

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8th April, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Speaker*), Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Kt., C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*) F. C. GODDARD, Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN (*Deputy Speaker*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. C. B. SEARLES, Mr. L. St.A. THORNE, Hon. D. D. GARNER (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E. and Mr. T. W. MILLER.

PORTRAIT OF HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that there is a portrait of the Hon. Sir Grantley Adams in the Speaker's room which hon. members can view. It is proposed to present the same to the Legislature.

MINUTES

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

Messrs. Tudor, F. G. Smith, Walcott and Husbands entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

By Command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows:-

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - February, 1958.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The Fishing Boat (Loans) Regulations, 1958.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The Fishing Industry (Amendment) Regulations, 1958.

Mr. Bryan entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$150,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No.1, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should like to state and it would not be known unless I stated it now- that this is a Resolution to give increased amounts to Civil Service Pensioners.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to settle the Rates of Income Tax for the year 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Quarries Act, 1951.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Beach Protection Act, 1890.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to settle the Rates of Income Tax for the year 1958 was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill to amend the Quarries Act, 1951, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Beach Protection Act, 1890, was read a first time.

LARCENY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Larceny Act, 1868.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as will appear from the Objects and Reasons, a recent case in the Law Courts has caused doubts as to the scope and intention of the law relating to falsification of accounts. I suppose that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who is smiling at me will agree that Lawyers would not live if these doubts did not arise. It is however, a useful thing for the administration of justice that doubts should be erased from the Statute Book, and in order to make it possible that in future no doubt shall arise as to the criminal liability of persons in the Civil Service or members

of the Police Force, the Government has sent down this amendment so that there can be no doubt in the future.

The last thing which I would dream of doing is to give any personal opinion on what has happened recently or anything of that sort, but I do say that if what has happened in the Law Courts recently were allowed to persist, then we would be back in the days when you could not lock up a man for stealing a mare, because the Act said that it was to be a horse. *(Laughter)*.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, with the principle of this Bill, we can have absolutely no quarrel, and I for one feel that any person who is found guilty of taking away, stealing or embezzling public funds should be brought to justice speedily. The Premier, I think, will agree that it is indeed a feather in the cap of Counsel (who are very often maligned) to discover after all these years that with this Act on the Statute Book they have created such doubt in the Law as to make Government bring down this Amendment, especially as Counsel were thought not to be up to the standard of the ancient giants of the past. The Opposition is in entire agreement with the Act. Of course, the Premier himself, in the days when he practised at the Bar, also profited by such uncertainty as the Law allows from time to time, but now he is in the position today of having to close these gaps and resolve these doubts as and when they arise as Head of the Government.

In the particular case referred to, I had the honour to be Counsel and I think there was considerable doubt. As a matter of fact, I do not think the Defence came out badly; it was rather the Prosecution. I am not condoning it; my job, Mr. Speaker, and that of the Leader of the Opposition is to see that justice is done as Barristers, and of course, to profit by such uncertainty that exists from time to time. No one in his right mind could quarrel with any Government or any person in authority who endeavours to make the Law certain where it is uncertain. God knows that in the Laws of Barbados as they stand there are so many uncertainties that this is only what Government will attempt to correct now. Of course, the longer these uncertainties remain, the better for practising Counsel; but with the Law as it stands, it is only to be expected that Government will bring down an Amendment of this sort.

In view of the fact that they have brought down the amendment, I will see to it that wherever in any Government Department any dishonesty is detected or suspected, they bring the culprit or culprits to justice, however low they may be or high, especially in this place when we are embarking on a big Development Programme. I think the amendment is necessary and in order. I would like Government not to condone the matter - I am not suggesting that they do - but to see to it that examples are made wherever possible of people who defraud the taxpayers by dishonest means. The amendment is in order, it is long overdue and the Opposition has no quarrel with it.

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

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in the temporary absence of the Chairman, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who is looking at me, be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees. He is certainly the most experienced member.

Mr. TUDOR: No, no. You should have known that.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees.

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

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

(At this point the CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES entered the Chamber and took his seat.)

On the motion of Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. E. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the principle of the Bill nor to the particular section...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am speaking on Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That Clause has already been passed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am sorry; you are too fast for me.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would have no objection to recommit it in order to hear the view of the member is he cares to ask. There may be nothing in it, or it might be an excellent point.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 be recommitted.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, as I began by saying, I am not against the principle of the Bill or of Section 2, but I am rather surprised after reading about the case in point which was mentioned sometime ago to see that such a small amendment is only necessary and to see that by just deleting these six words, that can really solve the problem. Of course, I must bow to legal opinion because the Hon. Premier and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew feel that that is all that is necessary. However, I am rather surprised that, by just deleting these words to the end of Section 56 and adding what appears elsewhere, that solved the entire matter. If I were a legally trained man I might understand it perfectly well; but as I am not that, I did not think that that alone could have things right. I am really relying on the legal gentlemen of the House; but I really cannot see that only this much is necessary after reading of the amount of argument which was extended in the Courts as to whom was the proper person to bring the charge and whether the money was that belonging to the Barbados Government and all that sort of thing.

The Hon. Premier said that he would be the last man to go into the case. I will just say that if all that is necessary is for you to do just that, then it seems to me that it is an over simplification. However, as long as the legal elements in this House tell me that this is all right, well, I must bow. If this makes it crystal clear now that the Chief Judge of the Island will know whom the charge is preferred against and you know who is taking whose funds, and we are now sure when we make this amendment that that will do, well I do not know - I can only be assured by the legal elements in the House. From what was said by the Hon. Premier as well as the hon. junior member for St. Andrew it seems to me that they are absolutely and lucidly clear that that is all that is necessary: but I say again that to my mind after reading so much of the difficulties that were presented to the Court over the case in point as to whose funds were being embezzled it seems to me an over simplification.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: As I have said before, I am not passing any opinion about what happened in the

Courts, but outside of the House I will have some very strong things to say about it. However, it is felt by legal advisers of this Government that this is necessary in view of that case in the court to clear up that point. If you look at Section 56 of the Larceny Act, you will see that it speaks of embezzlement by persons in the public service of Her Majesty or by the Police, but Section 58 merely speaks of punishment for falsification of account's by a clerk, officer or servant, or any person employed or acting in the capacity of a clerk, or a servant without specifically using the expression "person being employed in the public Service of Her Majesty or being a constable or other person employed in the police of this island." Well, the Crown Law officers felt that by putting in Section 58 what you have in Section 56 that that would meet the bill, and that is the object of this Bill.

I can well see as a lawyer that a lawyer may make the point that if you have something in Section 56 which deals with embezzlement and you do not have it in Section 58 which deals with falsification of accounts that it can be argued that servants of the Crown or the police do not come under Section 58; therefore, for safety's sake you should put it in Section 58. I advocate this amendment on that ground. I think everybody as a layman knows that, if you in one Section say something and you do not say it in another which deals with a similar thing, it can be argued that you did not intend to say what you said in the previous Section; therefore, for safety's sake it is far better for the law to be over-stated than to be under-stated. You should say it again.

I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter that it might seem at first to be an over simplification. It is quite possible to view it like that. I do not think that the legal draftsman was wilfully making work for fellow lawyers, but it is quite possible for you to have an omission in an Act which when making the legislation you never intended. I remember reading of a judgment in which a Judge said: (I think it was a Judge of a Court of Appeal in England) "I was in the House of Commons when this law was passed and I know that this was not what we intended: but the language does not say so; therefore, we have to go by what we have here." It might not be intended under Section 58 to exclude what was said under Section 56; therefore, it is better to repeat it. It is merely making this Section clear. To some hon. members it may seem to be doing too much, but too much is sometimes necessary.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, just to make the record straight, I rise again to say that what is responsible for this amendment is not the legal point which was made in the court. That was over-ruled by the Judge. The Judge over-ruled every legal point put by Defence Counsel and the case went to the jury on the facts.

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

On motion of Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER the Bill was read a third time and passed.

3.45 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 4 ORDER, 1958"

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. 4 Order, 1958."

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: As hon. members will see from this Order, the Registration Office and the Judiciary will be coming in for revision. I hope I am not saying too much when I say that the Cabinet has had certain doubts and it has referred this matter back to the Chief Justice; but the Chief Justice has gone most thoroughly into this matter and we are now satisfied that the recommendations which were made were sound and we are not being asked for more staff than is strictly necessary. I say that because, with the greatest respect to the Chief Justice, he is a new-comer, and he may have been looking for an ideal set up. That was our first impression. Perhaps, I should not be saying these things, but by saying these things, but by saying them, I want to assure this House that very careful examination has been given to these proposals. We cannot run a first-class Judiciary or Courts of Justice unless we have a Registry which is up to date and which is able to do its work efficiently. We are therefore asking the House to agree to this Order on the ground that careful examination both from the judicial and the political side, convinces the Government that it is essential.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, increases in this staff of the Registry are overdue and I am wondering whether what is proposed here will be sufficient. It has struck me that as soon as we instituted a panel of two Puisne Judges together with the Chief Justice, we would need at least two Deputy Registrars and you could call the Registrar, the Registrar-General and call the other two officers Assistant Registrars or Deputy Registrars as the case may be. I doubt whether you would be able to function with the three High Courts sitting simultaneously, which I presume will take place at some time or other, without having two Deputy Registrars instead of only one as is the case at present.

As to the Stenographer, I do not see that one Stenographer could be enough, and then there is the question of the Copyists. When a Deed is handed in to the Registry, I think the Law requires that it should be copied within a maximum of six weeks, but you are told when you hand in your Mortgage or Conveyance, to come back for it in six months' time. It is not because there is any dilatoriness or slackness in that office, but there is so much work to do, there is such a tremendous back-log, and the Clerks say that they have no space in which to turn around in the office. You cannot get the best out of the staff in an office if you do not have sufficient elbow room for them, and Sir, in that office there is absolute congestion and overcrowding. When the Solicitors' Clerks go in there, one is reminded of sardines having been placed in a tin. Anything which is connected with the Legal Departments is always neglected. In the Police Magistrates Clerks' Office, a typist is ill for two weeks and you could not find somebody to type in that office, because the boys who are fresh from school with their G.C.E.s cannot type; there is no typist in the Office, because the lady was ill, and they cannot take the trouble to appoint a typist. Sir, with the amount of work which the typist does, one would think that she is in private employment.

The increases which are proposed here are overdue, as I have said, but I am wondering if the staff proposed here will be sufficient or if the Hon. Premier is only asking for this number, because he feels that this is all that the House will pass without controversy and because he did not feel disposed to present the House with a more comprehensive proposal for increases in this Office. This is one of the most important offices in this Island; it is the one office in which a person's whole estate may be involved and it is an office which should not be as understaffed as it is now. I am wondering what is the proposal for getting room for the additional staff whom we are appointing, because if you put them in the present room, I doubt whether you will be able to get more work out of them because they will be working one on top of the other. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier can assure us that this is all that the Chief Justice

wanted or if it has been whittled down because the Premier himself, being so far removed from the law, does not know that the congestion in this office is more than it was in those days when he had to work for a living as we have to work for ours now. This accumulation of work and the inevitable arrears are due to the lack of staff.

If you have three High Court Judges they should give their decisions in writing. In order for a Judge to give his decision in writing, he must dictate it to the Stenographer who will type it and the Judge will read it and at the same time, he will hand a typed copy to each of the Counsel engaged in a case. When there are the three High Courts sitting simultaneously, surely, the Hon. Premier should ask for two Stenographers, if not three, rather than one. I cannot see that one Stenographer can do the work which is necessary to be done.

Then there is the question of the High Court Reporter. I was hoping that in this Order, provision would have been made for two High Court Reporters so that when the Chief Justice or either Puisne Judge is summing up a case, his summary would be taken verbatim; and when the matter goes to the Federal Appeal Court or the West Indian Court of Appeal, the Privy Council or whatever Court it is, if objection is taken to the summing up, there will be available an absolutely verbatim report of the summing up taken by the Official Competent Reporter to the High Court.

3.55 p.m.

This, Sir, is a move in the right direction, and I trust it is not regarded by the present Government as the final move in that direction.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have always characterised the Judicial Department of this island as the most defective Department in Government, if it may so be termed. Now what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said on this matter is entirely correct, and we can have absolutely no quarrel with any attempt by Government to furnish adequately any Department which is rendering a vital service to the Government.

The appointment of two Senior Clerks is absolutely necessary for very obvious reasons; there are certain documents in the Registry which must be signed by the Registrar, and it is terribly inconvenient in some cases and in some cases it is most undignified - to see a messenger from the Registry running to the Court of Assizes with these certificates for the Registrar to sign. What the Registrar actually does when the Court is sitting is undoubtedly something that could be done by Senior Clerks; therefore the appointment of two Senior Clerks who may replace him when he is sitting in the Court at the time is something which is necessary and which will save a lot of time - apart from the fact that in the Registry itself you might find Solicitors with clients who may want to have judgment confessed and other steps taken in judicial process and have to wait because the Registrar is in the Court of Grand Sessions. In view of the fact that Government is reorganising the entire Judiciary and have at present a Chief Justice and two Puisne Judges - and I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Government is contemplating the appointment of a third which is also a necessity - Government will have to decide for themselves whether the Registrar and three Deputy Registrars will meet the requirements for this new Judicial organisation. Of course, when the time comes I shall deal with that.

I personally feel, Mr. Speaker, that every Judge of the Supreme Court should have a typist of his own. After all, it is true that the Chief Justice is responsible in the long run for matters judicial, but there are certain judgments in the new judicial organisation which the Puisne Judge will have in due course to give decisions in writing because it is hoped - and this may stun the Premier - the senior members of the Bar are hoping to have a judicial reporting in Barbados of cases of importance. That is a new departure from the old regime, a tribute to the enthusiasm of young Barristers who would like to see their submissions or the Judge's recorded for all time in writing, and therefore it is neces-

sary that each Puisne Judge as a High Court Judge (and in view of the fact that a few of these Appeals from the Puisne Judges are likely to go to the Federal Supreme Court) be given a stenographer. That is not asking too much; it is not extravagant and I do hope in due course Government will bring down some Establishment Order giving each Puisne Judge a stenographer as is necessary. Only this morning it was necessary for Counsel for the defence in a case of ~~some importance~~, a case involving a capital offence, to ask for a Court Reporter. Each Court should have an official Court Reporter; that is something that happens in every civilised country. Barbados is the only place in the world where the Police Magistrate sits down and has to take down every word that is said. That is nonsense and nobody worth his salt is going to take down every word of bad language which somebody feels like using on Crumpton Street. You should have a Court Reporter, a silent typewriter or a recording machine for every Police Magistrate's Court in Barbados. This is 1958 and not 1928, and the Government should also consider that possibility, because with the new judicial organisation which is likely to come into force very soon, litigants will not be allowed as today to shout the word "appeal" when the decision is given against them. They will have to give proper notice of appeal to go before the High Court, and therefore the Police Magistrate should be in a position to concentrate not only on the demeanour of the witnesses, but to make his own notes as distinct from the evidence given. That is why it is important, now that you are taking away from people the right which they had from time immemorial of saying to the Police Magistrate after his decision "I appeal" and turn their backs on it. You should therefore give them the opportunity of knowing every word that is said and every piece of evidence accurately recorded so that when it goes on appeal there can be no contention that the record is inaccurate or out of order.

