

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th 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., C.M., (*Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. Brancker (*Leader of the Opposition*), Hon. M. E. Cox (*Minister of Trade Industry and Labour*), Hon. R. G. Mapp (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. F. C. Goddard, Mr. E. StA. Holder, Mrs. E. E. Bourne, Mr. J. C. Tudor, M.A., Mr. C. B. Searles, Mr. L. StA. Thorne, Mr. H. A. Dowding, M.B.E., Mr. T. W. Miller and Mr. F. G. Smith B.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings of the 18th and 25th February, 1958, and those of the 4th, 6th and 11th March, 1958, have been printed and circulated. Unless there be any objection, the Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

(After a pause) There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs L. E. Smith, Husbands and Talma entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month of January, 1958.

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Adjutant of the Barbados Regiment requesting the loan of the two 1914-18 type Vickers machine guns standing at the head of the steps leading to this Chamber for use at a parade. Unless there be any objection, I declare the request granted. (*Cheers*)

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I think that the House would be willing not only to loan those guns, but to make a gift of them. They can serve a very useful purpose. I suggest that perhaps Your Honour would put the matter to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: For the benefit of the Hon. members, I will read the letter. It is as follows:-

Gentlemen,

The Barbados Regiment is sponsoring in the parade of floats on Federation Day a float which depicts the West India Regiment.

There are two 1914-18 type Vickers Machine Guns standing at the Head of the steps leading to the House of Assembly. I would be most grateful if permission of yourself and the Honourable House could be given for the use of these guns on the float.

Should the Regiment's request meet with your approval, I would like to collect them before the weekend, so that the float may be equipped for a full rehearsal on 20th April,

I have the honour to be,
Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,

A. J. PARSONS
Major, SOLF & Adjutant
The Barbados Regiment.

At the moment, I think that we should deal with the request for the loan of the guns; the question of making a gift of them is a different matter. However, the request of the Adjutant is granted.

PAPERS LAID

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

Hon. M. E. COX: The Liquor Licences (Amendment) Regulations, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the acquisition of an area of land for the purpose of providing an access road in connection with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour for the use of the public.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. M. E. COX: *rose to speak.*

Mr. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I may appear to be a nuisance in this matter, but I am one who is a stickler for Parliamentary traditions as well as Parliamentary conventions. As I understand it from today we have the resignation of the Premier taking effect. As I understand it, the resignation of the Premier of any country naturally involves with it the formal resignation of the Ministers of the Government.

I should like to refer Your Honour to the Despatch dated the 30th April, 1953, signed by the Hon. R. N. Turner, Acting Governor as he then was, and on page 9 of that Despatch, the following paragraph appears:-

"Again proceeding along the lines of development from which the present system in the United Kingdom has been evolved, I consider that the appointment of the Principal Minister should be made by the Governor who should appoint the person who appears to him to be best able to command a majority in the House of Assembly. The other Ministers should be appointed by the Governor on the recommendations of the Principal Minister. Any Minister should be liable to be dismissed by the Governor after consultation with the Principal Minister and, in addition to resignation in the circumstances referred to in paragraph 21 above, the resignation of the Principal Minister must be deemed to include the resignation of all other Ministers who would automatically go out of office with the Principal Minister."

