited Civil Servants. Let us get that absolutely clear.

I entirely agree with the honourable junior member for Christ Church, the Leader of the Opposition, when he said that leave passage is part and parcel of the conditions of service of a Civil Servant. I will illustrate from the 1952 Order that there is more than one hardship which is imposed by the amendment which Government has brought today. In 1952, and it was rather significant, (I think the honourable member will be interested to know) I want it to go on record that the debate on that particular Order is not in the records. I do not know what the honourable member is pulling his nose for, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, but I want to go on record as stating now categorically because a search has been made by the Librarian, the honourable junior member for St.

Lucy and myself, and for some reason the debate is not on the record or files of this House. But my memory is not that short. Since the record is not here I am going to speak freely from mind.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph told members of this House that the rationality, the underlying cause, and the motive for introducing this Order, was the difficulty in recruiting personnel for the local service; and there was another reason. The other reason was that the backbenchers of his Party, I was then one of them, the late departed, were vociferous in their demands that it should be made to extend to minor personnel as well as to personnel who came from overseas; that there should be no discrimination, and the qualifying salary was fixed at \$2,160 a year, or £450 per annum or \$180 a month. I hope all these things go on record, because the records of 1952 has disappeared for some particular reason.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps I might be able to help the honourable member. I think when the actual Order was passed there was no debate. No debate took place.

Mr. BARROW: There was a debate. There was an introduction. I know what I am talking about, and there is not even a notion that any such thing occurred in this House. It was the most miraculous thing that went through this Chamber. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to tell the honourable member it was not left out because I myself have seen it.

Mr. BARROW: I am not saying it was not reported. The debate took place and was reported; but as far as the records of the House of Assembly are concerned, it has been removed for reasons best known to the people who removed it. I want to repeat that so that you can get it clear. I am telling the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that those were the reasons he gave then. If he has the record and it states what he said then, he can check on what he said.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I know what the honourable member is implying. He said that the record has been removed for some reason best known to the person who removed it, the implication being for dishonest reasons. If I can get a copy from outside here tonight I will show it to the honourable member.

Mr. BARROW: If I may save the honourable member the trouble, I would accept a certified copy, so that if he brings a copy after my suggestion that he removed it, or whether it was removed by a servant or else, all I am saying is this: I want the honourable member to tell the House whether the purpose and reasons were in order to enable us to get the personnel.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I was at the point where I had said that in 1952, the Order which we are now amending, came before this Chamber. It was debated and the reason for the Order being brought before this House, I have already explained; and that, to the best of my recollection, in the absence of the record, was the difficulty of recruiting suitable personnel to fill vacancies in the Public Service of this Island. There was no suggestion at that time that the 1952 Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) Order was other than an additional incentive tacked on to the prevailing conditions of service of Officers in other Colonies to apply for jobs in Barbados. But I must emphasise the point made by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, and it this: it was taken by honourable members of this Chamber, when the Order was introduced and passed, that that was

an additional condition of service, a condition of employment to which any member of the Public Service achieving the qualifying bracket of £450 per annum should feel himself entitled, as of right. Therefore persons have joined the Public Service with that belief, and under that impression since 1952; Officers in the Long Grade have worked up to the top of the Grade and are now looking forward to the benefit which they could derive from the 1952 Leave Passages Order.

Strange as it may seem, I am going to agree with one single Amendment in this Order and disagree with all the rest. In the 1952 Order, the words "at the qualifying salary in the Island or on duty outside the Island," did not appear in the definition of the word "service". In Article 2 of the Order, there are three definitions. The definition of "officer" is any persons earning the sum \$2,160 per annum and upwards; in other words, any person who is earning \$180 per month or £450 per annum. The only words used in the definition of "officer" is a person "whose basic salary is not less than \$2,160 per annum." In the definition of the word "service", all they say is this: "'service' means resident service in the island or on duty outside the Island including service before the commencement of this Order." Therefore the Amendment here, by putting the words "at the qualifying salary in the Island or on duty outside the Island," would be an Amendment which must be acceptable to all by the sheer weight of its obviousness and the commonsense underlying it. The Government could not intend that two weeks after getting his qualifying salary, a Long Grade Clerk would be entitled to his Leave Passages under the 1952 Order; but there is no other merit in this Amendment at all, apart from that which I have expressed my willingness to support.

The other Clauses in this Amendment go on to cut down not only the accrued rights of Civil Servants who have joined the Service since the Order was made, but also to cut down the accrued rights of Long Grade Clerks who have put in 15 years before 1952, and who since 1952, have put in the qualifying number of years. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph himself provided the answer when he said that they are cutting down on the accrued rights of persons; all he has said is that two wrongs make a right, and that they are cutting down on both parties. But they are not cutting down at all; do not tell me that you are cutting down on the Barbadians and on the fellows overseas also. The importees are entitled to return passages anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if I were able to rightly express my feelings on the statement which has been made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I am sure that Your Honour would consider me as unparliamentary; therefore I would refrain from so doing. I would use language so strong that despite the provocation in a matter of this kind and the flagrant offence to one's sense of honesty and commonsense, I feel that Your Honour would be justified in saying that my language would be unparliamentary. How could you be cutting down on a man who has come from England? This Government, within three months of Doctors coming out here, has been paying their passages back to the United Kingdom when they had got fed-up here; the Hon. Minister of Social Services should know more about that than anybody else. Doctors have called for their return passages to England on the ground that misrepresentations had been made to them by the Crown Agents for the Colonies and by the Colonial Office itself in respect of matters like Income Tax and matters of that kind. 7.50 p.m.

There are at least three Barbadian doctors whom I can name who did not come back for a refund of passage because they stayed here to practise. They stayed at the General Hospital in many instances for two years. The Barbados Government wanted to sue them for breach of contract for the cost of bringing them out here, but as far as the English officials are concerned, you are not cutting down on their rates. They are getting return passages whether they stay three months or three years. That is the practice which is going on in this country. Sir, there is a long list of doctors who have come down here and have not given the Barbados Government a whole contractual period or even a respectable period of it; and some who were repatriated to the United Kingdom. [A VOICE: Oh, no.] Is it that they wanted to go back? They are given return passages; but you are cutting down on the privilege to Barbadians.