The Premier need not have any scare in bringing down an Establishment Order which is ideal. Apart from the fact that we are fortunate in having the present Chief Justice, I would say that this is nothing extravagant. I hope this is not all that the Chief Justice has asked for, because my conception of how a Registry of the Supreme Court should be run certainly involves more staff than this. As I said, the Senior Clerks are long overdue, and of course you will realise, Mr. Speaker, with this Department, now that there is emigration to England, and now that people are somehow or other taking a greater interest in their ages - I do not know whether it is because they are dying faster under the present Government or because Government is giving Old Age Pension at 68 and they want to know how old they are more often - at the same time the volume of work has undoubtedly increased in this Department. Government should not only consider the reorganisation of the Registry as such, and I want the Premier - he probably will not be able to do it before he is elevated to a higher office - to go to the Chief Justice and consider not only the staff of the Registry, but to give in the Police Magistrates' Courts a Short-hand Reporter and allow the magistrates to make their own notes when it comes to appeal. These methods obtained when you had about six cases; but somehow or other, Barbadians have become fond of litigation recently. I should like the Premier to discuss this matter in view of the reorganisation which we hope to have very shortly in the Judicial set-up. He should discuss matters not only like this but of making people pay for launching cases in Barbados or making them pay costs. Barbados is the cheapest place for justice; it is not very good when it is too cheap. On these matters I am not talking as a Lawyer, but as a taxpayer, because a man can put the whole island of Barbados in Court and not pay a cent for it.

4.05 p.m.

This Resolution is perfectly in order and I took this opportunity of pointing out to the Hon. Premier ways and means of not only improving this branch of the judiciary but other branches. I think I have given him some ideas of how to get revenue to pay for these additional offices. Let me tell the House that the Opposition is entirely in agreement with this measure and we feel that it is not as adequate as the situation in this Department requires it to be.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I certainly welcome these proposed amendments and increases to this department. It was over a year ago that I brought this to the attention of the Government and I am very pleased that these steps have been taken. I may say that this has not gone far enough because the whole judiciary needs attention. The whole judiciary needs an increase in staff, equipment, proper fixtures and things of that sort. However, this is a step in the right direction because the public at large has been inconvenienced since the large scale emigration to England has been taking place. People have been waiting in the Registrar's Department for long hours to acquire Baptism and Marriage certificates since emigration to England has been taking place; as a matter of fact, that has been going on from 1954 and it is high time that this should be remedied.

I am quite pleased to know that the staff of this Department is being increased and I hope the two Senior Clerks will prove themselves efficient. At no time the Registrar and Deputy Registrar should be out of office. You get a bogging of work not only at the top but in the centre. You have to wait for hours to get certificates in the Registrar's Office and you have to wait for hours to see the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar. As I have said just now, I do hope that these two Senior Clerks will prove themselves efficient and I hope that the Chief Justice will investigate these matters not only in the Registry but in the Police Magistrates Courts not only in the City of Bridgetown but in the rural areas.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, I do not know whether it is because this may be the last occasion upon which I have to address this House that I have found members of the Opposition so helpful. (A VOICE: Hear; Hear!) On my leaving, I make bold to say that very useful suggestions have been made by the last hon. member who sat down and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew.

What we did as regards this matter was to give the Chief Justice all he asked for in number; that is to say, he asked for eight additional persons and we gave him the eight persons but we put them in different categories. I would say this, if the Chief Justice were to tell us that we have not done enough, there is no reason whatsoever why this Government should not come back to the House and say that we find we need a couple of Deputy Registrars and so on. I do not know as much about the Courts now as the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who is a practitioner at the bar, but we have always felt that the administration of justice should be smooth and efficient. Mr. Carrington when he was acting Registrar made representations to the Government and we ask those who deal with the Judiciary from day to day what is their opinion and to give us advice. It is no desire on our part to be cheeseparing where the administration of justice is concerned.

I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that Barbados is probably the cheapest place on earth to get justice. Of course, when a barrister says that he is probably thinking of himself too, and that a \$10 fee should be \$20. It is a fact that our Court fees are very low. I remember the late Sir Lennox O'Reilly telling us that what is being paid in Barbados as a refresher fee in a Common Pleas case was what they pay in Trinidad to bailiffs. It is known that the late Sir Herbert Greaves was most anxious to make law cheap for the poor people of the island and because of that he kept the fees very low.

I agree with the hon. junior member of St. Andrew that all these things should be gone into. Surely, if you have to pay more for your food and clothes, you should pay more for your law. I repeat, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the hon. senior member for Christ Church made some excellent points; but I would just like to say again that we have not cut down on the number of staff asked for; what we have done is to say that instead of so many Senior Clerks we will make them Long Grade Clerks. He asked for eight people and we gave him eight, but not in the same category as he asked for. I have no doubt if attention is drawn to the fact that we have not gone far enough that this Government would come down again to make further provision.

I do not quite agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew about what he said as regards the Police Magistrates Court. That is purely for financial reasons. It is perfectly true that you have the position where the Police Magistrate has to copy down all the evidence in a case, but it may be better from a financial point of view for him to do that than to pay reporters. Another thing is that you cannot have one reporter sitting down all day long taking down notes; you may probably have to do what we do in this House - you may have to have more than one reporter in each Police Magistrate's Court. That is expense. Even at the risk of appearing too cautious in financial matters, this Government has to watch carefully its expenditure because we are engaged in development plans which call for great expenditure; therefore, wherever we can save money we must try to save it.

Mr. DOWDING: I am very pleased to see the Hon. Premier's approach today. I wonder if he would take another suggestion. In talking about the Police Magistrate's Courts, we must bear in mind that these are modern days and I would not agree with him that to pay a stenographer to take down evidence verbatim would be entailing more expenditure than we can afford. I believe a lot of time would be saved by the procedure. If you cannot do that, I still believe that quite a lot of time and money would be saved if you use recording machines and I hope one day that we will have such machines in here. I therefore throw out that suggestion.
4.15 p.m.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I could not agree more with the hon. member who has just sat down. If we had a Recording Machine to record what the Opposition said on any Tuesday, on the following Tuesday they would not open mouths. (Laughter).

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

STATISTICS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the taking of censuses and for the collection, compilation, analysis and publication of certain statistical information and for other matters relating thereto.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the Hon. Leader of the House to take charge of this Order.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to say that it is hardly much which can be added to the Objects and Reasons of this Bill as they have been set out here. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill are set out as follows:-

"The object of this Bill is to provide the necessary machinery required for the efficient operation of a local statistical Department. The functions of the Department are set out in clause 3 of the Bill. The Department will be charged generally with the duty of organising a co-ordinated scheme of social and economic statistics relating to the Island and the compilation and publication of statistical data relating to the several matters contained in the First Schedule to the Bill. For the purpose of discharging these duties authority is conferred on the Government Statistician to obtain certain statistical data and to enter premises for the purpose.

Clause 9 of the Bill imposes certain restrictions on the publications of statistical data by the Department while clauses 10 to 12 deal with offences and penalties. It is an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment for members of the staff of the Department to disclose information without authority or to use it for personal gain. Provision has been included in the Bill requiring members of the staff of the Department to take oaths

of secrecy and power to make regulations is conferred on the Governor-in-Executive Committee (clauses 13 & 14)"

As you know, Sir, it is essential to have a statistical survey made from time to time. The last occasion on which we had a census taken was in 1946, and it has been agreed by the West Indian Governments that this survey should be taken. With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a day which is remarkable for the absence of controversy. I do not know whether it is by accident or by design, that the parting shot of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph should be sweet reasonableness; but it so happens that in everything which we have had to discuss so far there is nothing to raise any fire or controversy about. An atmosphere of drowsiness has stolen over the Chamber, Your Honour, of course, being excluded and it is only with a fair amount of effort that hon. members on this side of the House can summon enough energy to speak. It may be, the aftermath of the Easter holidays, but like the other two Bills which have come before us, we on this side of the House saw nothing to which to object. We certainly accept the principle of this Bill, and we have always wondered how it was that the Government of Barbados could function efficiently without having set up, until very recently, a full staff in a properly-run statistical Department. Every Government should consider collecting information of every sort, and one of the things which we have to inculcate into the people of this Island is that the asking for vital information from them is not designed to allow the Government to know their private business, but merely to enable the Government to administer its affairs more properly.

For the Government itself, it is also a good thing, because we want to get rid of the idea which is so prevalent among the Ministers, that whenever information is asked for, it is asked for because we wish to embarrass them in some way or other. It would have done a lot of people in the public life of this Island good, and it would help us when we come to discuss the development programme or anything of that nature if we could have at our finger tips the exact number of persons who are unemployed in this Island. Matters like that should not be secrets buried in some Government Department or pigeon hole; they are of vital importance to the people of this Island; and the sooner the Government realises that this information is not only to be gathered, but be spread abroad, the better it will be. Persons who are Heads of Government Departments and people in public life generally, cannot make their contribution unless there is a wealth of information which they can have at any moment and be able to use it for whatever purposes they wish to use it. It is not enough, therefore, to give legal sanction to the taking of censuses and the collection of information of whatever sort; you have to go two steps further.

The first thing which has to be done is to let it be made known to the people of this Island that a part of the business of this Government is to gather information, daily, weekly or monthly - information of all sorts of aspects of the life of the community; you should get the people to understand that, and they will fully co-operate with you. So very infrequently is information gathered that on the very few occasions when something is to be known, when the Government wants information and persons are sent to ask people questions, the whole thing is treated with suspicion, which should not be the case in a democratic community.

The second step is this: it is not enough to gather information of all sorts, but that information should be disseminated. I recommend to the Government the practice of publishing through the Government Printery or otherwise small, cheap leaflets or pamphlets conveying in them simple information which would be a good thing for the people of this Island to know. If three or four times a year you could have some brochure printed

which tells the people of this Island what wages were paid or what price the Island got for sugar or molasses then you will get the people taking an interest in the economy of the Island.
4.25 p.m.

If also from time to time, perhaps twice a year, you could let them know what revenue Government collected, how it was spent, what it is hoping to do with what is left over, how the Deep Water Harbour Scheme is progressing, how the Housing Authority and the Natural Gas Corporation and the Transport Board and the other Statutory Boards are functioning and what they are doing with sums of money placed at their disposal, that is vital information which the citizen should know and should have in his possession; and if you feed that to him yearly or monthly he will take it for granted that you will want to know more and more from him, because he will understand that the more he tells you and the more the facts of his daily life that are recorded by Government, the easier it will be for Government to formulate plans designed to promote his well-being and his progress.

Now there is one other matter in connection with this to which I think attention should be drawn. Penalties are provided in this Bill for persons who withhold or divulge information gathered for statistical purposes. I can quite see that you have to safeguard Government against the unauthorised publication of matters of information which Government wishes to use for its own purposes, but I should just like to sound a warning here. This sort of thing can be carried too far. For instance, as sometimes happen, information is collected by Government Departments, say, about the number of unemployed. I can quite understand how at a particular time, for instance, when a general election or any other election for that matter is coming up, it might not suit the Party in power at that time to have that information divulged, and I take it that the Penalty Clause in this Bill meets that particular infringement. It should be a Clause which ought not to be lightly invoked; the reason is this and it is easy to see: persons who work in the Statistical Department are different from ordinary Civil Servants in the respect that the nature of their own work brings them into contact with large numbers of people and their duty lies in asking and in sometimes answering questions. The collecting of information is best done when the enquirer himself can gain the confidence of the people from whom he wishes to gain the facts, and it may well be that a member of the Statistical Department or any enumerator or any such person who goes out to seek information which is to be compiled and reported on may find himself in a position, whereby in order to gain the confidence of the people among whom he is working and from whom he wishes information, of having to disclose the reasons for which he is asking the questions. Suppose you went into any of the slum areas of this City among people who are not accustomed to having people come among them asking questions, and three or four persons with notebooks and pencils suddenly appear among them to carry out a survey - it may be quite above board and you may only want to know how many people are living in a house, the total income earned by each household and so on - Barbadian people do not like you to ask them their business or what they consider to be their business, and it could happen that before you could get anything out of these people you may have to disclose a considerable portion of the reason for the survey. If you do that in all good conscience by telling people the reason why you want to know that from them is for this and that purpose, the officer doing that in good faith could be accused of divulging information improperly. It is a question of interpretation here, but I think in any case where it is necessary to gain the confidence of people in order that the information they give you can help you, certain disclosures would have to be made of an explanatory nature. I would hate to think that a person who acted in that way could be charged with divulging information belonging to the Statistical Department. That is only a warning which I would like to sound about the Bill, but apart from that it is very necessary and I hope that as a result of it the Statistical Department could expand its work and that, more important than that, we could all see the results of

it in Government having more accurate information on which to base its policies; and a secondary result of it might be that the Opposition itself might have greater access to the facts in any particular case so that they could play a greater part and make a greater contribution to the public life of this island.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before you put the question, I should like to say that I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Lucy when he suggested that publication should be given to the taking of these censuses. If I remember correctly, on the last occasion when the census was being taken, some people thought it was a means of Government finding out how much they had with a view to taxing them, and therefore the information was not as forthcoming as it should and could have been, if the facts or the reasons for the census were given to the people. I do agree with him that these are the points we must stress with regard to getting information from the people.

I also agree with him that now that we have a Government Printery it may be easier for us to print brochures and pass them around to the people in the island, which would be a means of assisting them in knowing what Government has done, is doing and intends to do. I must say that one of the reasons why perhaps the Labour Party sometimes does not get as many votes in certain areas as it would is because of the lack of information at times. I am very well sure that if the people really knew the facts of what is being done for them, we would certainly do better than what we have been doing in the past. I am very glad that he has hinted that, because rather than listen to "In the House" which gives a completely distorted picture of what really goes on, people would know the facts and the Party would be very much stronger than it is today - not that I am saying it is not strong now.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. L. E. SMITH being in the Chair.

4.35 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 15 inclusive were called and passed.

The first Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE LAND ACQUISITION BILL, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day - Order No. 4 - stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, Hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons that this amendment to the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, is for the purpose of lengthening the period within which payments for compensation in respect of compulsory acquisition of land can be made. Hon. members are aware that the time limit for this payment is twelve months after publication in the Official Gazette. That is the law under Section 50 of the Act.

It has happened recently in a particular case due to one reason or the other that a particular person af-

fected did not make his claim within that period. He was not particularly aware of this Section. We have looked up similar legislation in other parts of the world, and we find that this period in our Act is probably the shortest, and we feel that we can lengthen the period to two years. The Act is accordingly being amended. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. E. SMITH in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

4.45 p.m.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) No. 2 Regulations, 1957".

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I understand that these Regulations have not yet been printed, although they have been laid in the Legislature. I am therefore asking leave to postpone the consideration of this Order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:- To move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the establishment and management of public markets and slaughterhouses, and the provision of cold stores and for matters incidental thereto and connected therewith.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone the consideration of this Order and also of the next Order dealing with the provision for the improvement and conservation of the soil and the prevention of damage or deterioration by erosion to land in certain areas. I do not think that these Bills have been in the hands of hon. members long enough and, therefore, I do not propose to deal with them today.

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

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) 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 Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order. I am sorry, Sir, this matter comes more under the portfolio of the Hon. Minister of Trade. I am asking that the Hon. Minister take charge of it.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as the House was informed in the course of the Budget Speech made by the Hon. Premier, the preferential and general rates of duty on all spirits other than rum imported into this Island would be increased, the increase being by \$3 a gallon, and the preferential and general rates of duty on Cigarettes imported into the Island would also be increased, the increase, in this case, being by 60 cents a pound. This Bill, therefore, seeks to give effect to these proposals so as to realise additional revenue. As hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, these rates of duty are to be increased in the manner already indicated and this Bill will have retrospective respect as from the 4th March. That is the usual procedure adopted in these financial Measures. The principle of this Bill has already been debated in the Estimates and I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more in this matter.