I am not suggesting that it means a change of Government ---

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Before the hon. member develops that point, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Premier's resignation takes place at 12 o'clock midnight. (Mr. TUDOR: Oh, no, no.) It takes effect as from the 15th April, 1958. We are well aware of the constitutional changes. As a matter of fact, we have actually drafted these things and we know all about them; we signed all these things. What the hon. member is saying is what we already know and to which we have already agreed and under which we have already worked. The former Minister of Agriculture knows that we have to resign, but the question as to when we shall resign is something else. I am sure that the hon. senior member for Christ Church could put the hon. member right and not allow him to waste the time of the House. 3.25 p.m.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before that interruption by the Hon. Leader of the House, I was making the point that, as I understand it, the resignation of the Premier takes effect from today which started at one second past twelve o'clock last night. I did not think it could mean 12 o'clock tonight, because it would be tantamount to saying that the Premier and the hon. junior member for St. John could come and sit in the House of Assembly today. I am respectfully submitting that they cannot. Therefore in reading the paragraph which says "the resignation of all other Ministers who would automatically go out of office with the Principal Minister," I am not suggesting that this involves a change of Government. It would be nonsense to suggest that, because the Government in power still possesses a majority; nor am I suggesting that it involves a change of Ministers. All I am saying is that in view of the fact that the Premier's resignation takes effect from today, what really should have happened is that the Head of the Administration, in keeping with conventions should have called on the person of the majority Party who was able to command the confidence of his Party in his view, and today a Message should be before the House stating that Mr. So-and-So or the Hon. So-and-So has been appointed Premier and appointing the Ministers whom he has chosen.

I think, Sir, that it is a very interesting constitutional point, and that is why I have raised it, because if they are going to adopt and act on them when it suits them, that is not the best way. In England, you could not get a situation like this arising. I defy any Minister to tell me of one case in Great Britain where the country was without a Prime Minister and the House of Commons was transacting business. This is another example of the slipshod method of following constitutional conventions. The correct thing would have been for the Governor to call upon whoever could command a majority today, and then he should have been here today and should have appointed his Ministers who are to conduct Government business. That is all I am saying as I understand it and as I understand Parliamentary conventions.

My object is not to confuse or to embarrass the Government; I am only asking for a ruling and guidance to get conventions straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: My interpretation is that the Premier resigns as from 12 o'clock tonight. I am guided in that by the practice which we have around us. When you dismiss your servant, you do not dismiss her on the 29th and say that is the end of the month; if you send in a resignation to take effect at the end of the month, you are not called upon on the 29th to leave, because the end of the month would be the 30th or 31st as the case may be. That is my interpretation; it is common practice and I will stick to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling. On what are you speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Am I to understand that you are suggesting that the position of the Premier of the House constitutionally speaking, is comparable to a domestic servant or an employee? There can be no comparison at all. I respectfully submit that the Law itself seems to be quite clear on the point that the moment we received the letter, the resignation is automatic. If Your Honour will refer to the proceedings...

Mr. SPEAKER: I think Friday was the time to discuss that when the resignations were accepted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think it is the business of the Opposition to put the House right on matters when it is going wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a matter of putting the House right. No objection was made then.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There was no objection in the sense that according to the Rules

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled on the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to submit that it is wrong and the principle is very far-reaching.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I am wrong, I have already ruled on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It means that first and foremost the members have not resigned

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to repeat to the hon. member that I have ruled on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not questioning your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are questioning my ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am doing nothing of the kind. You said that last Friday we raised no objection at all. We purposely raised no objection, not that we did not know then that you were going wrong.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order,...

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you speaking on the same point?

Mr. TUDOR: You will only know that when you have heard me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may go ahead.

Mr. TUDOR: Your Honour will notice if you have a further look at the letter submitted to this House by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph as he then was, he said in this letter "I beg to give notice of my desire to withdraw from the General Assembly of this Island as from Tuesday next, 15th April, 1958", not as from Wednesday ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member remember that I just made a ruling to the hon. senior member for St. Philip?

Mr. TUDOR: My point is not to draw that to your attention; it is a question of interpretation as to when the hon. member withdrew. I think Tuesday is from a minute after midnight last night to midnight tonight. He withdrew as from 12 o'clock last night.

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

Mr. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. E. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1958-59 No. 1

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for \$150,000 to make certain increases in the allowances paid to Government pensioners.

No doubt, Sir, this item has been gaining momentum, so to speak, for some time. It has been discussed almost in every corner. The Press on many occasions, I think up to yesterday or this morning, published letters written as to if and when Government will be prepared to give increases to pensioners.