The Order in 1952 said that at the end of three years' service an officer (that is somebody working for \$180 and upwards) will have been entitled to the return cost of passage to the United Kingdom; or if he went somewhere else, to the cheapest fare for himself and his wife to that country. Now in Article 3, of the amendment to Clause 3 of this Order, we are saying that no officer will be entitled to payment of passages during the last twelve months of his service. The reason advanced for that from the many garble remarks from that side of the table, is that today the Government considers the purpose of Leave Passage is for an officer to go to England to get refreshed. That was not in the original Order made in 1952. Therefore, if an officer goes overseas during the last twelve months of his service, he is not going to get Leave Passage; and if he is due to retire he has to take it and give Government twelve months service afterwards. You have to refresh him for only twelve months. By that time he would have become inure to the work of Barbados when he needs refreshment after all those years of service, whether he is a schoolmaster or a clerk in the Audit Office.

I am saying that this is something to which a Civil Servant is entitled to as his right. I am also going further than that. I am going to say that I will press to see Civil Servants get this money to help them to pay off their mortgages or to buy a piece of land. As a matter of fact, he should get it even if he went to Bathsheba. Bathsheba is as good as any health resort in England. Any of our popular beaches is as good as any in England. If he prefers to go to Silver Sands or Bathsheba he should still get it. I am saying that it is part of his emoluments and he should get it.

As long as he is not on a stuffy office, he will be enjoying a change of atmosphere if he goes to any of those places. Then again, some people do not like travelling. Do you want to tell me that the man who do not want to travel in an airplane should be made a victim? I repeat that it is part and parcel of their emoluments. You should give it to them. You have no right cutting down on them. They want a freer and fuller life; not a restricted life as this Government is trying to impose on them. What is happening nowadays is that you have people winning the Barbados Scholarship spending anything like ten years in the United Kingdom, and you do not tell them that they have to come back here and work for you. You are denying the Civil Servant who has given anything like 30 or 40 years of service of Leave Passage. You do not tell the Barbados Scholar that he has to come back here and work although he is getting something free, gratis and for nothing, to sit an examination. As regards the Civil Servant, his consideration has already been established

in consideration of the loyal service he has given. That is why he is entitled to Leave Passage.

I would like an amendment put in so that if he has retired within three years of his retirement he can be entitled to it. Why in 1956 do you want to cut down on these rights? Are we retrogressing? We have a Bill cutting down on the size of land and now you are cutting down on the rewards to the Civil Servants. When you look at the real position, you are not cutting down on the other fellow. I am not going to vote for this amendment at all.

As regards Article 4 of the principal Order, you are amending it so that in the case of a return passage the amount will be doubled. That is unnecessary and tautological because it is sufficiently clear from the rest of the Bill that you can give the return passage where it is necessary. Section (iii) of the added proviso to Article 4 reads as follows:—

- (iii) where the officer's departure has been delayed at the request of Government made subsequently to the booking of the passage."

That particular amendment is also unnecessary.

As regards the qualifying period of 24 months which is contained in Article 5, we stated that an officer shall be eligible for the payment of passages for himself and his wife to an amount in the proportion which his period of service in any one tour bears to the maximum tour provided he has completed at least 24 months of his tour of service."

We have now put in Article 2 that this shall only apply to an officer recruited from overseas. I will like hon. members to look at that Article very carefully because it is an encroachment on the rights of the local recruited Civil Servants. I really do not understand how the Government could have the temerity to bring in an amendment to the Civil Establishment Order of this kind.

I do not really understand why the Government has come to this Chamber with an amendment to this Civil Establishment Order at this time. Nobody has complained. It is now part of your policy. Before I sit, I would like Government to answer this question: why consult a corporate body like the Whitley Council if it is part of your policy to ignore or over ride their expressions of opinion? Is Government merely saying, that we only consult people like them on the increase of salaries in 1952 or 1953, to tell them they are being efficient. The Government has lost touch with the people whom they represent, if this is the way they treat their own servants in their own houses.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be as long as the honourable senior member for St. George. I propose to take the same stand in this issue as I took when it came here. I do not subscribe to the idea that this leave passage arrangement was based on the idea of not providing a man with his leave passage in his last year of service. I would like to remind the Premier, (because I believe I had a lot to do with this) that the original idea of leave passage was not in truth and in fact for Barbadians as such. It was really to assist in the problem of recruitment of people from overseas; but we found that members of the Government were opposed to the idea of only providing leave passage for people coming from expatriate countries.

I would like to remind the Hon. Premier that there was no question of the last year of service. It did not arise at that stage; it was unnecessary to arise. I believe in my humble opinion that from the point of view of finance, more is made of the last year of service. That is a fact. From simple arithmetical calculations (it does not take a mathematician of the first order) to agree that a man can

only qualify so many times in his period; it is because they are some old Civil Servants in Barbados who has never went behind Pelican Island and this was the opportunity of giving some of them an opportunity of seeing some of their relatives in some other part of the world.

When you consider the reason why this was done, I do not agree at this stage to withdraw what I regard as a privilege you will guarantee to the Civil Servants on the basis of the last year's service. I feel that there are a few old cases you are going to get in the last year of service. And as we have already heard, some of these Civil Servants in Barbados have never made substantial savings; and if you are going to provide leave passages, I was wondering if you stick close to this, if it is not going to be controversial and be looked upon as if you are really depriving them of something during the last year of service.

I would like to remind the Hon. Premier that this is going to open the way for some people in Barbados to say that the Holiday with Pay Act should be amended. In that Act if a servant beats a master, though he can be charged with a criminal offence and dismissed without pay for breaking the contract, he must get holiday with pay. I know that some employers are saying they still have to give employees holiday with pay though they have stolen something. The Act provides that you must pay. There are some members here when it comes to private expenses or privileges they would like the Civil Servant on a basis that they have worked; because they come along and never found these privileges, these are too many for them to have. People believe that as long as some people get privileges which they did not get ten years ago, you are not entitled to it. Some people object on the basis that you should not have leave passages at all, but it has nothing to do with this.

This is dealing with leave passages. It only deals with not providing the payment of passages in the last twelve months of service; and it was just pointed out, and I have already made that statement, that an ex-patriate officer is not entitled to leave passage but entitled to return passage at the end of his day. [A VOICE: He cannot get both.] On that basis he would have to have a tour of longer than two years.

My contention is, Mr. Speaker, I do not see why at this stage we should quibble over this part of the last payment of a man's service. All it means now is that those people who are eligible would take it before the last twelve months. What I would say on the point which the Premier made as regards the man going for holiday and coming back to be of service, what happened on that occasion was not that; but other territories were providing leave passages, and if we did not provide leave passages under the same conditions it meant we would not get officers coming to Barbados. They were going elsewhere.