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

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

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

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

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

4.55 p.m.

DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the waiver of charges on funds made available to the Development Board by the Government from loan funds.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see, Section 19(2) of the Barbados Development Board Act provides that interest charges on loans should be paid by the Board into the Treasury, but as members will appreciate, the Board was established for some time before any action was really taken. By that I mean that no loans were issued for a long time and then they were faced after the Manager was appointed with administrative expenses. The Board has appealed to the Government to have these charges waived in so far as these expenses are concerned, and certain funds which were not allocated at the time to the Board.

As the Addendum reads: (1) "that all charges on all amounts allocated to the Barbados Development Board from loan funds and reasonably applied by the Board to its domestic administrative expenses (including the purchase of fixed assets) be permanently waived and met from the General Revenue of the Island;

(ii) that all charges, other than interest charges, on all amounts allocated to the Board from loan funds and applied by the Board to purposes other than those referred to in sub-paragraph (i) above, or remaining tempor-

arily unused by the Board, be permanently waived and met from the General Revenue of the Island;

(iii) that interest charges on all amounts referred to in sub-paragraph (ii) above, be waived to the extent that in any year such charges exceed the return accruing to the Board upon investments, loans or deposits made by it from such amounts, and that to the extent of such excess such charges be met from the General Revenue of the Island;"

The Addendum says it is proposed that "(a) all charges be permanently waived on the sum of \$2,996.23 allocated to the Board from loan funds during the Financial Year 1956-57 and applied by the Board to domestic administrative expenses;" that is the allocation to which I referred during the time when there were no loans advanced.

"(b) that all charges, other than interest charges be permanently waived on the sum of \$55,003.77, being the remainder of a total amount of \$58,000 allocated to the Board from loan funds during the said financial year;

(c) that interest charges payable in the financial year 1957-58 on the sum of \$55,003.77 referred to in sub-paragraph (b) above, be waived."

I think, Sir, that the Addendum explains quite fully the purpose of the Resolution. As I said, Sir, it is intended that on such funds including administrative funds there should be no charges attached.

I beg to move that this Resolution do not pass.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government's business for the day. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has intimated that he intends doing a Bill to which I have no objection.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No.1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James, to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to His Excellency's Speech delivered on the re-opening of the Legislature.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, the Address reads as follows:

"THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session 1958-59.

The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island and the many Constitutional changes and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address and beg to assure Your Excellency that all these and other matters submitted to them will be given their careful consideration during the Session."

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that that Address be amended by the deletion of the second paragraph and the substitution of the following paragraphs

in lieu thereof; so the second paragraph, Mr. Speaker, which I beg formally to move will read as follows:

2. From this Address, this House observes with serious concern that Her Majesty, acting on advice of the Ministers locally, has been pleased to issue instructions for the appointment of the Hon. E. L. Morris to be a Member of the Other Chamber. This indicates an unprecedented departure from Constitutional propriety by admitting into the Legislature through the door of the Upper Chamber, a candidate who has been defeated for a seat in the elected Chamber in respect of this same Session, and going even further by appointing such gentleman as Minister without Portfolio. It is as much contrary to established British Parliamentary tradition to appoint a defeated candidate as a Minister as it is for a Speaker - after his election as such - to participate any further, even in the slightest degree, in the activities and councils of his former political Party.

3. The House is disturbed at the failure in this Address to make any reference whatsoever to the Disendowment and Disestablishment of the Anglican Church and queries this significant omission from this formal declaration of Government Policy for current Session.

4. The House views with grave apprehension the total omission from this Address of any proposals for the improvement of the Social services, particularly in regard to adequate increases in the amount of Old Age Pensions. Equally is it profoundly unhappy at the non-mention of any proposals for payment of Christmas bonus to the lowest-paid public employees to implement the Address to that effect which passed this Chamber during 1956.

5. This House will continue to advocate, and press Government to take action to provide free hot meals for such children of public elementary schools of this Island as are unable to pay for same; and to institute a scheme of free secondary education for such pupils as are unable to pay for, and are likely to benefit from, such higher education; and this Chamber is astounded at the continued failure by Government to institute such vitally essential schemes.

6. This House deplores the omission of any reference in His Excellency's Address to the Chamberlain Bridge, and of any plans that Government may have in regard to its restoration as a swinging Bridge as it was formerly.

7. It is with profound disquiet that the House notes from the Address that in the case of the Transport Board, bus fares will be increased. The House has not forgotten the statement in this Chamber during the previous Session (of the Premier and Minister of Finance) relative to maintaining motor omnibus fares at their then level, and will resist any attempt at any such increase.
5.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is to take the place of the ultimate paragraph in the Address of which the hon. junior member for St. James has given notice and has proposed in reply to the Speech which His Excellency the Governor was so graciously pleased to make at the opening of the Session. Everything in this amended Address of ours speaks for itself and does not need any labouring. It is well known that it is the point of view of us over here that the matter of disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church is one which should be settled. We have been talking about it too long and it is amazing, to put it mildly, to see that there is no reference in that Address by His Excellency as to the plans and proposals of action in furtherance of that. The Governor's speech is one which deals with the policy of the Government and every bit of policy to be dealt with in the Session should be found in that Address.

It is wellknown what is the attitude of ours - the Official Opposition - in respect of Christmas Bonus just as it is wellknown of our advocacy of free hot meals for children in public elementary schools and for such pupils in secondary schools who are unable to pay for that. Our advocacy remains as true as ever and we will continue to advocate for them until we convince the Government that it would have to implement these things, be-

cause we know that the people of this island stand in need of them far more than certain things which are forced upon them by the Government and which things only benefit a few rather than the many.

When we come to the question of increased bus fares after what we were told in this Chamber about over the dead body of the Hon. and learned Premier, we come to find that after the Federal Elections have taken place, as distinct from before, we have these serious, considerable increases being implemented. It would have been more fitting to comment on these things soon after the Governor's Address. We have mentioned to the Government that they should take over all the buses and in so doing they would be able to run them more successfully even continuing on the same bus fares by virtue of their having all the bus services to run. Government should have done that instead of running certain routes and leaving others to the private concessionaires. We have no doubt that the bus system can be made to pay without the increases which have already been made. It is unfortunate that the Government put on these increases after the Federal Elections took place. These increases come into being from the 1st April which is "All Fools Day" and we all know the saying.

We refer, as we would be expected to refer, to the constitutional position in respect of the reference which was made to it of admitting through the back door of the Upper Chamber a candidate who was defeated in the elections for the Lower House. As you know, Sir, that is never done; it is contrary to British parliamentary institutions. When we say that, we are saying it without the least personal bias against the particular individual who is a man known for his decency, dignity and decorum and, in respect of his ability, a man whom every self-respecting person in this Island esteems and respects. In short, he is a gentleman. But, Sir, we are not considering the individual; we are considering the serious departure from constitutional practice and precedent of appointing in the local House of Lords someone who in the same session was defeated in Elections for the Local House of Commons and not only appointing him to the local House of Lords but elevating him to a Ministry. Why we have referred to this matter is because His Excellency the Governor spoke of it in his Address to the Legislature. We cannot understand why a matter of such absorbing importance as the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church should not have found a paragraph or even a sentence or a phrase devoted to it in the Address by His Excellency the Governor because it is something which the Government proposes to give legislative approval to during this period.

These, Sir, are the amendments which we on this side propose and to which we invite the attention of the House and the support of all right thinking members. I now formally move that the Address as proposed by the hon. junior member for St. James be amended by the deletion of its ultimate paragraph and the substitution in lieu thereof of the paragraphs which I have just read out.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amendment to the Address which was so comprehensively moved and spoken of by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. I must say at the outset that we are debating this Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech in very unreal circumstances. I am sorry that we did not have the opportunity of doing it even before the present financial year started and it is even more unreal to discuss it this evening for very shocking reasons. Hitherto, we used to debate the Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech on the basis of a report presented to the House by a Select Committee. We have been told that since we have advanced to a more responsible form of Government that method of replying to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Session is out of date and the more convenient method is for two backbenchers of the Government to move and second an Address which they bring in. I have no quarrel with the new procedure. I am in favour of it. However, we have witnessed a shocking spectacle this evening. The two backbenchers of the Government - the hon. junior member for St. James and

the hon. junior member for the City - both of whom you would have thought would have been conversant with the policies of Government which they support that it would have made such speeches on the Address which they presented that it would have taken some effort on the part of the rest of us to get them to stop; but, on the contrary, far from expounding the policies of their Government, far from telling us why we should thank the Governor for his gracious speech, we find that the Mover of the Address, the hon. junior member for St. James, even before taking his seat after just reading out the Address, summoned his colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, who was sitting next to him, to get up and second the Address which he moved. We on this side of the House are at this disadvantage. We cannot know what Government policy is besides what is contained in the Governor's Speech because it is not expounded to us; and this must have been the first time in the history of any Parliament wherein an Address was moved by two members of the Government Party and no speech was made by either the Mover or the Seconder of the Address.

5.15 p.m.

They have really created history, and parliamentary history at that; whether it will be valuable in future or not is another matter. In not speaking on an Address which they have moved and seconded in reply to an Address from the Throne - as a matter of fact, I say that if anything like that had happened in England or in a Dominion Parliament, it would have been taken as an insult to the Sovereign. This would indicate that the two hon. members are either not familiar with the procedure in Parliament or they are not in favour of the Address the passing of which they have moved, or they have preferred to be silent on the policy of the Government of which they are members and to which they may be diametrically opposed for all we know. It would have been far better for the Mover of this Address to have taken the Premier to one side and asked him whether he would like him to say a few words on his behalf in expounding the policy of the Government. If we had heard anything from the hon. junior member for St. James, we would have known what the Premier has in mind.

We start off with this disadvantage of not knowing the line of defence of the Government policy, which the two hon. members had promised to open up and it is difficult for us to make any criticisms except on the basis of what appears in the Speech itself.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I would like to know if the Opposition would be so good as to let us have a copy of their amendment. It is difficult to follow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I do not know if he feels that the amendment is not worthwhile looking at, but in a matter of this importance a copy of the amendment should be sent over to this side of the House.

Mr. TUDOR: It is amazing that the Hon. Minister who has been silent for some weeks now should burst forth with all his ignorance. There would not be any objection to the Opposition supplying the Government with a copy of the amendment if the Government intimates that it wishes to postpone this debate so that it could study the terms of the amended Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: I intimated that the House should be supplied with copies of the amendment.

Mr. TUDOR: I am glad that Your Honour has intimated that. We were not told that the hon. junior member for St. James would be dealing with this Address today, and that is a courtesy which should have been extended to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The only way I see out of this impasse is for Your Honour to give a direction that the amendment should be printed and circulated and that the matter would be properly debated at some future time. That is the only fair way out of the impasse. I should like to have Your Honour's direction on that matter before I give up my right of continuing to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering if the Mover and Seconder of this amendment would agree to the adjournment of the House for tea and meanwhile the amendment could be cyclostyled and then the hon. member could continue his speech.

Mr. TUDOR: Do I have Your Honour's direction that I will be permitted to continue my speech on the resumption?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting of the House be suspended for half an hour.

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

The question that this sitting of the House be suspended for half an hour, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and the sitting was accordingly suspended.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the Suspension of the Sitting, I had just made the comment that we had received no guidance whatever from the hon. Mover and Seconder of this Address as to the line of defence which the Government proposed to take of their own, and it is unfortunate that we have not, because nothing that the Ministers say in the course of the debate will be as substantial coming then than if it had been spoken at the beginning; and so it falls to us on this side of the House to voice our general disapproval of Government's policy as we can see it.

There were, Mr. Speaker, some very serious omissions in the Speech from the Throne which His Excellency delivered on that last occasion. I think allowance can be made for it in this respect; it was a Speech coming after a Prorogation and not a speech given in an opening Session of the Legislature, and therefore Government can claim to some slight extent that most of their policy had been enunciated and was known before, and what was mentioned in the Speech on 21st January was merely a foreshadowing of Government's programme for this particular Legislative year. But the sample for this year is as good or as bad as the sample for the whole five years, and we have seen no indication in this Legislative year or indeed any foreshadowing in the current financial year that there is any radical change in the policy of the Government.

When the Leader of the Opposition was moving his Amendment, the terms of which he read, the text of which I think is now circulated to hon. members, he dealt first of all with the disagreement of members of the Opposition with what we regard as a constitutional impropriety. That matter has been aired in this House to some extent before at the time of Mr. Morris' appointment, and we all made it quite clear then that while we had nothing of a personal nature against the Minister concerned or even against him being a member of the Other Place, we did feel it was not the best practice for a person who had been recently defeated in a general election as a candidate for the Government Party. We took it then as a question of principle, and we felt then - as we feel now - that what we said and expressed about it would hold good even if we ourselves were in power, and we would not like to see any political party adopting that particular practice. We feel in defence of our stand that if a person has faced the electorate, especially with a Constitution such as the Barbadian one, and has not received that vote of confidence which you normally require from the electorate, some time should elapse before the Party in power takes him up to elevate him. It is common decency that you should allow the people of the community to get over their disapproval of the person which they expressed. If the

boot had been on the other foot and we had been returned to power in the last general election and had sought to put Mr E. W. Barrow or Mr. A. E. S. Lewis or any of our defeated candidates into the Legislative Council, there would have been an uproar (and rightly so), and great disapproval would have been made of it by members opposite and by their supporters. I hope the time will never come when we as a political party, whether in the Opposition or in Government might have to resort to that bad practice which dishonours the two-party system.

With respect to the other matters mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, I have to underline certain basic principles which motivate this Party which is now in opposition. We think, Mr. Speaker, that something has gone wrong in Barbados. We feel, too, that the hon. member of this House who has led this Government for so many years and who has assumed the chief responsibility for the course of public affairs in this island has not at any time been pulling his real weight in the interest of the people of Barbados. We feel that it is symptomatic of our present condition in this island that at a time when he has to leave Barbadian affairs to take his place on the West Indian scene, he is leaving us in the middle of so much crisis, so much disappointment and so much worry.

Twenty-six thousand people or perhaps even more are unemployed in this island today. The industrial development of the island has not taken place at the pace which many of us had hoped it would, and consequently, Government has found itself in the last three or four years having quite grudgingly to embark on a make-shift emigration. It was pointed out that that could only be a temporary stop-gap and the time would come when avenues for emigration would themselves be closed, and that Government should use the period of emigration to develop its plans and schemes for employing the largest possible number of the population at home. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker; any Government does its work best when opportunities are created in the home territory, no matter how small they are, for employment. While it is true that you may want to take advantage of every opportunity to send people out to get work wherever they could get it, yet that is only the second best policy; the first best is to provide the opportunities and avenues for development and employment at home. In that matter this Government has signally failed. It has failed miserably; and it can say nothing in defence of its own policy except to point out here and there that its road building or house building programme has enabled a certain level of employment to be kept up. Mr. Speaker, they should be very wary to boast too much about that. Even in a community like Barbados, there is always a limit to the number of persons who can be gainfully employed in making or building roads, or making or repairing houses. That is Government's enterprise; and even if one, two or three thousand people at various times during the year are engaged in Public Works programmes, that is a good thing that some people should be employed and so cut down the general number of unemployed; but that is not what we should aim at and we should not congratulate ourselves upon that although, where possible, it should be encouraged.