I should like to say, Sir, that soon after the Godsall Report and recommendations were accepted and the Civil Servants got their various increases, Government began to consider the question of giving increases to pensioners as has been done for years since this Government was in power.
3.35 p.m.

It is true, Sir, though it might appear that this Item was delayed for sometime - and no doubt we all will agree that perhaps those pensioners should have been given their increased allowances already - I wish to state that we had very great difficulty indeed in arriving at what should be given. I think I hinted some time ago that the Government wanted to go into each pensioner's claims with a view of seeing whether or not there could be established a principle of paying a minimum pension to pensioners. By that I mean, suppose for example a pensioner was getting \$10 or \$12 a month, the Government could have agreed to, say, give him \$15 or \$20 a month as a minimum instead of a percentage-increased allowance; but, as I have intimated, there was great difficulty because the majority of these personal files from which the information would be sought and by which the officers in charge were to be guided, were not found and, as a result, after having made many searches, we had to give up the idea of paying a minimum pension.

The reason for that was obvious. The Government wanted to find out in the case where an individual drew a small pension because he, say, had only ten or twelve years' service, whether it was a small pension because he received a small wage or salary, or whether or not the circumstances were twofold. As I have said, after a long search was made the information was not forthcoming; and the Government, in order to do justice to all concerned and in order not to appear as if it were discriminating, or putting one pensioner to an advantage over another, decided to give 75% on the allowances paid to Government pensioners who were not pensioners under the Godsall Recommendations. The reason why the pensioners who retired after the Godsall recommendations

were not considered is because it was known that when Mr. Godsall was dealing with salaries, it was recommended that the allowances would be consolidated with the increase in wages or salaries and the pension would be placed on the total amount which the public officer was drawing. For that reason no allowances are to be given to those officers who retired after the Godsall Report. But, Sir, we have found that there are a few anomalies in that some pensioners who retired under the Godsall Report would not be as favourable placed as some who perhaps might have retired under the 1952 Turner and Dos Santos Reports; therefore the Government has decided that those persons can fall under the 1952 recommendations for revision of salaries in order that they will not be treated in no less favourable manner than persons under the 1952 or the 1948 recommendations, as the case may be. That is the position as it stands.

I again repeat that it took the Auditor General many days, and perhaps nights, to collect the figures and facts in order for the Government to arrive at what we consider is a reasonable conclusion. Now, Sir, as hon. members will see from the Resolution, suppose for example an individual was drawing \$12 per month allowances, he will get 75% increase on that \$12 and that will give him \$9 additional pay.

I do not know if there is much more which can be said on this Resolution. The Addendum explains quite fully the Resolution. I know that there will be no doubt some criticism but, as you will see, the amount that is to be spent on this is to the order of \$150,000 per annum. The Resolution dates back from the 1st April, 1956, which gives a total of \$150,000 to be paid to these pensioners.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat that while we all agree that it took some time to work out and perhaps some of the pensioners by now have died - in any case some time or the other we have to die; but even if some have died, those who have their legal representatives will benefit from the Resolution. I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$150,000 do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, just before we go any further, I certainly would appreciate very much if the Government would make the position clear as to why we are here today and what we are doing because in my opinion, Sir, nothing we do here today can have the force of law because the House is not properly constituted. To begin with, if we are following the British conventions in the matter of our constitutional position we have not followed that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like you to deal with the Resolution.
3.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot see how we can deal with the Resolution when, so far as we know, there is no Government here today. It is regrettable for people in Barbados in 1958 to be making these silly, elementary mistakes; we cannot go on making fools of ourselves. What is the point in asking us to proceed with a Resolution which has been sent down here by the Government when, on the floor of the House, there is no Government? Can you imagine in Great Britain that the Premier resigns and the Government has not fallen?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the hon. member was here at the beginning, but it was ruled by His Honour the Speaker that the Premier's resignation should take effect at 12 o'clock tonight.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Then you did not take the opportunity of speaking on the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did. The Speaker said his ruling