I believe it would be very unpopular to say because a man does not come back, he is not entitled to leave passage. He might have served for a very long period, perhaps twenty-five years, and never had any privilege of going out. But because he is not coming back it should not disqualify him. It is just like pre-retirement leave. The Act allows pre-retirement leave on a basis that if he has served a long period of years, it guarantees his privilege; whether you give him at a time before he retires from the service, because he must have been of some service to the colony.

This amendment reduces the leave passage to the extent that a man cannot get it in the last twelve months of his service. I really did not hear

the figures read out. I did not know the figures were read out to show the amount of money involved. The House might have been led to believe that they are substantial portions of money which you are going to be saved; but in truth and in fact, it might not be much, because though Government might not pay the passage for a man, it might cost more than the passage for him to live in either the United Kingdom or North America. If he is not fortunate to be living with relatives or friends, you can see what it would cost. So it means when a man goes on this type of holiday he must look for some type of money.

I am not at all clear in my mind that the Civil Service Association — I would say to the honourable senior member for St. George, and the Premier, (and I hope that they are some Civil Servants around) that you cannot rely on the Civil Service Association one way for an opinion. When they feel frightened, they will say "yes" and on other occasions they will say "no." The mentality of the Civil Service is such now that when they retire and come here, they come to sleep. When the Government of Barbados is finished with you, you are done with; you are only good for the waste paper basket. And when you weigh the situation of which you have had instances in this Chamber, you are fortunate to be relieved of them. That is the whole idea of the Civil Service Association. That is why it is the modern organisation that it is when the honourable senior member for St. George made the point.

8.10 p.m.

The Hon. Premier knows that you can afford to ignore the Civil Service Association, from what it represents; they have a big election whenever they want Officers, but after that there is the grand finale. Ask the people of the Civil Service today how much confidence they repose in the Civil Service Association; when they send anybody to Jamaica or elsewhere, they have to ask the Government to lend them money to send the person there. The Whitley Council is a very nice Organisation; this matter has been handed down from the Whitley Council, and I do agree that they should be recognised; but you cannot rely on what the Civil Service Association is saying, because you do not know that they are really and truly representing the point of view they are supposed to represent. If anybody wants a pension, he goes up to the Ministers. This is a statement which I would like to make: I do not have to go around and look into people's faces and ask them to vote for me; you vote how you like. There are matters on the Statute Book now, which, if the Civil Service Association were a virile Association, they would ask the Government to amend them. We pledge to represent people, but some of them deserve this treatment; such hard treatment will make a man a good Trade Unionist.

Looking at this matter as a Legislator, I do not feel that the Government is going to save much money by this proposal here. I do not like the Clause, which is a retrospective Clause, going back to May, 1955; if you put it back to that date, it will exclude somebody who did not know about it.

On the question of Leave Passages, I feel that the Government should be prepared to make a statement now. I feel that the Government should say, if they are in favour of Leave Passages, how far they intend to go with them. I say: if you want to go away, look for your own passage. I do not get any Leave Passages, although it is true that I get some free passages; I do not get any passage because I have served for a long time. If the Government feel that this question of Leave Passages is too costly, let them cut out this business. I want to make it quite clear that if a man is working for \$600 a month, he should

be able to save money in Barbados, no matter who he is. [Mr E. D. MOTTLEY: Do you mean a Minister?] I do not mind whether he is a Minister or a Pope! [Laughter]. The only way in which a man who is working for \$600 a month in Barbados cannot save any money is if he has about 18 wives. When it comes to a man in this bracket, when you provide him with Leave Passages, you provide him with an additional income which is free of Income Tax. I think it is time that the Government should look into this question of salaries which are paid to members of this House. I make the point, however that the money provided for Leave Passages is free of Income Tax. Imagine a man who has to pay Income Tax when he has to go anywhere! I say that this is an additional income without Income Tax.

I maintain that if the Government has reached a stage where they will have to stop the payment of Leave Passages on the basis of local people, then let them say so. We have followed Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana, but if we feel that we cannot follow them in the matter of recruiting people, well, I will say that the average Barbadian will not quarrel if he does not get any Leave Passages, but he will quarrel if you give them to other people and not to him as well. I hope that if the Government feel that Leave Passages should come to an end, then they will put them to an end; but I do not like the idea of taking out a section at the end and cutting it off. That is why I said that I do not like this matter to appear as if you are discriminatory.

8.20 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, the whole trend of the arguments of some hon. members is nothing but discriminatory. Hon. members should not forget the principle of these Leave Passages. I cannot avoid using an expression of opinion which is contrary to that of those persons who seem to be interested in furthering classes among Government servants and the community generally.

Some hon. members have limited their arguments on Leave Passage or pre-retirement leave to a Headmaster. I do not know if those hon. members are sufficiently serious in their argument. What about the junior teacher if he gives of his best? Is he not entitled to this kindness of the Government? What about the Janitor of the same school although his task may be considered as menial? If he does it to the best of his ability and with the consciousness to serve, is not he as much entitled to this generosity of the Government as the Head of the School? What about the junior Civil Servant, the artisans, the scavengers, the porters, the nurses, the cantoneers, the cooks, the engineers, the masons and the lorry drivers? All of those people have given service of the highest quality in many respects to the community, and are not they entitled to claim this privilege from the Government?

I only brought up that point, Mr. Speaker, to counteract the argument which some hon. members are trying to put in this debate. I do not believe in segregating one section of the community and giving them a cushioned life at the expense of another section which has equally done good service. We cannot give everybody Leave Passages; there would be too many thousands to give. If we give it to all of them, we would not be able to give them the other necessities of life; therefore, inasmuch as we cannot give it to all we should not give any unless in cases of the few technical officers who are indispensable.

I know my argument will be considered as contrary, and possibly unpopular; but we must be practical, Mr. Speaker. My argument is the same as when Leave Passage Order was first introduced in this Chamber, when we found it difficult to recruit mathe-

matical masters for the Lodge School and Harrison College, as well as efficient members of the staff of the Agricultural Department whose knowledge helps to enhance the life of the colony, as well as the Specialists at the Hospital whose services we cannot do without. I hate the attitude which has been adopted by some hon. members in picking out a particular section of officers for this reward.

Speaking of such Headmasters and Civil Servants whom some hon. members say should get it, you are causing them to involve themselves in further debt, by their going and mortgaging their houses or getting a note backed, just to succeed in utilising Leave Passage which this Government so stupidly has given to people too low down the brackets of the Service.