What we want in this island and what we have not done yet is to explore all the possibilities, no matter what they are, of protecting industries and expanding others, of looking for every possibility of employing another ten, fifty or a hundred persons. When Government can say to the rest of us in this community in this month of April that twelve, fourteen or even six more persons were engaged in some new industry, that is an indication of the increase of productivity and an indication that the welfare of the community is being looked after; and it would be hypocritical for members of the Opposition to agree either silently or in any other manner by thanking the Governor for his Speech when we know that the condition of our community is such that we have grave doubts as to whether we would be able to employ any large numbers of our fellowmen in the foreseeable future.

Take the question of the Deep Water Harbour for instance; we have all been told that employability will reach its peak in the second, third and possibly fourth years of that venture.

6.05 p.m.

But it is no consolation to the man who wants to get on with the job and who has a family to look after to tell him that, even if we have reasons to believe that year after next or next year will be the time for him to get employment. We have the saying: "while the grass is growing the horse is starving." I would like the Government to pay attention to this matter. The Hon. Minister in charge should regard this as top priority. Only to say that we have a Development Board and for the Government itself to walk up and down is not good enough. It should explore every avenue of endeavour, and look into every possibility to make sure that even not more than ten people get employment.

What frightens hon. members on this side of the House more than anything else is that sooner or later, and perhaps by the end of this year, we will be faced with many of our people returning from the United States of America and the United Kingdom. What is going to happen to the large number of persons who would be returning from the United Kingdom or the U.S.A? The persons who have already gone to the United States on emigration schemes on the last two or three occasions have been brought back more quickly than was anticipated due to the trade recession which has taken place in the United States. They have now over 5 million people unemployed in the United States, and rather less than that in the United Kingdom; and there is no indication that it will stop soon. Because of that our troubles will assume even more alarming proportions. It is certain that these countries, in order to pay employment assistance and all the benefits of the social security schemes that they have will think of employing all the local people first, and we have to face the fact that there may be an influx of emigrants in this Island and in the West Indies. Therefore we cannot wait until that happens to do something about it. You have got to start to lay foundations for the policies which make a difference between hope and despair. Jobs have got to be found in public works and other schemes; and therefore policies would have to be worked out for the employability of the people as and when they come back.

I know that it is the fashion of the Ministers of the Government and its supporters to boast that, apart from the sugar industry, the Government is the largest employer. We know that is true; but there is a limit to the number of people who can be employed in one year. If you have a Five Year Plan and you have projects to be completed in one year, you know the labour force which would be required to complete them; therefore you cannot employ more than you need and you would be silly to try to do that. For those who would be coming back for jobs, you would have to start on some other track. Sir, I can speak on that at great length because we have not noticed in the Governor's speech anything about this and no mention has been made of these possibilities. We have not seen any schemes to meet that particular contingency.

The next serious admission in the speech of His Excellency is of course the refusal of the Government to face up to its responsibility in respect of the Social Services. In the last five years we have had on the floor of this House laid and circulated to hon. members a Social Security Report produced for us at Government's request by Professor Richardson. It is a very comprehensive document which can not only be studied with profit but most of which can be implemented without much trouble. I know that it is argued that Government's revenue is to a certain extent limited, and when so many things have to be done with the money, that it is not always possible to do every thing which the Opposition presses for or what the Government would like to do; but there are certain things which stand out and which are so compelling in their logic that you must have other reasons for denying them. In the last two years the cost of living has risen in this Island to phenomenal proportions. We can have a lot of political controversy in this Island as to how that came about, but we are not now here concerned about that; we take it for granted that things have gone up in price, especially foodstuffs. It does not take a Solomon to see that persons in the lowest possible increments suffer most because if you only have

got a limit to budget on, that limit would have to go a far way. A man in receipt of a large salary manages to some extent to weather the storm more than the old age pensioner or a person in the low brackets of life.

If Government argues that it takes some time to initiate policies which in themselves would control the cost of living, there is one remedy which it never seems to use - and that is the remedy of increasing the money payments to all those people who are most in need of it. There is a school of thought in public life which looks upon Old Age Pensioners as individuals to whom charity is given. That is as far from the truth as anything can be. People who are in receipt of old age pensions are in the same position as people in receipt of Government pensions because they are thought of on the basis that they worked for the community, and the community, out of gratitude for the services they rendered, hands back to them something which they worked for. If you look at it that way you would always be willing to give a patient hearing to any claims for an increase in pension for them. Old Age Pensioners are persons who in their working days were exploited and you cannot expect former employers on whom they may not have any claim to make any adjustment for them. It is for Government to make adjustments for them.

There is a case of increase for Old Age Pensioners. It can be argued that the prices of sugar, macaroni, salt meat, flour and rice have gone up; and if the approximate cost of renting a house has gone up within the last five years, then it can be argued that there is need for an increase for old age pensioners.
6.15 p.m.

I feel, therefore, that it is not a question of giving something for nothing. It is common elementary justice that something more should be done for old people and done in a substantial way. I am convinced that with the revenue of this colony, we could spend a minimum pension of \$3 a week on Old Age Pensioners. But suppose we could not do that! Well, then, elementary justice should dictate to the Government that if any retrenchment is to be made, it should not be made on the food and comforts of old people, but in other ways. It is far better to buy three new buses less and give the old people something. It is far better, if it came to that, even to stop repairing a school or even to halt a part of a Housing Scheme, in order that those who are old and feeble should have the benefits of the wealth of the community. That is why we argue so strongly that we are disappointed not to see in the Governor's Speech anything which we can take as an indication that this matter will be attended to, and we think we could link the general question of the increase of pensions to the small and poorly paid Government Pensioners. We have argued, until we are almost sick of it, the case of the hot midday meal for school children and the abolition of the school fees in the Government-aided Secondary Schools. It has always been said that members of the Democratic Labour Party mention these things merely because we want to make political capital or to embarrass the Government or to catch votes. Well, if the truth must be told, if it is for those reasons that we mention these things, then we could stop mentioning them, because somehow or other, we do not catch very many votes. But we have greater reasons for mentioning these things. The reasons which we have for mentioning them, are because of certain principles which we hold.

Mr. Speaker, all the money in the Treasury belongs to the people of Barbados; whatever Government is in power, it can only act as stewards of the public money. We feel that it is the duty of stewards to spend as much of the public revenue as possible on the people themselves, since it is the people's money that they are spending. If we had time here this afternoon it would be instructive to gather up and set on record the total amount of surpluses which have been collected by this Government in overtaxation within the last ten years. The figures would run into several million dollars. I think that that is the biggest crime which this Government has committed against the people of this country - to take more money from them than it actually needed.

Our point of view, therefore, is, and has always been, that whenever a Government finds itself having to pile up surpluses through taxation, it should radically re-organise its taxation policy and either leave the surpluses in the people's pockets where they will fructify or, if they still intend to overtax the people, they should spend the money on essential social services as quickly as possible. If you had accepted our view of the hot meals programme for school children, you could not lose on it, because that would be an expenditure in the community itself. As to the food which you bought to feed the children, some of the merchants would sell it to you; and the vegetables which you bought would come from the people who have kitchen gardens or market gardens, which would be an internal expenditure. The fish which you bought would be caught by our fishermen in boats on which you have lent the people money to put in engines. The Government should see that if they spend \$10 million or any amount of money in the community, they themselves will get the benefit from it by way of revenue. The argument that you cannot afford the school meal service must therefore break down, because you cannot possibly lose on it. That is something which they have never been able to see.

If you had taken our view as to the abolition of the school fees, what would it mean? In the first place, you would be assisting the taxpayers, because all of us are taxpayers, and we would get immediate relief by not having to pay school fees; but we would be required to subsidise to some extent or other the private secondary schools; so that what you have saved in the taxpayers not having to pay school fees, that would be contributed as taxation to the welfare of these children. As the position is now, the taxpayers are paying for their own children and for other people's children as well. If only there was that humility in the Premier to make him imagine for some brief moment that somebody else could be right, we would have seen daylight in these matters; but no mention has been made of this very pressing problem in the Speech from the Throne and it is a grave omission which spells a lot of hardship for the people of this community.

With respect to the Transport Board, we could spend a whole afternoon and night in debating this question itself. I know that it has been drawn to the attention of this House and the public that the increase in bus fares was foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne; but the Speech from the Throne is the Speech of the Prime Minister or the Cabinet as we are taught according to the new constitutional arrangements, when the Cabinet submitted to the Governor the draft of the Speech, it must have reflected that a pledge was given to this House and to the community that bus fares would not be increased at all. Of course it was said in a way peculiar to the Premier that only over his dead body would bus fares be increased and some of us may have been pleased to see him resurrected so quickly, or it may be that it was only his corpse which was walking about here this afternoon. I certainly hope that that phase of his idea of politics has passed and that he will not engage the Federal Legislature with those promises which he has to eat so often and in such quick succession. We are very tolerant in Barbados and I do not know if the members of the Federal Legislature will extend to him that same tolerance as we do. However, I think that the Government should tell us why they have allowed the whole election campaign to pass without giving any hint or warning to the public that within seven days of the election the bus fares would have gone up.
6.25 p.m.

I have the impression - I am speaking subject to correction - that the electorate did not quite look forward to it at that time and did not believe members of my Party when we told them it would happen. I remember being told recently after a public meeting that it was a wicked slander on the Government to say that bus fares would go up on 1st April; therefore the public has no knowledge of it and those that had heard of it just did not believe it. Now that in itself, Mr. Speaker, would not dispose of all the transport problems in this island and

Government will have as usual to put the Transport situation on a different footing and let the public know through the House what exactly is to be the future. Certain plans are afoot; there are certain developments which we will have to watch with a certain amount of caution. In a few months we shall look forward to seeing whether these new schemes are bringing any improvement and, better still, any lowering in the cost of the service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just as the Government in power has the right to compliment itself on its own policy by using the medium of this Address in reply to the Governor's Speech, so too the Opposition has the right to criticise Government policy by moving an amendment setting out the position raised in the Speech. We do it as a duty because we feel not only would we be contributing to the Parliamentary life of the island in so doing but that we have used the opportunity to make clear our stand on certain public issues and to make abundantly clear the issues on which we intend to fight this Government. I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have few comments to make on this matter, because it comes as an anticlimax at this stage both after the Budget and after an election which has been held; but from a Parliamentary point of view we still have our duty to perform.

The first thing that strikes you in the Governor's Speech and then in this reply which has come down with which they want us to agree is the point made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Seconder. The appointment of Mr. E. F. L. Morris to the Other Place is nothing short of political dishonesty. This is a political appointment, and it is not in the days when you regarded the members of the Other Place as not being associated with any political party. On this occasion you appoint someone from a political party, and I can speak on this matter because I happen to be the member who is sitting here that this particular gentleman was put to run out in the elections. He did not succeed in running me out. I was re-elected; but he was taken out of the community after being repudiated by the electorate and put in the Other Place and, further, put in charge of a Ministry in that he is Minister without portfolio and presides over the destiny of this country in the Cabinet system. This is nothing short of a political scandal and political dishonesty, to say the least of it; because this is a defeated candidate who could never have been in a Cabinet post from the elections but was promoted to be member of the Legislature in the Other Place. Normally, he could not have seen the light of day in this Chamber until a bye-election had taken place, and it must be cold comfort for the present Ministers who are now enjoying Ministerial positions, because had he been elected to this Chamber, one of them would not be sitting here; so they must look to me as a preserver of their present position, because it is easy for any fool to draw the conclusion that if you are going to take someone who has been defeated, and if your Party is so low in political talent that within it you could not elevate one of your own to the Other Place and make him Minister without Portfolio, and put him in a higher position than some of the Party members who have been elected, again I say the political Party they enjoy within itself is a political anachronism. I would say that this is a very serious thing because, now that we have thrown off or are about to throw off the shackles of colonialism, we are re-instituting the same ideas which the tyrants of colonial rule tried to put in our heads when we did not have the power of checking them. Only in the bad colonial days would you find a man defeated in the poll being elected to the Other Place to defeat the will of the people, and to do this is nothing short of a scandal. When I say that, I, like the Leader of the Opposition, do not mean it in a personal way. We need not do that. I happen to know the gentleman, and I do not believe that he himself was even willing to be repudiated as he was in the last election because he told me that it was not his intention to be a candidate running against me, but the powers that be said that he must. He paid for it and now he has

reaped the reward. He has been elevated to the Other Place. This is something which we cannot speak too strongly against, because it comes up against what we are trying to build up - a real internal Government system in which we control our affairs, and I say that the British at their worst have long standing traditions of political honesty and integrity which we have to learn to emulate. That is one of their virtues; and if we are going to build a political structure patterned on the British way, let us take this aspect of the British way of life. You cannot quote an instance in the British Parliamentary system in which a man who had been defeated at the polls as a candidate had been taken and made a Cabinet Minister. They do not even take defeated Judges or Barristers and appoint them to the Bench to hold judicial positions in which their influence on the Bench would be over the people. You do not find a Lord Chancellor who ran for the Conservative Government being made Chancellor to preside in the House of Lords, and therefore I say that we should follow the example of the Mother Country in its old traditions. I say that because we are so near to Venezuela and Central America with their type of rule that we can see what is taking place in these places, and have to be afraid of the dictatorship that is likely to raise its ugly head. It is a very dangerous thing for us to adopt something like this.

The other point which I would like to raise is that you have taken \$2 million as surplus. I am sorry that it has come after the budget, but here again it is an indication of how Government runs its affairs. The Government is responsible for dealing with this, but the Governor made his Speech in January and now in April, we are replying to that Speech; that is indicative of the unbusinesslike manner in which they conduct the affairs of this colony. It could have been dealt with before; they have enough members in the House to deal with it; they have a clear majority. I need not then apologise for making the statement which I am going to make now.
6.35 p.m.

Are you taking comfort in what the hon. junior member for St. James put forward? It is true he is looked upon as an innocent babe. He dealt with this matter as innocently as a child deals with a matter of which he knows nothing. Yes, we express gratitude as to the finances of the colony being in a sound position, but are we grateful that you have a surplus of \$2 million accruing every year, and yet you have not reached the stage of paying a limited wage of \$15 a week to people in the lower brackets of the Service? You know that can only give a man a low standard of living. You have not thought fit to reduce some of your surplus and put some of it in the pockets of the people who are sadly in need of it! If you work out a wage of \$15 a week, you will see that it is only a matter of \$2 a day. How can I be satisfied with your paying a wage less than that! That cannot satisfy with your paying a wage less than that! That cannot satisfy a minimum standard of living. It is better for this colony not to have a \$2 million surplus and to know that the standard of life you have circulated is one in which you are giving people in the lower brackets a minimum wage which would approximate near to a minimum standard of life for a man to live in common decency, and to prevent him from living in the sort of squalor which you now have. If I did not have a responsibility to this community, I would say that a people get the Government they deserve and I would say that you should give them a dollar instead of \$15 a week. Because they have placed a vote of confidence in people who seem to be impervious to some of the basic requirements of the community. But because the people - at least the people of St. Peter - have placed that confidence in me from the last elections, even though I did not get the vote of confidence in the Federal Elections, then I would say that the people who put me here are not indifferent of my support of them. In view of the fact that the people of St. Peter have shown in no unmis-taken terms that I am worthy to represent them, I would say if for no more than on their behalf, they have given me a vote of confidence, and on that basis I feel that I am assured of continuing to fight their interest in a matter like this.

Now, Sir, the last point I would like to mention is on the question of the coming Local Government Elections.