was that the resignation becomes effective as from Tuesday th 15th April, 1958.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have refreshed my memory. The Speaker ruled you out of order, and I will do the same thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I expected you would do that under the circumstances.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Speaker ruled you out of order on the same question on the ground that the resignation of the Premier would take place as from 12 o'clock midnight tonight.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not the law of the Island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The only thing for hon. members to do in the circumstances is to walk out of the House. I am not talking about the Speaker's ruling at all. You are assuming that I am referring to the matter which the Speaker ruled out of order, but I am not referring to that at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would regard it as the same question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have been made to understand that we are not constitutionally set up today. I am not saying when the resignation is effective. The Hon. Leader of the House has introduced a Resolution purporting to have come down from the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee can send down something - if the Act has not been changed -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to speak on this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am beginning by challenging the constitutional authority of the hon. member to present this Resolution today. I am not concerned at all with the resignations now. The Law will take its due course with that both here and in the Federal Parliament. I am questioning whether the Government is constitutionally authorised to bring down this Resolution as the Government now stands without a Head. Although the Executive Committee Act has not been amended, we are supposed to be following the constitutional position in Great Britain. Under the Executive Committee Act, no ordinary member of the House can lay a charge on the Treasury; unless you are a member of the Government, you cannot introduce a Money Bill. While it may be true, normally speaking, that the hon. member who introduced the Resolution is a member of the Executive Committee, yet that normal position has been changed or superseded under the Ministerial system and Cabinet Government, and we have now adopted the practice which obtains in Great Britain.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member is going over what His Honour the Speaker has already ruled. If we are doing wrong, let us have that decided in the Law Courts. (MEMBERS: In Parliament, not in the Courts.) Who can tell us that we are wrong other than the Law Courts? If we are doing anything wrong here today, the Courts will say that we are wrong. I am suggesting to Your Honour that the hon. member is out of order; His Honour the Speaker has already ruled on the question and the hon. member is now trying to get around the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not doing anything of the kind. The hon. member has introduced a Resolution which is a charge on the Treasury. Now, the position is this: under the present constitutional position in Great Britain, on the resignation of the Premier one of several things can take place; but the procedure is either that the entire Government falls or the outgoing Premier nominates his successor and have a reshuffling of the Ministries.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going back

on what the Speaker has ruled. He is not speaking on the Resolution. The hon. member is saying what should be done; he is not saying anything which is relevant to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am submitting that the Resolution is not properly before the House. If we refuse to discuss it in Committee, we should say why we are not discussing it. That is all there is to it.

Mr. Chairman, on more mature reflection, you yourself will discover that we have no authority to do what we are doing today; and it is not a question of the Courts deciding it. Somebody has to carry the matter before the Courts; it cannot get before the Courts automatically. Are we to appear as if none of us knows what we are doing at all? The position is that those of us who feel that we are doing wrong are justified in saying so. I hear a voice saying that the last election was also carried before the Courts. Of course, if the hon. member who said that knew what he was talking about, he would not say it; I therefore suggest to him that he enquire of somebody who knows what was wrong with the petition and why it was thrown out. It is sheer luck on the part of the Government that the petition was thrown out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying from the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am voicing my protest against the discussion of this Resolution under these conditions.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, on the declaration of the Chairman that the "Ayes" have it.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Clerk was in front of me and I could not get up to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already passed it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to move that the Resolution be recommitted, because this is a very important matter.

I beg to move that the Resolution be recommitted.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I must thank the Leader of the House for his magnanimous gesture. This Resolution which has come down is for the sum of \$150,000; but I should like to draw to the Leader of the House that there are certain discrepancies in it. Though he has said that the Auditor General has worked hard on it, I am going to point out certain things to him which are now relevant and should be borne in mind. This Resolution seeks to increase the pension of such persons by an amount of 75% on the allowances paid in accordance with Resolution No. 80/1951. I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention that this looks like a lot of money, but the amount is really only an amount approximating 12 1/2% of the pensions which you are already giving and I think that it can be worked out arithmetically by anybody. I am going to give an example to show the hon. member why I do not regard it as sufficient for these people. In 1951, a man whose salary was £100 per annum drew a pension on \$40 a month, and this was raised by 20% of the pension which he was then receiving. If the hon. member looks at the Addendum, he will see that "Resolution No. 80/1951 authorised the payment of an additional cost of living allowance on the first \$480 of annual pension including existing cost of living allowance of 20%," which meant that if his salary was \$480 including cost of living allowance, he would get 20% of that. If he were receiving then \$40 a month he was therefore given an increase making the total \$48 a month.