A VOICE: Yet you say that you want it lowered so that all people can get it.

Mr. ALLDER: My argument is not a question of lowering it; I do not want it lowered. My argument is if you have come down to the point where you have, come down the whole hog or go back up to the point where it should be. That is, give it to people whom it is difficult to recruit, and to let it serve as an inducement to those specialists personnel of the Civil Service whose services we cannot pick up as easily as the services of other people in the colony. Every person who has served Government has given service. That service differs in quality but not in proportion. Do you mean to tell me that it is wise for a headmaster who is about to retire but who cannot afford to take a trip abroad to go and back a note, or ask the hon. senior member for the City or the hon. junior member for Christ Church the favour of doing that for him, just because the Government is willing to grant himself, his wife and family Leave Passage? When you give such people Leave Passage, you are only helping to put them into more difficulties.

It is the people who have to contribute to the cost of these Leave Passages through taxation, either directly or indirectly. Leave Passage is nothing else but a luxury. Government should not encourage any class or section of the community to stupidly indulge in any spate of luxury at the expense of the thousands of other people in the community who daily have to go without the ordinary necessities of life, some of whom cannot even purchase a loaf of bread.

Sir, that is all that this Leave Passage means. When Mr. X goes and take advantage of it, taking with him his wife and family, it is not that he ever had it in mind; it is because the Government made it possible for him to do so. That is my humble opinion. When he takes advantage of it, the cost has to be paid by the poor woman in St. Andrew, St. Peter, St. John and St. Lucy, who does not have a job or who depends in many instances on Old Age Pension or a parochial pension. It is people like her who has to pay the cost of these discriminatory arguments which some hon. members are putting up and accusing the Government of practising. Those hon. members are doing nothing more than trying to perpetuate the same discriminatory practices of Government by suggesting that a headmaster and certain Civil Servants above a certain bracket should get Leave Passage. They are in effect saying that Mr. X who is employed at the Government Industrial School and Mr. Y who is a headmaster must not be deprived of it. But, what about the attendants at the Government Industrial School; what about the junior teachers? Have they not given service as well? Hon. members are not willing to go that far, but in my humble opinion, Government should be no less kind to the least of its servants who have done their share of service than to the Headmaster or Head of a Department or somebody second to him.

Now, Sir, this is not any new argument which I am producing. From the time Leave Passage Order was brought to this Chamber I said that ministers of the Anglican Church should not be entitled to it. As a matter of fact, some of them have taken me to task about it. I told them that they did not expect it and Government was foolish to give it to them. After it was put in force, Government brought down a Resolution making it possible that a clergyman of the Anglican Church, his wife and children could go on vacation to any part of Europe. I am sure these people were surprised that they were granted this concession; and it is the same feeling with several others in the Service.

8.30 p.m.

The labouring masses in the streets, by buying a penny loaf of bread and a pack of cigarettes, can they hope to go anywhere? The hon. members are deciding to play politics with one particular section. I feel it is too heavy a burden. Some hon. members only look at the cost of the passage, but as a member of a School Board in this colony, I know it gives a lot of difficulty. Many members of the staff are competing against each other for leave at a time when the school cannot afford to dispense with their services, however short the duration might be. What is more, you have to bring in other people to act, which means the additional cost is added. It might sound ridiculous Sir, in fact some hon. members may feel it is ridiculous, but in my opinion it is not one of ridicule. If the Headmaster is entitled, his assistant is equally entitled; and the junior teachers, those who are put on to act and are given less per day for acting than they really deserve. These people also give of their best. These people are equally entitled to any sympathy and consideration of Government.

I do not want anybody to tell me that the revenue of the country cannot be stretched that far to give all of them leave passages; and because of that, let us carry it back to the limits not of imported officials. I do not want the hon. senior member for the City to tell me what to say. If you want a surgeon at the Hospital, a radiologist or persons of that sort, you cannot walk down Broad Street and say: "Here mister, come and do this radiology for me!" Well, then to induce them to come from overseas, their salaries and conditions of employment must be better. I would say give them what they would get in their respective countries. But when it comes to the ordinary teaching fraternity (and I said ordinary, because Barbadians are educationally inclined if given an opportunity to develop these propensities); when a thing can be found in 99 out of 100 of our population it becomes common. We train you and let you in turn train our children; so when it comes to a mathematical master whom you might find it difficult to recruit locally, give him because we know other countries and colonies are offering him concessions which might prevent him from coming to you. Stretch it to him; but do not tell me that non-grade or secondary or even first-grade Civil Servant, because it is a popular thing to argue, should be entitled to it, when there are others in the same Department many of whom might have done greater service to the community than him, never hopes to get anything. Tell me: the lorry driver or cantonnier working in the sun for twenty or thirty years when he is ready to retire, what does he get? Can he think of getting Leave Passage or the cost of a trip to Speightstown paid by Government? He has to have strings pulled to get a reasonable gratuity.

I know that Government at times cannot please every section of the community. It cannot at all times please all of its servants; and instead of trying to save a couple of hundred dollars, Mr. Speaker, I am

hoping as I said, that the next time it comes down here it would be cut right off; as far as technical officers of the Government, they should be excluded from the cutting off. I hope hon. members understand the point I am trying to make.

I repeat: the Doctor at the Hospital, the Specialists, the technical officers of the Agricultural Department, the Scientific Officers, the Mathematical masters at the schools. Beyond them, I am unwilling to give as far as Leave Passages are concerned. [A VOICE: What about Science masters?] That is what I said; I thought the hon. member would understand. I suggest all specialists in the Government's employ who cannot be easily recruited locally. I would give them because their abilities can attract other Governments whose resources are better than ours; otherwise inasmuch as you cannot extend it to all and sundry who have given of their best in the Government's employ, I would limit it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling.

LEAVE PASSAGES—Cont'd

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the hon. junior member for St. John was addressing the House. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, as I reminded the House on the last occasion, I think that the present Leave Passages Order, came to this House at the special request of the House; I think, in the first place, the Government intended doing something on the lines recommended by the hon. senior member for St. John, but the House said that this privilege should be extended downwards, and I think that in deference to the wishes of this House, the present Leave Passages Order came down to the House, including persons who receive a salary of \$2,160 per annum or thereabouts. Sir, if you are going to extend this privilege so low, then everybody in that category should have it, and they should have it on the terms laid down in the Order; that is to say, if people are to have Leave Passages at every 3½ years or 4 years, that is how it should be. I told this Government on the last occasion that it was wrong, in my opinion, to regard a holiday at any time in the nature of a training course, and that they could not insist upon persons coming back to work for the Government.