If this last Federal Elections should be any guide to any one in this Island, it is clear that the method of conducting elections on the basis upon which the Federal Elections were conducted, without proper information and notice, and without making it easy for people to go to the polls was not in the best interest of the people. If you intend to go on with the Local Government Elections on that basis, I want on that basis, I want to say that the method of conducting the Federal Elections was not conducive to a large number of people being facilitated to exercise their civic rights. Elections should not be conducted on the basis that a man or woman must get to the polls by a motor car. Polling stations should be placed so near in the vicinity where the people reside that it becomes a matter of indifference if a man or woman does not go to the polls to exercise his or her civic right. Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me for saying that I saw your car conveying people around during the last elections but that should be a matter of choice; it should not be a method of getting people to go to the polls. In the U.S.A. you do not have to hire transport for people to get to the polling stations. In the district of Caroni, Trinidad, there were 145 polling stations and that is one electoral area out of ten in Trinidad. In the whole of Barbados, there were 110. In a small place like Grenada, there were something like 104 and that country has a population of something like 40,000 to 50,000 people.

When it comes to your holding the Local Government Elections and you run it on the same basis that you make it a 'must' that candidates must have private transport as a means of getting people to vote, then I say that should be re-organised. Let us take my constituency of St. Peter as an example. Do you think that a woman 65 years old or a man 75 years old is going to walk from Indian Ground to All Saints to cast a vote? No man is going to walk up the Rectory Hill to the polling station to go to vote. Similarly, no person from Bakers is going to make the pilgrimage of walking from there to the polling station for that district to go to vote. Do you think that an old man with corns is going to put on shoes to walk to a polling station to go and vote? There are people in this country, and many in Government circles, who think that it is the duty of the candidates to get people to the polling stations. That is the antithesis of the right to vote. It is the duty of the Government to make it very easy for people to go to vote. There seems to be this traditional idea that even if the polling station is next door to the people that they think election day is a day for them to take a free ride. I accept the broad open challenge in dealing with such matters. I am satisfied that I am going to have the opportunity within two weeks' time of pointing out in this Chamber certain basic difficulties which exist arising out of the present party system.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to detain this House too long but I think there are a few statements which were made to which some reply should be given. I will deal with the remarks made by the last hon. member who spoke first. I am not prepared to deal with the question of voting because if the people wanted to vote, the facilities were there, and it will be remembered that quite a considerable number of people showed on the occasion of the Federal Elections that their interest was not very keen; there was little or no enthusiasm; therefore, the people did not worry to go out to vote in large numbers. But people went out and voted for whom they wanted. I would go further and say that I am sure that if the Barbados Labour Party had campaigned a little earlier, the candidates who were defeated might have lost their deposits and I am sure that everybody will agree with me that all five seats would have been won by the Barbados Labour Party.

6.45 p.m.

Now, the hon. member dealt with the question of paying \$15 a week to certain workers and he also spoke of the surplus which is being created and he speaks about \$2 million. I am sure that every hon. member of this House knows, or ought to know, that at the end of the financial year the surplus which one sees - while it may be a surplus during the coming financial year, there are advances made from that surplus for the purpose of carrying out the capital works pending the raising of loans.

If loans are not raised, then that money is used for the purpose of carrying out these works. While it may appear that we have a surplus, yet, during the financial year the supplementary resolutions which come to the House from time to time from that surplus are advanced to carry out the capital works programme.

In so far as wages are concerned, I can say without question that I have always supported the payment of good wages to people. I have always been pressing for better wages for the working classes and also for better working conditions for these classes. If we will reflect for a moment, we will remember that not long ago, we had the Godsall Report. It was in 1956 when the Report was made and increases in salaries were given throughout the service. These increases were brought before this House and I think even the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke favourably of the Government's proposals in so far as the wages which were set out were concerned.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I did not speak favourably about them.

Hon. M. E. COX: All I have to say is that Mr. Godsall, in making his recommendations, consulted the Organisation of which the hon. member is General Secretary, the Employers' Organisation and so on, and based his recommendations on the comments and proposals and suggestions made by the Barbados Workers' Union and other people.

Mr. WALCOTT: This matter was explained by Your Honour's predecessor who had something to do with it and he pointed out that that is not true. He is not in the Chair, and on his behalf, I am saying that the statement about the Barbados Workers' Union acquiescing in this matter is not true.

Hon. M. E. COX: Since the hon. member has said that, I am going a little further, and I will say that the wages paid to these workers were in excess of those recommended by the Barbados Workers' Union. That is a fact.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Barbados Workers' Union could not have made recommendations to the Government, because they are not people with whom the Union have to deal. Your predecessor in office, Mr. Speaker was called upon in an unofficial capacity to answer certain questions and to give certain scales which were in existence. I had nothing to do with the matter, but on behalf of the person who had something to do with it, I say that we were not called upon to make recommendations, but to state what recommendations were made.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I have never heard more nonsense than that. Here you are, called upon to produce to Mr. Godsall the rates which the merchants and the Sugar Producers' Association who employ people are paying and whose wages are there set out. Mr. Godsall is going to call on the Union to show those rates, but the Employers' Organisation and the Labour Department are there to give these figures! I am saying pointedly that Mr. Godsall called on the Barbados Workers' Union for their recommendations in so far as wages and rates of pay are concerned, the rates per hour, and in respect of the rates which they submitted - not the rates which were paid at the time but the increased rates submitted - the Government came down to this House with higher rates.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is only interrupting me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have to rise on a point of explanation, because I am Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and I want to show that the hon. member has distorted the facts so much that I can say that the rates brought down by the Government were withdrawn after they came down to this House. I spoke against them and the Government brought down increased rates.

Hon. M. E. COX: I happen to be one of those who sat to consider these recommendations. After Mr. God-sall made these recommendations, the Government went through them with a fine tooth comb. We saw what the Barbados Workers' Union had put up and also the opinion given by the various firms and also by the Labour Department. I am telling you Gospel truth here tonight that the new rates submitted to be paid to workers by the Barbados Workers' Union, were less than what we brought down to this House. (Mr. WALCOTT: That is not true.) He can say that it is not true, but I know that the people of this Island have never found me in any lies or in any foolishness and they have every good reason to believe what I have said. (Mr. WALCOTT: What about the huts?) If I were to reply to the hon. member, he would be very worried. I am not sinking down in the mud; I am not going down there. What I am saying tonight is a statement of fact that can be proved by bringing a copy of the report which was submitted. It is all well and good for the hon. member, because he is opposed to the Government for personal reasons, to get on the floor of the House and try to make out that this Government with which he has been associated for so many years, the Government over which he wielded quite a lot of influence— it is all well and good for him to come here and make the people believe that we are such bad people that we tried to get this thing and that thing done. I say that he has been as much Socialist and as much Labourite as my boots.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to the hon. member saying by intimation that I am self-interested because I would reply to him, No public enquiry has ever been put up over my conduct in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I only said that because the member talked about self-interest.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will not talk on that matter now because the House is no place to abuse anybody; he can get away with that in here, but not outside. I do not need to repeat what I have said already, but he should not come here and try to make out Government as the hardest task-master and exploiter of the people. His soul is yearning to help these poor people as if he had it to his own, he would give them \$50 a week! This is not the first increase in wages and salaries that has been made. He was in the Government from 1948 - the same time when I became a member of the Executive Committee from time to time. He has not made any noise because he was one who agreed: we looked forward to him by virtue of the position which he held in the Trade Union to say what he felt was reasonable to recommend for any of these workers. He was an adviser on labour matters and things like that. What nonsense is he talking now in trying to criticise this Government when we have paid more than Godsall or the Labour Union recommended?

Now there were a few points made by the hon. members for St. Lucy. 'The wicked fleeth where no man pursueth.' So far as the amendment is concerned.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I bowed in abeyance to you to leave the Chamber, and I wonder if you took that remark "the wicked fleeth where no man pursueth" as being directed to any member of this Chamber. The hon. member can be impolite, though it does not matter to me, but I think a member has the right to leave the Chamber when he feels like doing so. I could wait to reply to the hon. member, but I have another mission to perform.

Mr. SPEAKER: You rose on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I only wanted to find out whether the remark was applicable to any member of the Chamber.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry that the cap fitted the hon. member and he drew the string.

As far as these amendments made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and supported by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy are concerned, this is a rehash of their manifesto, and time and again we know that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has always favoured a hot meal for children in elementary schools. I will tell you something; I have not changed my mind on that up to now. I have always said and will always support better wages and better salaries and conditions of work for people. I do not like the idea of having to feed children cuddled and herded together in these institutions, because there is a bit of a stigma attached to it, and when children come along they tend to point out who were given the daily meal. I believe in having better conditions and allowing the parents to feed the children as they want, and I can therefore never support an idea such as this.

There is another point raised by the hon. member in this amendment and it is the question of Christmas bonus to people in the lower brackets. Surely if you ever adopted the principle of paying a Christmas bonus, why should you pay in the lower bracket and not to all Government workers? It is true that there are more votes below than above, but at the same time we ought to be practical and view any suggestion or proposal put up in the broadest light in order that there should be no hard feelings or discrimination in our attempt to put forward anything which is in the interest of the people. I oppose that on this ground; Government is not a business undertaking. The purpose or the principle underlying the giving of bonuses is that when you are running a sort of commercial business, you find that at the end of your financial year you have made some money. If you made \$10,000, you divide, say, \$5,000 between your employees; but Government is not a commercial business house. Government taxes people for what it considers to be sufficient to run the services of the colony. It says it would like to build so many schools, so many houses, lay down so many water mains and so many miles of road, provide hospital beds and things of that nature for which it would take \$X, and therefore as near as it can budget for that amount it does so. If after it has budgeted there is a surplus, it is thankful for it. Sometimes there is a deficit; but we do not say that because we have this surplus we must give out bonuses. If we did that, what would have happened when "Janet" struck us? We spent \$3 million; but if we had taken the advice given by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, who, I understand, is an economist, I am sure when "Janet" struck us we would not have had one red half cent in the till to do anything for anybody in Barbados. Any wise Government would be like the ant and put by something for rainy days. That is what we have been doing and intend to do as long as the people say we should remain here, and I think that they will say so for many years to come.

Now, Sir, commercial concerns as you know, keep back wages and at the end of the year give bonuses; Government does not do that. As far as is humanly possible and within the resources at its disposal, Government pays wages and salaries; so the question about these Christmas bonuses does not really deserve further consideration.
7.05 p.m.

As regards the Chamberlain Bridge, I do not think that His Excellency needed to say anything about that. That is a matter for the Minister. The Minister in charge said some time ago that it would soon swing.

As regards the question of the increases in bus fares, what is the position? When the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing dealt with a Resolution here some time last year, the Minister said then that the Government had proposed to raise bus fares and he gave his reasons. He told the House that the new buses cost something like \$25,000 each and he was prepared to raise bus fares. Now, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said that the people did not know that the bus fares were going to be raised and perhaps, if the people had known at election time that these bus fares were to be raised ---

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. My point was this: when they were told that the increase was coming about, they just would not believe it.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. senior member would remember when the Hon. Premier was making his budget speech that he clearly stated that bus fares would be increased. We did not hide anything from the people. We told them what we were going to do. When do you think would be the proper time to raise bus fares? Certainly at the beginning of the Government Financial year - 1st April. We were not prepared to raise them in the middle of March, in January or February. We gave notice that the bus fares would be raised on the 1st April which begins the Government financial year. What is wrong with that? It is not a question of hiding it from the electorate.

The last point to which I would reply is the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy concerning the use of money for emigration purposes and that it is expected that large numbers of people would be returning to Barbados soon and because of that, we should seek to find some undertakings or industries which would absorb these people. I would have been glad if I had been given some sort of suggestion by the hon. member as to what he thought we could embark on in order to absorb these people. But, again, the Government's policy is to lend people money to provide money. It is the Government's policy to make advances to people who want to go any part of the world to look for a job, and that is what we are doing and what we will continue to do. I will agree that the employment opportunities in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. are not as good as they were a year or two ago; but at the same time, we still have calls from the Transport Authorities in England to send a number of our people out there every six weeks. We hope it will continue. We are not at all pessimistic over what is happening. We still feel that there will be demands for our people and they will still have opportunities for going to the United Kingdom. I know we had quite a lot of snow in Florida which almost destroyed the citrus crop and that over 1,000 acres of canes were spoilt. It was reported that the snow fell as never before in that country with the result that quite a number of our people had to come back. But that does not necessarily mean that a little later on that will happen again; therefore, the Government intends to keep money there available to lend people to go abroad if and when there is employment for them.

So far as Industries are concerned, very soon from now a Bill will be brought before the House to amend the Pioneer Industries Act. We will also be bringing in a Bill to amend the Hotel Aids Act because, as far as we can see, in the hotel industry there is some hope; therefore we intend to give further assistance to the industry. Already, there are one or two pioneer industries being established and which we hope would fall in line with this Bill. Realising our position in this country and that we have little or no raw materials, we know that the question of establishing industries is not an easy one and not very fruitful, never mind how much we may hope to have these industries in this island. We must face the practical side of it. I feel that as far as we are concerned, we are doing everything that we can do to encourage people to come here and spend money and also to keep the unemployment situation as low as possible. Everybody knows of our Capital Works Programme, all of which were mentioned when the Annual Estimates were before the House last month. The Capital Works which we have to carry out include the building of the Deep Water Harbour which will absorb quite a number of people. I must say that on the performance of this Government, we have absolutely nothing to be ashamed of and I feel sure that no other Government could do what we have done to better purpose.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I certainly apologise for speaking after the Hon. Leader of this House. While agreeing with the amendments made by my colleagues, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I certainly view with some concern the

great omission in the Governor's Speech as to what measure is proposed to be taken in so far as curbing the steady increase in the cost of living.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the House said that the increase in bus fares came into effect as from the 1st April. I would like to know if he also referred to the other increases in price of essential commodities which only came into force after the Federal Elections. The cost of rice, flour, condensed milk, bread and other items has increased. The cost of living generally has been increased since the Elections.
7.15 p.m.

However, His Excellency the Governor took pains to omit any mention of the step or steps which the Government proposes to take in so far as curbing the increase in the cost of living which is increasing periodically every few months. There is hardly any point in increasing salaries with one hand and then increasing the price of commodities with the other hand, whereby the increase in wages or salaries cannot be of any beneficial effect. My colleagues have touched on the question of the Transport Board and the increase in bus fares which the Government says was inevitable, but which today, is a burning question in this colony and which is engaging the attention of people island-wide. When you consider the various increases - to mention only one in my own constituency, the bus fare from Bridgetown to Silver Sands is now 15 cents as compared with eight cents or ten cents formerly - when you also consider the fact that many school children will be travelling distances and having to pay 30 cents per day and so on, you can well understand the plight of the people.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of explanation. I should like to inform the House that in so far as this question of school children is concerned, their rates will be 40% of what the others are.

Mr. TALMA: Are they 40% more or what? I do not quite understand the explanation which the Hon. Minister attempted to make. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: They will be 40% less than what the others are). My point is that the rate of increase in the bus fares is phenomenal, so much so that it is working a hardship on the average man or woman; and if the Hon. Minister fails to realise that, then it is in my place to bring it to his attention. The increases in bus fares are causing island-wide disapproval and great hardships not only on the working population but on the school children as well. The Minister has attempted to explain that there will be no hardships where school children are concerned; I know the system whereby children receive school tickets for a month or so at a reduced cost.