On the first \$480 you paid 20%, on the second \$480 you paid 7 1/2 % and on the third \$480 you paid 5%, which means, Mr. Chairman, that nobody in receipt of a salary in excess of £300 per annum would get any cost of living increase above the third amount of £100. The Government has therefore limited the amount of money which any pensioner would receive above a certain salary. I think at one time the total which you could receive no matter how high your pension was, was \$17. What I am showing, Mr. Chairman, is that by this Resolution Government is proposing to give 75% on the allowances paid in accordance with the Resolution No. 80/1951, which means that for the man whose pension is on \$480 there was an increase of \$8 a month, and you are now proposing a 75% increase, which in truth and in fact will be \$6 a month, or a percentage of 12 1/2.

When you go lower down the scale, Mr. Chairman, you will realise that a pension of \$480 a year is not a princely pension for anyone to live on nowadays, and I think I am right in saying that there are more pensioners in the category of \$480 per annum and lower than they are above; and therefore Government will find that if they are giving a reward to the needy, \$6 a month as pension which is equivalent to six shillings a week cannot be regarded as really facing the situation in an adequate manner. If you give a pensioner who is receiving \$10 a week as an additional 6/- a week, I do not feel that you have given careful consideration to the pensioners in relation to what is your wage index figure and what has taken place since 1951, because since 1951 you have increased the salaries in the Government service, and the salaries indicate an amount higher than 12 1/2%. If you are looking on the pensioners to equate the situation for them and put them on a similar basis as in 1951, then it is not wise nor just to work on this basis.

I do not think that Government is wise at this stage in continuing the cost of living allowance in relation to the salary. You are reacting as if you were living in abnormal times and are looking forward to the day when you would no longer pay cost of living. The mere fact that there is a cost of living which you have retained for several years is enough proof that after seven years, you should consolidate it. It is no reason why you should have a cost of living allowance going on like this and you might as well consolidate it in the pensions which you are paying to persons. If you look at the salary of \$48 a month, you cannot regard it as reasonable after seven years and only give an increase of 12 1/2, and that is what you have done.

4. 05 p.m

To those people who work for low salaries the amount would become even more ridiculous if you work it on a percentage basis. If you give a man whose pension is one half of this - say his pension is \$240 per annum which is \$20 per month and you give him cost of living of 20%, the amount you are giving him is \$4 a month more. Now you say you are giving him 75% on that which means you are giving him 75% of \$4 which is \$3. That is too miserly. Ordinarily, you would not reasonably tell me that in your calculations normally if you were going to increase the pension of a man who was getting \$24 per month, you would only give him \$3 per month more. That is only three shillings a week more. Surely, you would not feel that you are doing him justice by offering him only three shillings a week more. Let us be frank about it. I am going to give the Government good advice and you can take it or leave it. When you increase these pensions by an amount which is too small, or as small as only three shillings a week, it becomes infinitesimal and so completely absorbed in the person's budget within a short time that he feels you did not do anything for him and he becomes discontented soon afterwards. You are giving a pensioner three shillings a week as an increase. That is the sort of increase which you do not even give to your domestic servants. When you increase your domestic servants you give them one dollar a week more. If you are spending \$50,000 approximately, I will say this to the Government.