On that occasion, too, the point was made that many a class of employee getting a salary which qualified them for Leave Passages, got it late in life in the service, and on account of raising a family, they might not have accumulated any money on which they could get a holiday, and it was on the strength of their gratuity that they could afford this holiday. I see no reason why, if you have a certain Salary Scale, Leave Passages should not apply to that Salary Scale; you should not make any discrimination against persons who are in the last stage of their retirement if they stick to the time they should qualify for Leave Passages. If the Government want to save money on Leave Passages, all it has to say is this "I am not extending it down to this salary Grade," and nobody could get vexed with them. This is not anything which was in existence all the

time; this is something which was brought in as something extra, so as to meet certain conditions which existed in 1952, and it was the express wish of the House that it should go down to where it is. Do not let us discriminate inside the salary brackets at any particular time; there is no reason to do that especially when you can quite see that in the case of expatriates, you have to contribute to their passages back home. It is possible that some Civil Servant recruited in England might go back in January, or he goes back to England and is transferred at the end of the year, and you might find yourself having to pay his passages in a year's time. There may be circumstances in which you have an Attorney General who has got his leave here and he might get appointed somewhere else; what happens in his case? You have to pay his passage back anyhow. Sir, this is a wrong thing to do; it is a wrong way to save money on Leave Passages, and I counsel the Government once again not to pursue it.

Some years ago, when we were taking a census in this Country, you will remember that the C.D. & W. or some other Organisation paid the cost of taking that census. When the matter came in here to be approved, hon. members agreed that there should be put in the question as to ownership of land. Do you know, Sir, that when the time came for the payment for this additional question, C.D. & W. asked that this House should stand the responsibility of paying for it? It appears to me that since these Leave Passages went down as low as they went in the salary scale, somebody wanted to get back to the House with this type of Amendment. I cannot imagine that this Amendment suggested itself to any Minister of the Government; I am of the opinion that some expatriate has put this idea into their heads, and they have fallen for it as they fall for these opinions from these sources.

If you increase the salaries of the Civil Servants, you will add to the number of people who are getting Leave Passages. This is an extra perquisite which you are giving Civil Servants, and they are now getting other perquisites in the way of loans at a small rate of interest for acquiring homes and so on. I do not think that they have any kick, but do not let it be said that just where a man or woman cannot save anything on the small salary which he or she has been getting gratuity by which they can pay their way, you are robbing them. I do not care how anybody looks at it, this Amendment can only be designed to prevent Civil Servants from getting this privilege after they have qualified for it. That is what it is, and I am sorry that hon. members of the Government cannot see it in that light.

On the last occasion, instances were mentioned which would support the idea that they were specially designed against certain people, and all the protection which these people have got they have been given by the Other Place.

One of the worse features of this matter was that on the last occasion when this Order came out of the blue, it was made retroactive for nearly a year. It was passed at the end of February and a Clause was put into it stating that it was effective as from May 1955. Certainly, that was going back a long time. On this occasion we are giving them the opportunity to put their houses in order because we are allowing them to stay in the Order that Article 3 shall come into operation on the first of November this year. I have no doubt that such persons who feel they may lose it, whether they inconvenience Government or not are going to beg somebody to back a note for them so that they can take their leave before the time that they would lose it. I am sure that they are not going to wait until the last month.

I do not see what the Government has to gain from this, nor can Government get away from the fact that this discriminatory legislation.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no getting away from facing the fact that the Civil Servant is a privileged worker in the community. It also has to be borne in mind that it takes him fifteen years before he can qualify for Leave Passage. If the clerks in Bridgetown had such a privilege, I think they would all recognise it.

Sir, I cannot for the life of me see if Government provides Leave Passage for a man, his wife and two children to travel to England, Canada or the United States when he reaches the salary scale of \$180 per month and upward, why you should just say that you must use this privilege in your last year of service. The principle underlining our allowance of this privilege is that you should take time off with your family, or part of it, to go abroad as a sort of refreshment, vacation or rest, in recognition of your past service and come back and give Government further service. [A VOICE: Why?] That is a privilege we are granting them, you should not take privilege during your last year of service because that destroys the principle on which we are granting it. [A VOICE: Then a man must not take it.] I am not saying that they must not take it, I am saying that they should take it before they reach the age of retirement. Mr. C. W. Cumberbatch took advantage of it before reaching his age of retirement.

If a few people for one reason or the other are not able to take advantage of it before their last year of service, that does not destroy the principle. It is there for you with the one stipulation that you must not take advantage of it in the last year of your service. You can take advantage of it up to the year before your last year of retirement. I do not see any great injustice in that, therefore, I am going to vote for this Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that if any other member wants to speak on this Resolution to do so before I reply, otherwise I shall draw Your Honour's attention to the rule which entitles me to speak in reply to anybody who speaks after me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my position in this matter is quite clear. On the last occasion when it was before the House, I expressed my direct opposition to it. I therefore do not intend to waste the time of this House again to repeat what I then said. I merely rise because I find it difficult to assimilate the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John. He used to bear in this House a reputation for some sort of reason, and if now he wants to make it appear that that reputation was mistaken, he can find no better way of going about it than talking in the way he did just now. He began by admitting that it takes the average Civil Servant fifteen years to qualify for Leave Passage. [A VOICE: It takes longer than that]. He said that it takes fifteen years for a Civil Servant to work for \$180 a month. A man like him gets up here and suggests that a man with a family working for \$180 a month because his passage is paid to England, can pick up himself and go and live in England on a vacation with his wife and family the moment he qualifies.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of order. I never said the moment he qualified for Leave Passage. I never used that statement, nor did I imply it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He said that you get it after fifteen years' service, and in his opinion with this \$180 per month which you get at that time, you can go to England taking with you your wife and two

children because Government is paying your passages. Apparently, because he can live—

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. You do not qualify for Leave Passage until you work three and a half years at that salary. That is in the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is within the knowledge of the average human being who lives a normal existence, a normal family life, and who has some idea of the average cost of living for a family, that no man with a wife and children who is working for \$240 a month, having children to educate, probably to send to a University. Many of our teachers and Civil Servants are not only sending their children to secondary and first grade schools, but are sending them to the University of the West Indies.

9.55 p.m.