I think that Government was in favour of supplying hot meals to school children, but, in the first place, they found it to be an expensive scheme and on the other hand, it was found to be inconvenient to work. I think that it was on those two grounds that they thought the scheme could not work. I heard a Labourite say that he was in favour of increasing wages on the ground that doling out hot meals to children is not the best thing, however, if we dole out hot meals to school children or if we dole out milk and biscuits to them, it is doling out just the same; but if you are doling out anything, then you should dole out something. The Government was in favour of supplying these children with a hot meal, but they found that the implementation of that scheme was too expensive and the Government could not find money for that specific purpose although money is found for other purposes) and then there was the question of the difficulty of carrying out the scheme.

Paragraph 2 of the Address as moved by the hon. junior member for St. James says this: "The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island" Therefore, if the Government, through one of its backbenchers can make a reply to the Governor's speech to the effect that the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island is sound and satisfactory, then you can only draw the conclusion that the time has come when we should

implement a scheme for supplying a hot mid-day meal for these school children. It is for that reason that we are pressing for the implementation of a scheme for supplying this hot mid-day meal for school children and there is also the question of putting into effect a scheme of compulsory education - something for which we have fought for years. These things should be considered and implemented. I am in agreement with the comprehensive amendment which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I am hoping, although we may be out-voted today, that the Government will take a serious view of the proposals made in our amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I happened to be absent during the afternoon, and therefore, I could not say a few words on this matter; however, I think I will make a small contribution to this debate now. I quite agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the cost of living in this Island is reaching heights at which something should be done about it. In my opinion, the Government should immediately appoint a Commission of Enquiry to investigate the position and to submit recommendations for improving it. The cost of living in Barbados is the highest in the British West Indies; officials who came here recently from Jamaica, were able to get a higher cost of living allowance in Barbados than they got in Jamaica, because they could prove by figures that everything which they had to buy cost more than it would cost in Jamaica. That does not speak very well for the country. The tourist season this year was not what it was expected to be, because the *New York Times* last year carried an article setting out the cost of various commodities of food and clothing in Barbados, which scared a greater number of people from coming here, and people of moderate incomes in this Island are finding it almost impossible to make two ends meet. If officials who come here from Jamaica can present a case for a higher cost of living allowance, then it means that Barbados has taken the place of Jamaica which had the highest cost of living in these Islands. 7.25 p.m.

(A VOICE: That is not true.) Do not tell me it is not true! You do not know what you are talking about! What I am telling you I can prove.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was just replying to an aside. The time has come when the Government should appoint a capable Committee to investigate every aspect of the question and submit recommendations. There is no reason why, to quote one single item of food, butter should cost \$1.10 a pound here and 79¢ in Trinidad - the same butter. That is merely one item of food. Bacon in this country is \$1.60 a pound; there is no island in the West Indies in which you pay that for it. I could go on if I wanted to quote figures which I have at my disposal to demonstrate that for foodstuffs, clothing and other essential commodities, the cost of living in Barbados is higher than Trinidad, very much higher than British Guiana and higher than Jamaica, and there is no reason why it should be allowed to go on soaring beyond the reach of the people. If Government refuses to appoint a Commission of Enquiry into this matter, it means that the Government does not think that the cost of living is abnormally high and the people will know what to expect.

With regard to the bus fares, they should be further revised because the increase is entirely out of proportion to what the public can afford to pay. The current rates, Sir, are really imposing an intolerable hardship on people of moderate incomes and people of small incomes. There are certain routes which before the increase cost 4¢ and today cost 10¢; so whoever is responsible for the increase did not know what they were doing. It means that either people have to look for almost double - and in some cases more than double - the bus fares which they formerly paid, or walk. If you want to see a demonstration of it, go any morning to Hastings. There are routes, Mr. Speaker, about which I know nothing, but I am going to speak of routes which I know. If you go any morning to Hastings, you will find droves of domestic

servants getting off the bus at Hastings and walking to St. Matthias and Navy Gardens, because it would cost them another 5¢. People who left Carters Gap, Christ Church to travel down to the Parochial Treasurer's Office formerly paid 4¢; today it is 10¢, and I defy the Minister to say it is not so. That represents an increase of 150% on the former fare. Only absolute idiots or people with no sympathy at all for the working classes of this country could have sat down stupidly and evolved the present fare rate. In any case it will cause a riot, and I know that people will tolerate an imposition like that up to a certain point, and no further. Let the Minister get on any bus route any morning and hear the hardships they have put on the people now that the rates have been increased to the present level. There can be no denying the fact that these rates are imposing an undue hardship on the people of this country. I believe, Sir, that even if an increase were necessary, it need not be an increase to the present point, and the Government will be well advised again to go into the matter. I am not talking about school children alone, because they have special rates on school buses - and perhaps on other buses if they can prove that they are *bona fide* school children; but the entire travelling public is suffering a hardship from the present rates and something should be done about it. I would suggest therefore, that there should be a Committee of Inquiry into the cost of living immediately and also a further revision of bus fares.

In these proposed amendments, Sir, there are of course several things to which reference could be made. I heard the Leader of the House say that no island in the West Indies could do better from the point of view of providing work for the unemployed; that is sheer fantasy. Either he is sleeping or living on Mars and does not know what is going on in the other islands. What we are doing does not bear any comparison with what Jamaica and Trinidad are doing; they have not got our unemployment problem. The figures for unemployment in Barbados are over 26,000. Maybe another West Indian colony in proportion to the population has the same unemployment figures. Let him read the budgetary proposals of Jamaica and Trinidad before he makes such a nonsensical statement that no island can do what we are doing. That is sheer imagination. What he means is that no island can do less. For instance, last year in addition to the large scale industrial programme and large scale Public Works programme, the Trinidad Government spent \$750,000, after the sugar crop was over, in sugar areas alone to provide extra work for sugar workers who were no longer employed in the crop; that was in addition to the normal Public Works programme and the normal Development Programme, to say nothing of the real proposals for industrial development which he says is not within the bounds of practicability here, following people who come to the country who do not know what they are talking about, and saying that there can be no industrial development here, without formulating proposals himself. All he is doing is following industrial men that come here. The last Commission that came here put up some nonsense before the Barbados public that Barbados had no natural resources. What he as Leader of the Government should realise is that it is not to be expected that the British Government or any of its experts are going out of their way to recommend any sort of industrial development in any part of the British Caribbean. 7.35 p.m.

C.D.C. first went to Jamaica to investigate the possibilities for development. In their report, all that they could recommend for industrial development was cocoa. The report of the Colonial Development Corporation of 1949-50 with regard to industrial prospects in Jamaica spoke entirely in regard to cocoa. The British Government wanted more cocoa and coffee, so as to provide work for their manufacturing plants and the report recommended the growing of more cocoa. The Jamaica Government did not sit down and admit that only cocoa could be developed there, just as you get the Hon. Leader of the House and this Government repeating the same antiquated, imperialistic arguments about the impracticability of development in Barbados which in truth and fact does not exist. Great Britain does not have any raw materials; yet for its size, it has more manufacturing plants than anywhere else.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member was not listening to me. I told the House about the new Pioneer Industries Bill which we are bringing down and I also told hon. members that we are doing everything to encourage industries. I said that this new Bill is more liberal than the other one, but do not expect too much. Is that saying anything of impracticability of any industrial development?

Mr. CRAWFORD: He did say that the prospects were not too rosy. That is entirely different from being more liberal with the establishment of pioneer industries. The Government thought about doing something to encourage pioneer industries for about ten years before it did anything about it. With the example of what Puerto Rico and other colonies were doing, it still brought down legislation which did not go as far as those other colonies. The Hon. Leader of the House must not feel that by merely making provision for the facilities which you intend to extend to pioneer industries and by making them more effective and expanding them that you can develop industries or that you can do so by simply raising a magic wand. It may be true that the better the concessions you offer to industries, the more you would attract them; but merely passing this legislation does not mean that you are going to get them. It means that the Government should get down to work with its experts and prepare its own development programme. Let it get down to work to see what industries should be attracted or fostered by Government funds and by specifying the industries which Government thinks the colony can attract or can maintain. Barbados has to compete in this respect with one or two other colonies which are loudly voicing what they have to offer and they are going further than that; they are not praying for some fairy godmother to come along and push something in their laps. They themselves are saying: "we want such and such an industry; our population can support such an industry; our resources can afford such and such an industry." That is what is wanted in this colony.

I repeat, Sir, that in very many respects the speech of the Hon. Leader of the House this afternoon seems to be fanciful statements of a man who no longer has his feet firmly on the ground but is living somewhere in the sky. To reply to it at length would take the whole night. To say, Sir, that his Government believes in paying high wages as an alternative to providing a hot meal for school children may sound all well in theory but is so easily inadequate when it comes to dealing with it in fact. Is he saying that the wages paid to the Casual and Unestablished Staff of Government are enough to enable these workmen to keep body and soul together and to maintain a wife and children and give them a hot meal? Does he really suggest that a Public Works employee drawing \$13.20 a week can really maintain himself, his wife and children with the current cost of living? The very least which the Government should ask any of its employees on the Casual or unestablished Staff to work for should be 40 cents an hour which would give a wage of something like \$17 a week. These people have themselves, their wife and children to support on their wage. It is terrible to boast of the financial solvency of the colony and that you budget for a surplus when you have a large number of people working for only \$13.20 a week. It is not fair. I am sure that none of us around this table would object to revenue equating expenditure without any surplus balance, if in order to do so we were paying a living wage to certain categories of Government employees. The one thing which should be done immediately with the Budget Surplus is to pay a more reasonable wage to semi-skilled and unskilled workers in the employ of the Government and you should even go further than that. Only the Government can effectively reduce the cost of living. The Government should provide a special cost of living allowance immediately for workers getting less than \$120 a month. Government should provide a special cost of living allowance immediately for such workers or we would have to provide for an increase in emoluments to all Government employees working for less than \$120 a month. Anybody working for under £300 a year requires a 20% cost of living allowance if he must keep body and soul together. People come to this country from North America and I am sure, Your Honour has met a

lot of them, because every now and then I see your name mentioned in the newspapers as having met certain people at the Airport.

7.45 p.m.

When they come here they must marvel at the abnormal cost of living in Barbados; it is really beyond bounds. Even people with inflated and elastic incomes like the Ministers must themselves admit that their pockets are also affected by what it costs to live in Barbados today. It was not always so. In some respects the firms are trading on the innocence of the Government or the lack of detailed attention of the Government in certain things. In other respects, profiteering is rampant; that is all there is to it. You and I can think of instances in which the cost of certain items has been reduced to the community purely by the actions and efforts of certain people who are coming to trade in the Island. I can think, for instance, of one item - Irish potatoes. For years after the War, you could not buy Irish potatoes under 18 cents a pound until a Trinidad merchant came in here and he had apparently better market possibilities and he knew the sources of supply of which the local traders were ignorant. Let us be charitable and put it in that way; he knew sources of supply of which the local traders were ignorant. There is no doubt about it that he was able effectively to bring down the cost of this item to the public. It may be that the local traders did not know whence they could buy these potatoes so cheaply; but the result is indisputably what I say it was. I believe, and I should like to be told to the contrary, that there are avenues existing for bringing down the cost of essential commodities to this island and if the Government were to accept its full responsibility to the country, then it must investigate the position and take steps to alleviate it.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that it was not intimated to us that the Government would be proceeding this matter today, because we could have done greater justice to it. I am taking time off to reply to the Address in the manner in which we see it and from the speeches which have been made here today. I will deal with the last speaker first.

The cost of living is giving all of us great concern and no one would welcome more an enquiry - a proper enquiry - into the cost of living than the mercantile community. That would bring forcibly to the Government and the public that the reasons for the increased cost of living are beyond our control in the business world. Let us take the instance of meat which is a large part of any one's diet. In Trinidad they receive a cold storage shipment every six weeks, but in Barbados we are allocated four ships a year which makes the supply every three months. When a meat boat comes in, we spend about two or three nights receiving that meat and we jam it into every available space in cold storage. That meat has to remain for three months before we can get another shipment. The cold storage freights are the most expensive things with which you can deal. The mercantile community has made application to the authorities in New Zealand and asked them to put on two more boats per year in order to relieve that congestion in our cold storage, to relieve carrying charges for that length of time and also to assist us in financing our business over that period. When we have to carry a shipment for three months, you can see the amount of money involved, and all of these charges, which are added to increase the cost of living, are quite a lot. It is for the Government to assist us in trying to impress on the authorities in New Zealand that they are not treating us fairly here and that at least two other shipments a year should be put on. That is a point which the Government should take up, because it would facilitate the financing of the storage today and an actual reduction in prices could be made. Those are things with which businessmen are faced. You have the price of butter at \$1.10 in Barbados and 79 cents in Trinidad. I know that a brand of butter costs 90 cents per pound in Barbados, but I do not know what it costs in Trinidad. There is the other type of butter at \$1.10 a pound and it is the type which our people persist in buying; whereas, they could buy a similar brand of butter from Norway at less cost. We used to carry a cer-

tain commodity and we have stopped it, and rightly so. If people buy butter at \$1.10 a pound and they can get it for 90 cents a pound, it is up to them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The brand of butter at \$1.10 a pound is butter in a paper package. Every body has not got a refrigerator, and therefore, the man who has not got a refrigerator is more prone to buy tinned butter than the brand which is in a paper package.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making another speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am just explaining the point as regards this butter. I want to know whether it is not correct to say that the butter for which we pay \$1.10 a pound is available in Trinidad for less than that amount. 7.55 p.m.

I do not know whether it is due to the fact that Trinidad buys more or from another source, but since he is *au fait* with the food market, I am sure the public would like an explanation for it.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there are two types of tinned butter from two different sources; you get one from Ireland which is the expensive kind, and you get one from Norway. The New Zealand butter is package butter sold at 90¢, but I think what the hon. member is referring to is the Irish butter as against the cheaper tin butter in Trinidad, which I believe to be the same quality as the Norwegian butter. I am not *au fait* with the last details on that, but it was drawn to my attention some weeks ago when he made a similar statement that that was the answer. An inquiry, however, would do no harm whatever.

The hon. member also mentioned potatoes; potatoes are not perishable and the merchant he referred to is in the island today, but he did not say that he went out of business. He used to sell potatoes at prices and we did not know how he used to do it; he kept it up and the next thing we knew was that his name was still up but he was out of the door. In the trade you have to know all the points at issue.

Now there are in these amendments many things with which I agree, but there are some with which we do not agree, have never agreed, and have stated it on public platforms. When it comes to free secondary education, if you had the facilities in Barbados to give every eligible child that facility, and if the finances of the colony could stand it, we would say "yes". The facilities afforded by Government and which will remain for many years with the finances as they are, are so small that it would be impracticable to have free secondary education. I know the method adopted by the Party of saying "abandon all school fees" and that is free secondary education; that is not free secondary education for me because you would only be freeing secondary education for those now in school and the few who would be able to go there from year to year. But what about the thousands outside and those in private secondary schools?

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of explanation. I spoke of free secondary education for such pupils as are unable to pay and likely to benefit from such free education.

Mr. GODDARD: If the last speaker thinks that the children in secondary schools today are the only ones that should benefit from free secondary education, that may be his view, but not mine. I think it would be a much wider scope and many more thousands seeking entry into secondary schools who should be entitled to it. We have expounded that on our platforms and adhere to it today. We can do it if the finances of the island can afford it; if we find oil in great quantities or have other resources we can do it; but on sugar I do not see it. We have propounded that and that is how we stand; therefore embodied in this I cannot vote for this amendment.