It cannot bankrupt the Government to spend another \$50,000 so as to give them twice the amount. I say again that if a pensioner is getting \$24 and you give him \$3 a month more as pension you put him in the position of a man getting only three shillings a week more, and that is something difficult for him to eke out a living on in these days. When those pensioners retired - I mean those in the low brackets - the cost of living and the general standard of living in Barbados were not what it is today; therefore, if you are satisfied that when they retired many years ago their salary was low and they worked for lower stipends than their successors, it is nothing unjust if you give them something more.

Sir, you can very well understand that the majority of pensioners who would be within the \$40 bracket could not be in a position to have much savings during their life time, because a man drawing \$20 a month pension would not be a man who was working for a very high salary. I do not know who is responsible for this idea of thinking out this 75% on allowances. It would have the appearance of giving the pensioner more than actually what the sum total is. I wonder why they went in for this sort of calculation which seems to have an inflated appearance on the amount. I feel the Government should be prepared in the light of all that is fair and just to review this situation again. Hon. members of the Government do not like me to mention this, but when you put this alongside the Resolution which we passed sometime ago in which a very liberal attitude was taken towards the Attorney General in providing him with furniture, I think if you are as liberal as that to a certain officer who is not in an impecunious circumstance and who would not feel the pinch of the shoe as much as these people, then I say that there is nothing wrong in Government consolidating these pensions and giving a percentage increase which would more equate with what you have done in your Public Service.

Hon. members will realise that in 1951, salaries of Government officers were reviewed and later on there was a cost of living allowance added, and then in 1955 we had the Godsall Report when there was an increase of salaries; therefore, there were about three or four increases of salaries from time to time since 1951. When you take that into consideration, I am sure that you will agree with the present wage index that wages have risen more than 12 1/2% since 1951. This increase in wages naturally would have an effect on the living standard of the community. When you look at what the Government is subscribing to in this miserly amount which they intend to pay to pensioners, I do say that it is not just and fair. I heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that they were coming down with a minimum amount.

Hon. M. E. COX: What I did say was that we were aiming at doing that and then I explained how difficult it was to do it; therefore we had to adopt this method.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I think the Government was aiming at by their own decision was that they would not give a pensioner less than a certain amount. If you had decided that you were not giving a pension of less than \$5 to pensioners receiving salaries of less than so and so - that is to say if a pensioner was getting \$20 a month, you say that you are going to give him \$25 a month, or if a pensioner was getting less than that, you were considering that he should not get less than \$20 a month - then I do not think that is beyond your capacity to do. I do not think if you did it that way that that would be beyond the capacity of your Civil Servants to work out how much more it will cost. I do think that there are people in the Civil Service who are able to work out these ordinary arithmetical calculations which do not call for higher mathematics. Sir, when you look at this Resolution you cannot come to any other conclusion than that you have not been treated on this occasion with what you expected. We never expected, on pensions approximating to \$48 a month, that all you would give the pensioner is \$6 a month and to a pensioner now getting \$24, all that you intend to give him is \$3 a month more.

4.15 p.m

We never felt that a man who got \$24 a month as a pension would only get an increase of \$3 a month. We regard that in the light that you had better not give him any pension at all. You could very well see that when the increase is put down at this rate, it is a matter of three shillings a week. I do not think that a Government Pensioner should be regarded as though he is getting alms. That is an aspect of social security which you have provided for your public servants, and you should not look upon it in the light as if you are giving a reward to somebody who is not entitled to such reward. The whole idea of reviewing people's pensions is to equate them with their retiring pension. If a man retires in 1920 and he is still living - well, there will be very few pensioners now living who retired in 1920. In the Addendum to this Resolution, this is what is stated:-

All pensioners who were in receipt of pensions and allowances thereon at 31st March, 1956, should be granted an additional Cost of Living Allowance of 75% of the allowances payable in accordance with Resolution No. 80/1951;

an officer who retired on or after 1st April, 1956, should have the option of receiving a pension computed on the salary he would have received had there not been a salaries revision plus cost of living allowance payable in accordance with Resolution No. 80/1951 and this Resolution or a pension on the revised salary without any allowances.

The annual additional cost will be approximately \$50,000."