No normal parent is going to deny his child an opportunity of going to England or to America to a University, merely to gratify the visit of himself and his wife to America, because the Government said he could not go if he does not give them a specified time. A man's first duty, Mr. Speaker, is to his family and children; not to himself to go on vacation because he gets the passage money. You cannot support your wife and children in England on a salary of £50 a month; and the average Barbadian father or mother with their deep sense of obligation to their children are prepared to make all personal sacrifices on their own part for these children. You are not going to find the average parent picking up himself and going to America or England merely because he gets his passage paid at the expense of the furtherance of his children's education. Why do the other West Indian Governments not find it necessary to impose similar conditions?

Is the hon. member aware that in the same Order before us, an expatriate officer is entitled to a proportionate part of his Leave Passage after two years of service? After twenty-four months of service he is entitled to some proportion of the cost for his wife, if married, as the period of service so completed bears to forty-two months. It is manifest to everybody except somebody who purposely does not want to see it, that this amendment must militate against your Civil Servants; and the hon. member knows that too; but he believes that he is one of those people who is so intellectually superior that he can come here and put up a defence on any matter; and because he may try to satisfy his own conscience, he believes he can fool other people with it.

If the hon. member were not playing with the Government Party he would be singing an entirely different tune. Anybody can agree with them coming in here and expressing themselves in a manner which they honestly believe on any matter before the House; but do not come in here and try to make out a case that you yourself do not believe.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I object to the hon. member saying I made a statement which I did not believe. I have made an argument for it as I see it. If he does not agree he does not agree, but I object to him saying that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I wonder if the hon. member remembers the position he adopted when the Leave Passage Order was first before the House? Do you mean to tell me that within a short space of two years, the hon. member who was diametrically opposed to Leave Passages, can now not only support it but support it and discriminate against Civil Servants like himself, born and bred in Barbados? And he wants to tell me that he is honest in his convictions on this matter that he expressed these views on Leave Passages? The only conclusion I can come to is that if he is honest now he was dishonest then.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, today a man may support a certain thing which he honestly does not see

the reason for objecting to. Many a statesman has changed his views on certain policies which is perfectly valid; it does not mean that he is dishonest.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member really provided the answer to the House. Of course when he talks about statesmen changing their views, one wonders how he can think of himself in the same breath because with these rapid changes in view, he might be entitled to an appellation beginning with an "S"—simpleton. But not statesman; and he tells me you are entitled to change your view for reasons: certainly but for what reasons, reasons of conviction I agree with him that you are entitled to change your views for reasons.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I never said anything about changing one's views for reasons. I will not stay here and let him put into my mouth things I have not said. Whatever I said I can intelligently repeat at any time before any public. He cannot frighten me from it; he has not got the rational foundation to do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member means that he changed his views without reasons; no reason at all. One day he abuses the Government on something, and another day he supports the Government and says something different. That is the type of man we are dealing with. Since that is the sort of member we are dealing with, it is an absolute waste of time. At least, Sir, if you are going to put up yourself as a representative of the people in Parliament, you should be able to advance some kind of reason for changing your view. When we first discussed Leave Passages he held one view, but since then the Government has smiled on him, and for reasons purely economic, he has now changed his view.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I object to these insinuations. Any hon. member must be able to air his views without being charged with wrong things. I said I am capable of defending any issue. A statesman may have any view on any issue today and a different view tomorrow. The greatest of them have done it, because you hold a certain conviction this week which you may not have seen an argument then for changing it. It does not mean you will hold them next year. That is a fact from life and reason. A man does not hold a view like the hon. member who just sat down for the whole of his life.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member speaks, there was a remark which I caught with reference to the hon. member changing his views for reasons economic. I do not think that is the sort of remark the hon. member should make in reference to any member in this Chamber. It is a most unfortunate remark. I think the hon. member should desist from making any more remarks of that nature.

10.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point really is that since the hon. member has said himself that he had no logical reasons for changing his views, one is, to some extent, justified in speculating what the other reasons might be. From his line of argument, it seems now perfectly clear to me that at least two years ago, he adopted one line of argument and being this famous intellectual statesman that he is, entitled today to present another line of reasoning; and one never knows whether his genius will enable him by this and the end of the year when he gets to St. John, to bring about another line of argument.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has paid sufficient attention to the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely want to inform the House that in the future we can look forward to people changing their views from week to week and in extenuation of that calling themselves statesmen.

I was saying, Sir, that in this Order before us, there cannot be any justification at all for what the Government proposes to do. The House has been told that the Civil Service Association does not agree with this change; indeed, I cannot imagine meeting any Civil Servant who would agree with it. Since we, in the West Indies are thinking in terms of West Indianisation of the service, and since the trend is to employ as many local men as possible in Government posts, does this not mean that we are discriminating against the majority in favour of the few? There should be no stipulation at all as to when a man should be compelled to avail himself of Leave Passages; that is something which should be left to him. When he regards himself as best able to avail himself of Leave Passages, when the education of his children has reached a particular stage, he should be able to say: "I can afford to give myself a holiday; a firm foundation has been laid for my children." Nothing which has been said so far today, and nothing which could be said, can change the unanswerable argument that in this Amendment the privileges of expatriate officers are well protected whereas the fundamental rights of the local Civil Servant are being denied him.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is a bit late, and it may be that, in normal circumstances, I would not make a reply because everything which might have been addressed by way of argument, has been addressed before and replied to. Matters which have been advanced in the way of abuse have been advanced before, and they will be advanced again. If I reply to some of the accusations which have been made, it is because when we deal with the work of the Salaries Commissioner, these questions may arise. If I misquote the hon. senior member for the City, I hope that he will stop me and say that I am misquoting him. Let me first remind the House of what I said. This matter was discussed in Executive Committee; it was put before the Civil Service Association. The Whitley Council met and at first they thought it a good thing; they thought it a reasonable proposition and agreed to the principle of it. They changed their minds afterwards. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No, No!] I said over and over again that at first the Whitley Council agreed with the principle and they later changed their minds.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member never said that they later changed their minds; he said, if they have later changed their minds.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not accusing the hon. member of any indirect untruth, in spite of the fact that he constantly accuses me and he did it tonight. I have said that they later changed their minds; one of the reasons was that they have discovered that this thing was not done in other Islands. That was all the information they had. The hon. member went on to say that they were surprised to read in the *Advocate* that the Government was coming down here with the matter. I take it that he means now.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That was in February when the matter was dealt with here. They said that the matter was before them two years ago; they expressed their view and objected to it, and they were surprised to see that it would be brought up again. They expressed that view the day after the *Advocate* carried the report that the matter was dealt with in the House.