We think busfares should go up. We told Government when they were taking over the buses that it was a legitimate claim of the private concessionaires; and if they had seen the light then, they would not have been involved in the thousands of dollars which they are spending today and would not have to make it pay at these rates. Where I disagree is on the method of increase. There are stages of 5¢ which have created great hardships on many people in many villages. For the people at Sargeants Village the fare is 5¢ from Bridgetown to "Lyrias." "Lyrias" is the home of a person who has a motor car, but for another two hundred yards they would have to pay another 5¢. It is all right today now that the rain is not falling, but when the rain starts to fall they have to look for another 5 c to get to their doors. That is, I think, the ridiculous part of these bus increases; it is not satisfactory. My servant comes from St. Joseph and her fare has gone from 17¢ to 25¢. In some cases there has been even a reduction, and Mr. Speaker, do you know where the reduction has come? It has come in the area where the people are best able to pay. From Bridgetown to Blue Waters is 5¢ but it used to be 6¢ before. I do think that the adjustment of these fares has been so thrown out of gear that only when the rain comes in you will know the full impact on the people who can least afford to pay the new rates. There are thousands of domestic servants, artisans and people who have to get to work from St. John and other parishes daily. These revisions have been made for all the buses, including Government buses, and it was felt that that was the one system from which they could get more revenue. That is only one feature about it but it is going to create a great hardship on thousands of people whom you should be helping. I disagree with it and I do hope that we will have another debate when the full implications of it come home to the Government, because it is now coming home to them.

There is an omission in the Governor's Speech on this occasion which was made on the last, but nothing has been done and I am going to voice it again. We reel the time has arrived for a Town and Country Planning Bill to be in this House and an Authority set up to prevent the promiscuous building of all sorts of things all over the place which is going to create a great hardship and a great expense to Government when they try to straighten them out. I have drawn to their attention again and again that people are building garages on main-roads and have to reverse their cars on to the main road from these garages; it is a great driving hazard. People are allowed to build on corners and create blocks. No mention has been made of it here and I do hope that Government has not forgotten about it, because the longer it is postponed, the more expensive it would be for future Governments to unravel. I draw it to their attention again and something should be sent down to cover all the aspects to try and safe-guard the present population from the hazards that will be created by builders. In the absence of Regulations people from outside can put up public houses that can be death-traps to the public with no embarrassment nor any precautions whatever. 8.05 p.m.

I think the only precaution is that of the Fire Officer because he can go in and say that you do not have sufficient staircases. People putting up buildings can put on any type of roof and construct it however they like. Your Honour, you know that they put up one at Worthing which blew down in the storm.

Now, as I have said before, we of my Party, are in agreement with many of the amendments made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but we do not agree entirely with all of them; and for that reason, we are not going on record as voting for this Address. As I have said, we stand firmly on the point of free secondary education, but provided that facilities would be available to all.

I will now call to the attention of the Government that when His Excellency made his speech it was estimated that our crop would be 190,000 tons. Today, it has

dribbled down to 160,000 tons and if we are having all these cane fires and the drought continues, it will be as little as 150,000 tons or less than that. We have grown accustomed to having large crops and, as a matter of fact, our economy has been geared to that. Added to all this, we are faced with a recession in work in the U.S.A. and we cannot escape these things because they affect us in one way or the other. We are committed to large expenses on the Deep Water Harbour project which cannot be stopped. We have not even raised the loan for that yet and we do not know at what rate that would be. Because of all that, Government should be warned to go very cautiously indeed.

Sir, I am one who feel that you should not budget for a deficit; but what I do say is that every encouragement should be given, and constantly given, to the encouragement of other industries. If the Government feels that the Tourist Industry is worthy of that encouragement, then do what is needed for the advancement of that industry. We have told you what that is. If you are satisfied that that is the reason, set about and remove the difficulties. You have promised to bring in an amendment to the Hotel Aids Act but I have warned you during the Budget, and I am warning you again, that it is for those outside who have money. We asked people to come here to enter this industry and they say that they are not coming unless the Barbados Government give them a Hotel Aids Act with the same facilities and encouragement that are given in Jamaica, Trinidad and the other islands of the Caribbean. As I have said to the Hon. Premier, do not even leave out a comma, because they can take their money to many other colonies and territories in the West Indies to invest it. But we need it here and, as I have said before, money invested in hotels is risk money. It is not like investing money in an ordinary factory where you can take up the machinery and move it to another place, say, to Trinidad. When you put up a hotel and put in your beds, if it is not doing well, the most that you can do is to turn it into flats and you can only do so at great expense. You may be able to sell the beds and some of the furnishings, but at great sacrifice. You cannot move it from one parish to another. As I have said, you will not be doing it to catch any investor over here. I do not know of a single Barbadian investor who has money that is willing to put it in a hotel, therefore, whatever we are doing, it is to attract outside capital; and unless you can give the outside investor the facilities and encouragement which he is asking, you cannot attract him.

We are hoping that the Gulf Oil Company strikes oil this time. I know that they are going down to a great depth. I am one who is hoping that the burden of taxation would be relieved by the striking of oil. If you rule that out and the Gulf Oil Company pulls out of Barbados, then the little money which that company is spending now - and it is not so little - will be gone from us and there will be many years before another oil company would think of coming here to sink wells.

We have a large population which can be put to work but it would take a lot of capital to put them to work. I see the tourist industry as the one immediate benefit to the island; therefore, do not let the present opportunity you have to slip through your hand.

Sir, I am not voting for these amendments but there are many things in them to which we agree.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, it is a bit unfortunate that some members of the Opposition spoke after the reply was given by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour. In view of certain criticisms made by certain hon. members and which pertain to my Ministry, I think I should make a reply. I will answer one or two points made by the last hon. member who spoke because he has made the most constructive speech. I think he must have missed one of the paragraphs in His Excellency's Address: if not, he would not have said what he did about the Town and Country Planning Bill. I want to correct that impression first of all (Mr. GODDARD: I really did not notice that.) What I would say is that the legal department is very hard pressed but I can assure the hon. member

that that is a Bill which is being given priority.

The chief criticism was about the bus fares. Let me say this: Certain hon. members of the Opposition - I am speaking, Sir, of what is called the Official Opposition - and I think it was the hon. Leader of the Opposition who said that these increases in bus fares were only put on after the Federal Elections had taken place. Mr. Speaker, that is true. The implication is that it was so timed to fool the public. Let me say that no attempt was made to fool the public. We told them long ago that the bus fares would be increased and they knew it. It is simply because April is the beginning of the financial year that we have made the increase in bus fares as from the 1st April. If we wanted to be smart we could have kept it back until after the bye-elections have taken place. We stated it in the House early this year and the Hon. Premier announced it in his budget speech.

8.15 p.m.

As I have already said, if we wanted to be smart and hide something we could have waited until after the bye-elections to bring about these increases in bus fares. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to read into all this, when talking about the bus fares being increased, something which is absolutely not there. This matter had nothing to do with any elections whatever.

In so far as the present system is concerned, let me say here that in every change there are bound to be anomalies taking place. Let us take the anomaly which has been mentioned by the last speaker. He said that Lyrrias was a stage and there is a village a little beyond and you pay an additional fare. I could mention other anomalies. Let me say that it was not the intention of the Government to work exactly by the mile stones; but rather make a convenient point to the public so long as you set a reasonable limit at the end of the stage. This is the tropics and when the rain is coming, you cannot drop people out of a bus anywhere.

I have had complaints from St. George; in some cases, it seems to be an error, either ignorant or calculated, on the part of a Conductor to charge anybody going into, say, Ellerton more than ten cents. It is not a question of the milestone, which is in No Man's Land, so to speak, being a stage. Some people are being charged fifteen cents to go to Ellerton, and those are the sort of things which must be put right. What has happened will happen in any change which takes place, but it does not mean that the system itself is unreasonable or wrong or unduly harsh on the public.

I should like to tell the House some of the reasons which led up to this change and of the system itself. The House will remember that Mr. Gibbon came here and made some recommendations, and this is the effect of certain of the recommendations. He recommended that fares should be charged according to the stages which are worked out. It used to happen that on some routes people who went a certain distance paid more in fares than those who went a similar distance on other routes. In the parish of St. Thomas people have told me that they used to pay ten cents for going a certain distance and they still pay the same ten cents today. That could be explained. People used to pay seven cents to go to Paynes Bay in St. James and to Shop Hill St. Thomas. They pay the same seven cents; but to Redmans Village, the fare was ten cents - a distance less than Shop Hill or Paynes Bay. In all systems we will get anomalies, and therefore, we say, let us have a uniform system based on mileage, instead of the old system of having a stage here and a stage there at random without any uniformity. After all, it must cost so much and no less to travel each mile, and it must be an economic fare if we are to pay our way.

We have found that these short routes are uneconomic; the long routes did not work out badly, but the greatest trouble is in respect of the short routes. I would like to read out this information from the Gibbon Report to the House.

"There are fifteen stages (as many as 7 stages to 1 route) now being operated; with the large new buses

carrying more people it becomes impossible for conductors to collect all the fares from all the passengers using the large new buses on routes with short stages. The number of stages must, therefore, be reduced and related to specific mileages."

After recommending that the fares should be tied to the new Caribbean coinage, the Report continued: "The revision will considerably simplify the construction of ticket machines, which should be used on all buses, and will reduce the appreciable loss of pennies and half-pennies not accounted for. The present book-keeping, hitherto the numerous coins, will also be simplified and the opportunities for errors and omissions considerably reduced and economy effected."

Let me tell the House this: these new fare stages are designed not to bring in the maximum, but the absolute minimum. We have tried to inflict the least hardships on the travelling public. On some routes, passengers are paying a cent or a penny more, on some routes they are paying the same as before and on others the fare has gone up by four and five cents. All that will take place in any new system which is adopted.

Hon. members will remember that we said we would introduce the turning stile system. We have had to send out the design of the buses and we are in touch with the makers, but we must work them with the new coinage of five cents and ten cents. Hon. members who have visited the United States of America will know something about this matter. We cannot work them other than on the five and ten cents stages.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have only risen, less my Party member thinks that he is singing any solo in connection with the Reply to His Excellency's Speech. As he actually said we do agree in part with some of the things which have been mentioned by the Official Opposition as it is termed, but we do not agree with many things. 8.25 p.m.

As he rightly said, we were not prepared because we thought Government was going to deal with the Order Paper and not go on to Private Members' Business, because it is so rare that Private Members are given an opportunity to deal with matters, and therefore we did not bring along our notes. We will therefore take the opportunity of expressing our views on some of the matters.

I will deal with them as I see them here. We cannot very well just say that we agree with the Reply which the hon. junior member for St. James has given. One would have thought, although he is a back-bencher, that the hon. junior member for St. James would have made a contribution. May be he is thinking that brevity is the soul of wit, and he realises like his Leader that there is no point in trying to convince his colleagues.

Now I am going to deal first with the part which reads as follows:-

"The House is disturbed at the failure in this Address to make any reference whatsoever to the Disendowment and Disestablishment of the Anglican Church and queries this significant omission from this formal declaration of Government Policy for current Session."

We are somewhat disturbed too because, as Government has started and stopped half-way, it is causing great inconvenience to the running of this Institution. I think it must be within the knowledge of the Government members what is happening today which most of us regret, whether we are Anglican, Roman Catholic or else, because we know that the Anglican Churches are so tied up with the schools that the majority of people still go to them. I think it was the Premier who quite recently said it would be a bad day when religious teaching is taken away from the schools. I do not know whether he is copying Sir Winston Churchill or whether Sir Winston Churchill was copying him, but I think he is copying Sir Winston, because I think it was because of hostility that he mentioned that he would hate to see religion taken away from the general teaching of the people. I say that because we find that the Church has been appointing quite a number of retired men. I am not happy about the fact

that a man must retire and draw pension through the Treasury and then because of the situation and the partial suspension of the Act be reappointed. It is rather difficult to get anybody to accept a post in the Church. I think the members of the House should be somewhat concerned about this because they have agreed to the appointment of men who have already retired and who are drawing money from the Treasury. I object to this very strongly because you have to fall back to appointing these men, and I have been told from good authority, which I have no reason to doubt, that there is the greatest difficulty in filling these positions. I never subscribed to the idea but it is causing us great concern; so I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in putting in the amendment. This is Government's policy, because you have created the situation in which it is difficult to get anybody from abroad because they feel they could make a more lucrative living outside. It is an established fact already that it is the policy of Government to disendow the Church whether or not we agree with it; and having agreed upon that, it is hardly fair to keep it where it is and allow the position to remain, as it is, in great uncertainty, because there should be some declaration as to what it is proposed to do in the not too distant future.

Paragraph 4 reads as follows:-

"The House views with grave apprehension the total omission from this Address of any proposals for the improvement of the Social services particularly in regard to adequate increases in the amount of Old Age Pensions. Equally is it profoundly unhappy at the non-mention of any proposals for payment of Christmas bonus to the lowest-paid public employees to implement the Address to that effect which passed this Chamber during 1956."

I think myself that there are people with families in the lower income bracket who find it very difficult at Christmas time. I am not asking for a bonus; I am asking, as is done in other countries, Government to make a loan, especially to the established staff, to be taken out over the period of a year which would relieve our weekly workers.

As to the first part of the paragraph, I feel that one thing which is staring Government in the face is the fact that Government has established an Authority which is responsible for the lending of money and to administer Labour Welfare funds and what not. That money is being loaned to people in the sugar industry to build or repair houses. I should like to suggest to Government that they take a census of the people who were employed in the sugar industry during and immediately after the 1914 War, and the number of persons today who are between 50 and 60 years or 60 and 70 years who are no longer engaged in the sugar industry

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

and see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how many there are actively engaged as small farmers. I think the policy which Government has of lending people presently engaged in the industry is not good enough. 8.35 p.m.

It is true that Government is lending money to workers in the sugar industry but I am advocating that persons who have worked in the Sugar industry should be given a free gift of a certain amount. Members of my Party have discussed the matter and we have agreed to it and I think members of the Official Opposition could hardly refuse to agree to the suggestion that persons who have worked in the sugar industry and who can no longer work and who are now given what I would call this conscience money should be given a free gift up to a certain amount. It can be worked out. Those persons have worked all their lives and no one wants to go to the Almshouse; and, as a matter of fact, if they all went, the Almshouses could not hold them. I am suggesting to the Government which is now lending these people who work in the sugar industry not to consider them alone but to give those people who worked in the industry, but can no longer work, a gift of around \$200 out of the Labour Welfare Fund to repair their houses. I throw out the suggestion and I hope the Government will pay some regard to it.

As to the giving of free hot meals to school children in public Elementary Schools, I think I can speak with greater authority than any other hon. member in this Chamber because of my practical knowledge. I think you will agree that while you cannot embark immediately on any scheme big enough to supply every child in elementary schools with a hot meal, I think it is time that any Government pretending to be a Socialist Government should ascertain from the schools the number of children who do not go to school because they cannot get a hot meal, and with your domestic science classes set up in many of these schools teaching this type of cooking, I know that you should be able to supply a hot meal to such children who cannot get it. Let me say that if I get another 200 children - of course I am too old for that - they all must go to an elementary school. I feel a lot of those people who want to remove their children from elementary schools are causing them to lose a tremendous lot of human thinking. Of course, I know that your answer will be: how can you give one and not the other? But there are hundreds of children who would not want that hot meal, while on the other hand there are hundreds who can do with it and who after Sundays and Mondays do not get it at home. While I know that you cannot embark on it as a overall scheme, I cannot see any Government pretending to be a Socialist Government failing to take advantage now of the suggestion I am throwing out. No Government can really disagree with that. No parent would want to have his children to eat a free meal if they can afford to provide it, but in every country you will find that there are children who would want and stand in need of it. As a matter of fact, I think in this respect Barbadians are a lot better than people in many parts of the civilised community. The hon. senior member for St. John knows that he has seen children hanging around the school and sneaking around when the school is about to give out biscuits and milk around 10.30 o'clock although they are not in school. I know that but for the grace of God, that I might have been. It really hurts. I am reasonable enough to say that you cannot embark upon giving a hot meal to all school children as an overall scheme; but I am sure that at the girl schools they can take care of this and, as a matter of fact, you can have special janitors appointed to assist in the domestic science classes in these schools.