That means that this new pension allowance which you are providing is not going to apply to those people who retired since April 1956. You are providing for pensioners who, you know, will not be increased by this Resolution and this is a question of a diminishing amount, because the pensioners will not be added to on this occasion. Some of them will die and when they die the pension will diminish. This \$50,000 is going to be diminishing amount in this Resolution because it only applies to such persons who are with you now, and not those who are coming after. The Hon. Leader of the House says that they have given serious thought to this matter, and I am asking that it be reconsidered. Seven years ago, you gave a man \$4 on his pension when the Cost of Living was lower. Today, seven years after, you give him a smaller increase than you gave him seven years ago! That does not seem to be logical to me. Where a pensioner is now entitled to more money than in 1951, you give him less money, whereas in the Government Service you give people more as increases than they have ever had in the history of the Island by way of increases. The relative position of the man who goes on pension on the 1st April, 1956, is going to be better than this other man, because he would be drawing a pension on a higher salary and with better conditions attached to it than those in respect of the older pensioner. The position is this: you will find that there will be fewer people going on pension today on salaries and receiving less than \$20 a month unless their services have been very short. Salaries are higher, and therefore, pensions are higher. All we are asking is that you redress the situation as regards the old pensioners who have given the Government their services and we do not feel that they are giving him an adequate reward.

I have chosen the higher amount in order to show you what I am saying. For a man to receive more than \$8 a month as an increase, his salary would have to be higher in the sense that if he has another \$480, he gets 7 1/2% and if he has a third \$480, he gets another percentage on that. I do not think that this amount is enough when you consider that the total additional cost annually is \$50,000. I think that the Government should reconsider this matter and give better treatment to these pensioners.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I too, regard this increase as being very trivial more especially in view of the fact that this is an old grievance which has been drawn to the attention of the Government in recent years.

When you read the Addendum to this Resolution, on the face of it, it will appear as if something is being done to help the pensioners, but in truth and in fact, it is only a question of 75% on \$4 to \$8. In other words, the great preponderance of pensioners through the Government are those who also are receiving a pension of less than \$40 a month; the great majority of Government pensioners in this Island receive a pension of less than \$40 a month. When you give an increase of 20% on \$480, that is an \$8 a month increase. In the great majority of cases, this 20% increase is a negligible amount; this is a way of trying to fool people that you are doing something for them. This is a 75% increase on almost nothing; and therefore, you are not doing anything. If you are drawing a pension of \$20 a month - the allowance as it now stands is 20%, the increase will be \$4 plus another \$3 making a total of \$27. The great majority of pensions are those of \$20 a month. That is the basis, because the highest salary which was paid in those days to a Postman or Messenger after 40 years' service was \$50 or \$60 a month, with the result that you now have a pension of \$20 plus \$4 plus \$3 which is \$27 a month. When you read about 75% of the allowances, you make people believe that this 75% means something. I will say that a lot of these high percentages do not exist and you are only trying to fool people who do not understand the position.

4.25 p.m.

If they view things like that if you view the poor salaries today of these Messengers, Postmen and Warders, many of whom are yardfowls for the Barbados Labour Party - and one would have thought that the Barbados Labour Party, of all Parties, would try to do something for these people - it is left for us to try and settle their grievances. For that reason I am saying that nothing is being done. These are just complicated figures and expressions which are apparently worked out and which represent nothing in terms of money or of personal value at all. This is a negative way of trying to hold out to keep a promise which apparently was not intended to be kept, and on these grounds alone, without exerting myself any further, I beg to move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just sat down was very hot. Now on this Resolution, Sir, I am going to start by saying that this is an appeal first to members of the Government. If I had been a member of the Government bringing down this Resolution, I would have set out in the Addendum the number of pensioners at present or up to the 15th April who are drawing pensions from this Government, and I would have put in the various categories, those receiving £100, those over the second £100 and so on. Let us say that Government was busy and did not see it that way. What else can be argued but that this Schedule 2 which they have put in is nothing but a calculation to deceive and mislead the poor pensioners?