10.15 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in August 1954, I raised this point with the Executive Committee. I believe that the meeting of the Whitley Council took place before that. Around and about the time that the matter was discussed by the Executive Committee, a memorandum was circulated to the

Whitley Council. That would be before the meeting of the Executive Committee took place. As far as the dates are concerned, I have them before me. On the 19th August, 1954, I raised the matter with the Executive Committee. The note which I have before me is this: the Premier suggests that the policy of Leave Passage should be reviewed with a view of disallowing Leave Passage to officers other than an officer returning finally to his home which is pre-retirement or immediately prior to retirement as stated, that is, an Officer who served over a specified period, say, two years after being granted Leave Passage.

I have discovered that on the 6th August 1954, in short, two weeks before I made that suggestion to the Executive Committee, unknown to me the matter had been dealt with by the Whitley Council. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is before you dealt with it?] Yes. It never seems to occur to the hon. senior member for the City that instead of accusing me of not speaking the truth, however indirectly might be his remarks, that the Civil Servant who interviewed him might not be speaking the truth (I would not say deliberately) but because he was suffering from a faulty memory. However, the public will be able to judge who is misleading it. I will only say that it never seems to occur to him that a Civil Servant may have an axe to grind or may be suffering from a faulty memory, or did not explain himself carefully. The hon. senior member for the City is at pains if he has a different version from a solemn statement made from these benches to say that we are not speaking the truth, but his informant is speaking the truth.

The hon. member goes further by saying that he was surprised we did not pay the Civil Servants the decent courtesy to tell them that we were proceeding with it. That is after 1954. Neither of these statements is true.

I have before me dated the 6th August 1954 that the Whitley Council met and considered a memorandum that had been circulated to them. I repeat that was before I raised the matter in Executive Committee. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is on 6th August 1954]. I repeat, yes. It was stated that cases have recently occurred where officers had been granted Leave Passages only to retire shortly after resumption of their duties. It was felt that the Government stood to earn little or no benefit from the award of Leave Passages under these conditions, and that some action should be taken to control what was considered an abuse of the purpose for which Leave Passage had been granted. That was what the Whitley Council said to themselves. The Vice-Chairman informed us that the Whitley Council had agreed in principle with the items of the memorandum and considered that some provision would be necessary in order to safeguard all those officers who were eligible for Leave Passage and were due to retire shortly. It was two weeks roughly before I raised it in Executive Committee that the matter was dealt with by the Whitley Council. [A VOICE: That was on the 6th August, 1952].

A number of Civil Servants got together and said that an Order should be brought up that everybody who was entitled to Leave Passage should agree after taking advantage of it to come back and give three and a half years' service to the Government. That came to nothing because after consultation with different Law Officers by the Government, it was felt that that should not be pressed.

I have a copy of a cable before me containing the very words that I have just read out to honourable members. The words were used by this Government making enquiries in different colonies as to whether they also had these restrictions. They

are the very words used by the staff side of the Whitley Council. Subsequently to that, after receiving cables from abroad, they said: "Let the matter stay as it was." [A VOICE: That was in 1954] I said they agreed to it as it was and then they changed their minds. I am only giving honourable members chronologically what they said. The hon. senior member for the City has said that I could not prove what I was saying.

10.25 p.m.

Subsequently, Sir, later near the end of 1954, they decided not to pursue the question, to use the precise words. Now the matter came up for discussion and consideration later this year and it was represented to the Government that there was no necessity.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The hon. member said the matter came up for discussion in 1954 and again this year. I am asking him by whom? My argument is that the Civil Service Association and the Whitley Council said it did not come up by them. If he can deny this, I am man enough to get up and apologise. He has gone so far as to say it came up for discussion on 6th August, 1954, they disagreed and now he says it was brought up after two years. I am making this statement that the Civil Service Association did not bring it up and did not know about it until they read about it in the Press. I want that cleared up.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Later Sir, the Government considered an amendment to this Order at the beginning of this year.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not fair. I am asking the hon. member to clear up a point.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I had one millionth part less intelligence than the hon. member, I would not be stupid enough—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am asking the hon. member to clear up the point about the matter being discussed and the Civil Service Association not knowing anything about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. members really want an explanation from the Premier they will listen, but they must remember that the House is not in Committee now and they cannot get up and make speeches at this stage. They should not make such loud asides in Parliament; and if they try to jolt him into saying something he does not want to reveal, they are wasting their own time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if I were merely desirous of controversy with the Civil Service Association, I would merely say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter who knew and saw a lot of the Civil Service was in fact associated with the Council of the Civil Service Association who gave the answer. I notice quite intently that the hon. senior member for the Service was not listening. [A VOICE: Hon. senior member for the City?] Perhaps I was right after all, the hon. senior member for the Service!

It is obvious that Civil Servants still run to you: in my experience the minority would run and tell you something which might not always be right, but it is always for their individual self.

Mr. Speaker, I apologise to you and to the House, except the hon. senior member for the City, for having reverted to that, because you have to be very careful with some Civil Servants who come to you. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has told you, with what I have read out to the House, I wonder if anybody . . .

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Sir, the hon. member has accused me of saying he was misleading the House. If he can prove that I will be man enough to get up and name the Civil Servant who approached me. The matter was discussed and

they disagreed with it. I am asking him to say by whom it was brought up because it was unknown to them; and the only time they knew about it was when it was seen in the newspaper. If you will prove that is incorrect I will be man enough to say I was misleading the House; but he is not doing that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot determine how the Premier should address the House. He is hoping for too much.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Can he say that the Civil Service knew about it on the 2nd January, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot demand an explanation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Sir, he has accused me of saying I have accused him of doing something.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I can see five hon. members over there who ought to see how easy it is to disturb the equanimity of the hon. senior member for the City. I see one Barrister who ought to know when you have an unintelligent witness and you can play about with him and get him annoyed; that is what I am doing with the hon. member now.