I made it a point to go around to almost every school to get the number of children who would require the giving of a hot meal. I asked the schoolmasters and school mistresses not to sit by, but to find out who would like to get a hot meal. You may say that I am buying votes by doing that. Well, if that is so, let me get all the votes. I have seen one bus concessionaire who had enough feelings to make out a return that he was able to bring 30 school children free daily in his buses to go to the Park to get a hot meal. In any country you get neglected and unwanted children, and that is why I agree with paragraph five of the amended Address. I am sure what I am suggesting can be done in every parish. You have brought a second mobile unit and you are sending it to the Ministry to carry about letters. Certainly what I have suggested can be done. Get your statistics. Some Minister has said that it looks too much like an institution. If you have somebody who is hungry, he is hungry. Is the Hon. Minister saying that because you give school children a hot meal you are making them dogs and pigs? You will always have the poor with you. There are people who do not want children and who neglect their children. I am not saying that the Hon. Minister does not have sympathy for children. You have to provide for such children and you must provide for them.

8.45 p.m.

I have heard the hon. member advocate extreme social measures in here and now *sotto voce* he talks about making children feel like animals. I have listened to wonderful theories; "If you give people higher wages tomorrow, you will still find somebody without anything;" "If you give higher wages tomorrow, you will yet have unwanted and neglected children; but they are still human beings. If you find yourself with these children, then you must provide for them. I should like to come for the hon. member tomorrow and take him to Queen's Park. I feel

very strongly on this matter; you can give people wages as high as you like, but there are some people for whom you will still have to provide. I can always tell when I sting the Government; the hon. member wants me to stop speaking. I have not got to make any political splash, because everybody knows that I am not just blowing hot air. Actions speak more loudly than words.

I quite agree with hon. members on this side of the House that something should be done in this matter, but I do not agree that you can have a big scheme. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. John knows that what I am saying is correct; while you cannot embark on a big scheme, yet something should be done to relieve the suffering people by way of the provision of a hot meal.

I am not worrying about the Chamberlain Bridge, and therefore, I am going to paragraph 7 of this amended Address. That paragraph says this:

"It is with profound disquiet that the House notes from the Address that in the case of the Transport Board, bus fares will be increased. The House has not forgotten the statement in this Chamber during the previous Session (of the Premier and Minister of Finance) relative to maintaining motor omnibus fares at their then level, and will resist any attempt at any such increase."

I sincerely regret that the Hon. Premier is not here, because it would appear that we have been gathered at the funeral service of a very able man, and that is the Premier. If we recall aright, he did say that the bus fares in this country will only go up over his dead body. Apparently, we have gathered here to pay tribute to this very able man. Bus fares have been increased and I want to put a few facts before this Hon. Chamber. It has been argued that I started off the bus row. As from the 1st April, this year, bus fares went up all over the Island; they went up on "All Fools' Day", because the Government thought that all the people in this country were fools; that is why they carried up the bus fares on "All Fools' Day". Let us address our minds to this matter. The Transport Service of this country was run by concessionaires who were given concessions by the Government. The Concessionaires asked for more money and a Committee was appointed to go into the matter. That Committee recommended, as I recall after enquiry, that bus fares should be increased. The Government in its wisdom said "No", and the Hon. Premier went further and said, "Bus fares will be increased only over my dead body." He is not dead, but from "All Fools' Day, all the people who are considered to be fools, will have to pay increased bus fares. The Committee which was set up by the Government to go into this matter was comprised of Mr. Alkins who I understand will soon be Honourable", Mr. Freddie Clairmonte, who ought to know everybody's business in Barbados and Mr. Osbourne. The recommendations of the Committee were thrown aside in 1955; there was not to be any increase in bus fares, but today bus fares have been increased! Will the Government please tell us why the Committee recommended that bus fares should be increased? I am not afraid to say where I stand in this matter. You can read my speeches all along. One would have thought that the Government would have been decent enough to come in here and say: "when we had this Report from the Committee, we did not have these facts. We have tried for ourselves and we find that it is absolutely necessary to increase the bus fares." The Government cannot do that, because they are face to face with this matter. During that period, a few people still held on to their concessions, and even after the Government had taken them away, one man begged back for his concession and it was given back to him. Since then people have found money to buy some of the buses, at least.

8.55 p.m.

Mrs. Weatherhead who ran the Brittons Hill route did not give up her concession, and I remember the speech of the then Minister of Transport over Rediffusion when he said that before he closed he would like to pay a special word of praise to Mrs. Weatherhead for the way she had stuck it out and supported Govern-

ment by carrying on her concession without asking for a raise in busfares.

Mrs Erma Rock of St. Andrew carried on at the same rates and did not run into bankruptcy. Mr. Trotman also carried on his concession. Government did not believe the Committee which they appointed, but they are now saying that busfares must be increased. Every year Mr. Trotman who ran the Boarded Hall route made a report saying that he had made money. (Hon. M. E. COX: Not much.) Over \$2,000. (Hon. M. E. COX: Oh no!) The hon. member is saying "oh no!" I am telling him that Mrs. Rock, Mrs. Weatherhead, Mr. Trotman and several others held on although they got no increase. They did not say that they were losing money and we saw new buses being imported. Those who were not importing new buses were buying houses and plantations. One of the proposed candidates for the bye-elections, Mr. Coward, who ran the Boston Company, not only carried on at the same rates but accepted another concession. Of course, that was after he left our Party and joined the Labour Party. Let me say this again, because it seems to annoy the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Coward accepted and got a new concession after he left the Conservative Party and joined the Labour Party. The Hon. Minister wants to speak on a point of order. I am accustomed to that as there is no speaker who is accustomed to more heckling than I.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I think the hon. member out of humanity and decency should realise that he came here at a late hour after having rested, and now it is time for other people to get something in their stomachs.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is wrong with the hon. member's stomach? The hon. member can follow the example of the other Ministers and go and get something to eat, because I am speaking and nothing will make me speak longer than when I am irritating somebody. Is the Minister afraid that the other members have eaten everything outside? I think I have some anti-acid tablets here; would the Marshal like to take some around to him?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member address the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was saying, it is very difficult for Government to convince anybody in this island how they arrived at an increase in busfares on All Fools' Day when several people held on to their concession and accepted other concessions at the old rates, and when Government had in its possession a Report by a Committee which they appointed and the Premier said that only over his dead body would there be an increase in busfares. Government effected an increase in busfares on All Fools' Day, and yet, there were people with concessions who were making returns to the Vestry not only in this parish but in the other parishes and saying that they were making money.

Mr. Birch asked to have his buses back and you did not pay him to take them back; he said that he would take them back however they were. (The senior member for St. Philip left the Chamber.) That is a sign of old age; when you get old you get fretful.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is difficult to convince this island on the increase in busfares and we are going to have a ding-dong row on it. The Minister of Communications said in here tonight that Mr. Gibbon had come and made recommendations and had shown that when you travel to Paynes Bay you were paying less than for the same mileage to St. Thomas. Mr. Gibbon was thinking of a big country. If you paid six cents to Paynes Bay for six miles and eight cents for the same mileage to St. Thomas, it is quite fair. Actually there are so many people travelling along the Black Rock route that you can afford to have that rate; but when you start from Bridgetown for St. Thomas, there was no room for more passengers and you had to charge a higher rate than that. But how can Government in making these charges go from 4¢ to 10¢? I thought the Minister would have said what conditions were implemented in these increased fares for

school children. This does not seriously affect the people in Bridgetown, but do you know what it will mean to the people in St. Lucy? Do you realise what will happen in St. John and in Christ Church where people have to send their children to school? Do you know how this is going to interfere with the economy of a father who is making \$15 a week and has to send two or three children to school? Can the Minister tell me whether any provision has been made, not only with the Government-run buses, but with all those who have concessions for school children during school hours? If a man enjoys a concession and is making money, there should be some condition put in for school children to pay half pay.
9.05 p.m.

It was your policy to increase bus fares. It is true to say that if you wanted to play tricks about it you would wait until after the bye-elections to increase the fares. All I am saying is that you should have increased the bus fares when you had the Report in 1955 by the Committee which you had set up to deal with it. The Hon. Premier is leaving this Parliament soon; therefore he is leaving the baby to others. In 1955, the bus concessionaires at that time demanded an increase in bus fares; you took the Report of the three competent men you set up to deal with it and scrapped it. I would say that I was one of the people who felt that bus fares should not be increased. I did feel so but I think they could have been revised without increasing them. I felt so then and I feel so now. I also never felt that the Government should own any buses. I feel that, just as they offered buses to the Federal Motor Bus Company, the Boston Motor Omnibus Company and others and made provision for them to import new buses, they could have done so with the routes Government is at present running. It is going to come to that because Government is going to ask somebody to run the buses which it is at present running. It is not the Government's business. This country is different from London and New York where transport services are nationalised. In those countries you have to move about two million people between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., on working days. What private company could undertake to do that? Therefore, they must nationalise transport services because of the magnitude. That is not the position here.

The last paragraph of the amended Address reads as follows:-

"It is with profound disquiet that the House notes from the Address that in the case of the Transport Board, bus fares will be increased. The House has not forgotten the statement in this Chamber during the previous Session (of the Premier and Minister of Finance) relative to maintaining motor omnibus fares at their level, and will resist any attempt at any such increase."

I say, like my colleague, that we do not entirely agree with this amended Address and therefore we are not voting one way or the other. As a matter of fact, we did not know that you were going to deal with this today.

Finally, I say that the points which I have made are that we feel something should be done about the disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church as it is your policy. We also do feel that you should do something to alleviate the hardships of persons over 60 years of age and who gave of their best to King Sugar, and who are now unable to work, and who do not qualify under your scheme to borrow money. We are asking therefore to make some provision to help them to repair their houses. While we know that you cannot embark on any full scale scheme of feeding school children at the moment, now that you have your domestic science classes set up in many of these public elementary schools, you can do something as regards giving a hot meal to children who need it. I also think that some more free exhibitions and scholarships could be offered to children in secondary and first grade schools, but I do not feel that you can embark on free secondary education. I would prefer to see compulsory education first. I do not know that we have very high standard of literacy in this colony; but whether or not our illiteracy is one percent or two percent, it is better that you do something about that small percentage. That is how I feel about it. Therefore, I prefer to see com-

pulsory education first. Of course, you should not start a system of free secondary education before putting into effect compulsory education and therefore I do not agree with the hon. members of the Official Opposition that we should embark on any scheme of free secondary education. Sir, I have made my contribution and I cannot vote one way or the other; but I would say that quite a number of suggestions were made by hon. members of the Official Opposition which have found favour with many members of my party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to suggest that I am not replying now because I have already replied.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted from the Address stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. L. E. SMITH, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. BRYAN and Mr. SEARLES. - 5.

NOES: Mr. TALMA; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.

Hon. M. E. COX: (Sitting) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that I heard you say that the Hon. Minister of Social Services could not vote and the reason given was because the hon. senior member for St. Lucy said that the Minister of Communications was not in his seat, but as soon as Your Honour decided to put the question the second time he was in his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I rule that the Hon. Minister was out of order to vote.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to know by what rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Because he was not in his seat when the question was put.
9.15 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to apologise to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, because it has slipped me to inform him that it was my intention to move the adjournment of the House until Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon. As far as I have been able to gather from the Hon. Premier, it is his intention to give notice of his resignation from membership of this House, and I think that Your Honour will also be giving notice of your resignation similarly. Then there is the matter of the hon. junior member for Christ Church being desirous of dealing with a Bill which he explains is of an urgent nature. I have no doubt that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will oblige us on this occasion.

I, therefore, beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon. (After a pause). I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, 10th April, 1958, at 2 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am always prepared to meet the Hon. Leader of the House half way, because he is certainly not guilty of showing any discourtesy to this side of the House unlike the majority or certain of his colleagues; however, the notice is too short and we have already made our disposition as to Thursday of this week and we see no reason why the announcement, which should have been made today, should be made on Thursday of this week instead of on Tuesday of next week. We know what the announcements are; we know who are taking leave of us and we know who are proposed to fill this place and the other place. We also know that there is the feeling that there will not be complete unanimity with regard to the propositions to be made, which we have to debate from noon until midnight next Thursday, so that on the following Tuesday the matter will be declared and there will be no long debate in the Council Chamber for the announcement to be officially heralded.

Although we are always prepared to meet this particular Minister more than half way, on this occasion, we will be inconvenienced if we meet on Thursday. I therefore beg to move that the words "Thursday next at 2 o'clock p.m." be deleted and the words "Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m." be inserted in the blank thereby created.

clock p.m." be deleted and the words "Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m." be inserted in the blank thereby created.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that, and in doing so, I want to underline what my colleague has said. If we are to have a row over the new elections, we may as well have it next Tuesday as on any other occasion. That will give both sides more time to prepare for it, and in any case, the seats which are to be declared vacant will not be legally so until Tuesday, the 15th instant. We never had any indication that we would be summoned to come here again on Thursday of this week and we have made other arrangements. It is not only on the ground that the Government has moved the adjournment, but we have made other arrangements for that day.

Hon. M. E. COX: I think that hon. members on the other side are mistaken as to what we are going to do. It is not a question of appointing the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, or anybody else next Thursday; it is a question of giving resignations. As you know, Sir, notice of resignation has to be given at a meeting at which the Speaker reads out that notice and at the next meeting, the House agrees to that resignation or resignations. If that is not done, we will have another week to go and that will put us on to the 22nd April. We are therefore asking hon. members to come here on Thursday to receive notice of the resignations and on Tuesday, we will agree with those resignations and everything will be clear then. As I say, there is no question of appointing the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, or anybody else as far as I know. I hope that hon. members will see the point which I am making and will agree to come back here on Thursday. We will not be long - we should be here for half an hour or an hour - and as I have already intimated, the hon. junior member for Christ Church has a Bill with which he wants to deal. I submitted that we should meet at 12 o'clock, but I think that 2 o'clock will meet the Bill. I hope that hon. members will appreciate that.
9.25 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I put the question for the Adjournment, I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter which reads as follows:-

Legislative Council Office,
York House,
St. George's,
Grenada,
22nd March, 1958.

Dear Sir,

I have the pleasure to inform you that a member of the Grenada House, the Honourable Theophilus Albert Marryshow, C.B.E., Senior Elected Member, will be celebrating his 33rd anniversary of unbroken membership for the Town of St. George as a member of the Grenada Legislature on 30th March.

I shall be grateful if you will communicate this information to your House.

Yours Sincerely,
R. A. Daniel.
Clerk, Legislative Council.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday 15th April at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. TALMA; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.

NOES: Mr. L. E. SMITH; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. BRYAN and Mr. SEARLES - 6

*The question that the House do now adjourn until Thursday, April 10th at 2 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.30 p.m.*