It was subsequently brought up in Executive Committee that certain changes should be made in April 1955. These changes were put to the Civil Service Association and agreed to, and there was not yet this bit about the twelve months. There was a note dealing with the question of the Governor's discretionary powers in case of wives and so on. Some of the other controversial things in the requirements with the exclusion, Sir, of the payment of the wives' passages were discussed with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What Civil Service Commission is he talking about?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I apologise if I said Commission; I meant to say Association. What Commission was sitting in April 1955? How can anybody not realise that was a slip of the tongue? It is so easy to get some fish to rise to bait that you do not have to throw. [A VOICE: You do not know anything about a line, man]. I spoke to the Secretary on the 27th April [Asides]

I do not even have to have a line and they would jump out of the sea. [A VOICE: Watch them, they are barracudas!] I spoke to the Secretary of the Civil Service Association and got their concurrence and there was another note the following day, the 28th April, 1955 in which the Secretary of the Civil Service Association informed me that the staff had agreed with the proposed changes, so they had all non-controversial matters put to them in April 1955 and agreed to. In 1954 I told you what the attitude of the Council was, and actually informed you of the dates, (August 6th and some day in November which I have forgotten,) relevant to these changes in the Leave Passage fixing the limit of the passages for the wives travelling within six months.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: So the twelve months was put to them then.

10.35 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have already said in so many words that the twelve months affair came later. It was not in these changes. I am replying to the hon. member that not since 1954 has anything been put to the Civil Service Association.

In 1955, this non-controversial matter was put to them and they agreed. Now we come down to this Order. Again the matter arose this year when it was suggested in January that the Civil Servants should be told of the proposed changes. The Government was informed that it was unnecessary to do so, because the Civil Servants should have agreed. [Asides] The hon. senior member for the City is making his interruptions; well, they prompt me to say something in

order to show that it is inaccurate. The Civil Servants agreed with the first lot of Amendments; their views were known and they agreed with the second lot. The hon. member had said that not until the Civil Servants read in the *Advocate*.—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I said that the matter was discussed two years before, and the Civil Servants did not know anything about this period of twelve months coming up again until they read it in the *Advocate*. When it came to this other part of the matter, it was said that it was unnecessary to deal with it. How am I wrong?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The accusation is that nothing was known since 1954 until what appeared in the *Advocate*. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Nothing about the twelve months.] At the beginning of this year, the matter arose with the Administration before it came to the Executive Committee and now this appears. In January of this year, the Establishment Officer said that the Civil Servants agreed with the early part of the Order, but disagreed with the twelve months affair. Attention was drawn to the fact that it was desirable that they should nevertheless be informed of the decision of the Executive Committee. This is a subsequent note: the President of the Civil Service Association agrees with the above, that it is unnecessary to put either of them, because the non-controversial part they agree with and the controversial part they disagree with, but if the Executive Committee's decision in January of this year should be put to them, they were going on with it. That is the subsequent note which I have read. The President's suggestion was that this period of twelve months should not be put into operation until one year after the Legislature had approved of the Amendment. I agree with this suggestion. He mentions the case of those persons who were already promised that they would have Leave Passages; therefore it is impossible to say that in January of this year, the proposal was not put to them. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Put to whom?]

When the Executive Committee made the final Order, two copies of it were sent to the Civil Service Association on the 15th of this month. Now I give honourable members bait, they do not take it. [Laughter.]

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member must be aboveboard. All I said was this: when we dealt with the matter in February, on the morning after it appeared in the *Advocate*, there was a surprise. From what the honourable member has read out there, I think that the whole thing should be withdrawn, if they have any respect either for the Whitley Council or for the Civil Service Association.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Perhaps I am misquoting the honourable member. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member what month and in what year did they see this report in the *Advocate*?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for the City is speaking with my permission. He need not answer if he does not want to do so, but he cannot make another speech.

10.45 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All the honourable member has done is to prove everything I have said tonight. I am quite willing to answer him with your permission, Mr. Speaker.

All I said was that it was the morning after the House dealt with the matter that it appeared in the *Advocate*. We dealt with this matter on the 28th February this year and it was put to the vote and

you remember very well that after that, this matter went to the Other Place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not involved at all. The honourable member is now making a speech.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the Hon. Premier should be man enough to get up and say if I have proved my case.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have tried my best not to say anything which might be a reflection. I can only go by what was brought to the notice of the Executive Committee. If the Civil Service Association does not give sufficient publicity to things which they are told to pass on, that is a matter for them. I have read the communication which passed between the Establishment Officer and the President of the Civil Service Association. If members of the Civil Service say that they knew nothing of it, if they did not get the information or the information was not sent to them as should be sent to them, that is a matter for the Association. As a result of the information they had before the 25th January, they held a meeting on the 2nd March. I have given the three dates on which they were notified. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for the City does not see that he may be making a justified attack on somebody but not the Government.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Whom?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is for the honourable member to find out. I give him bald facts. To suggest that the Government has done this, that or the other without bringing it to the notice of the Whitley Council is not correct. [A VOICE: That is what they say.] If the Government decides that the Civil Service Association should be informed and the Establishment Officer tells the President or the Secretary of the Association that this is what the Government is doing and the Association proceeds no further, what can this Government do? It is quite easy to accuse the Government but as soon as the Government can reply and can reply fortified by the written word —

A VOICE: I think you are getting soft; I do not think you are right in your head!

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have no intention of replying to the honourable member. I have no intention of replying to the honourable senior member for St. Philip nor the honourable senior member for St. George. [VOICES. Hear! Hear!] As far as I am concerned, they are just cyphers sitting over there. I have replied to the accusations and any human being can take these dates and check them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I prefer to be a cypher than to have lost my brain.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I end as I began. It started with the Civil Servants saying that it is an abuse of the purpose for which leave passages were given and that was quite unknown to me. That was said by the Whitley Council two weeks before I raised the matter in Executive. Now, we are supposed to be doing them an injury. Mr. Speaker, I apologise to the non-noisy members of the House for having spoken at such length but it was clearly my duty to reply to the accusation that the Government had not the courtesy after August 1954 to tell them of the change.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No."

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: [Sitting] Ring the bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no bell.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: [Sitting] If there is no bell, get the Marshal to call honourable members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The means provided for that is the ringing of the bell. If there is no bell, there are no means to get them.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing 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, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. ALLDER — 13.

Noes: Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. GODDARD, and Mr. TUDOR — 6.

ADVOCATE STRIKE

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. Leader of the House is going to ask to fix

the Order Paper. Before that is done, I am sure that you, sir, honourable members and the general public will be glad to hear that a settlement has been made in the waterfront dispute and that the waterfront workers will go back to work as from tomorrow. The Government will conduct further negotiations with the Advocate on Friday and the Advocate strikers will go back to work as from Saturday. [*Cheers*].

The Order Paper having been fixed.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House until this day week, Tuesday, 29th May, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.