After the usual Preamble "Resolved that the sum of \$150,000 be granted from the Public Treasury" etc., you have "to all pensions plus allowances payable at 31st March, 1956, there shall be added an additional Cost of Living Allowance at the rate of 75%."

Mr. Chairman, apparently this got in the hands of somebody some time last week, because a woman whose husband was a writ-server and died recently, came to me and asked whether she would get this back-pay for the pension and told me right away that she understood that he was going to get 75% on the pension and she had made arrangements for spending it. If you had prepared an Addendum in accordance with the way I suggested, you would be able to see for yourself that this is not really the right type of Resolution to bring down. Maybe what I am saying here tonight will get the majority of the Government's back up against a Bill which I will ask them to pass in this House in another few days by the Vestry, which is absolutely different from this and which is giving more money than this. They will get their backs against this and oppose it, but it is a matter entirely for them. The present cost of living which you are giving is

20% on the first £100, 7 1/2 % on the next £100 and 5% on the next. All along when we were pressing the Government to send down a Resolution, the Premier or the ex-Premier - I am not questioning the Speaker's ruling; it is a matter for the Premier, because he can be double Premier - said that the reason why he could not bring down the Resolution was because he did not intend to see people who were getting big salaries draw cost of living allowance on the same basis as the other people. He realised that the cost of living struck hardest on the people at the bottom and he wanted to bring down something that would benefit them.

According to the Laws of this country, a man who had retired and was receiving \$40 a month would get 20% of that which is \$8, and he would therefore get \$48 a month. It seems to me that the correct thing to do would have been to consolidate the \$8 to the \$40 and then give 20% on that. That is what I have succeeded in getting the St. Michael Vestry to do. In other words, a man getting \$48 will get 20% on that, which is \$9.60 per month more. According to how the Auditor General has worked it out, a man will get \$40 plus \$8, and you are now giving him 75% of \$8 which is \$6. So he will now get \$40 plus \$8 plus \$6. I feel that it should be \$40 plus \$8 plus \$9.60. Is that too much for a man who has worked all his life and is getting \$40 a month? I should like you to postpone this, and now that the Hon. Leader of the House is, so to speak, Chairman of the Cabinet and has a freer hand, I do not think he would consider that \$48 plus \$9.60 would be too much.

On the other hand, for people who are receiving between \$40 and \$80 a month, they are receiving \$11 and you are paying 7 1/2 % on that. That is nonsense; they should be entitled to 10%. That is what I am asking for in a Bill which will be advertised in the paper. You can get up against it, but I would have discharged my conscience, and when I put my head on my pillow I would sleep comfortably.
4.35 p.m.

That is the Bill with which I am coming in here to deal. Ten per cent is what I think they are entitled to and that is what I am asking you to do. When I do that for the Vestry employees, I would have discharged my conscience: therefore when I put my head on my pillow I can sleep comfortably; nothing will haunt me. I say again you should give ten percent to all those who are getting from \$80 a month down. Imagine a man who had retired and is getting \$60 and you tell him only 7 1/2% increase. How do you think he would feel?

Sir, in my opinion if this Resolution was not calculated to fool and deceive these pensioners as well as the people by this percentage increase, the Government would not have brought it down this way. You say that you are giving them 75% on the cost of living allowance. Why wickedly deceive these people by saying 75%? My opinion is that it should be 20% on the consolidated amount, that is to say, those who are getting \$48 per month would get \$57.60 and this would be the percentage for all those who are drawing up to one hundred pounds per annum. Let us think of the person who is drawing \$20 and even \$11 per month. Do you know that there are some people in the Government Service who are retired who did not expect to live up to 79 years or 80 years and who because of that took a gratuity with a reduced pension and who are now drawing about \$9 or \$11 a month? That is why I am wondering whether the Hon. Leader of the House has worded this Addendum or whether it has been worded by the Civil Servants. We are all members of this House of Assembly. So often, Civil Servants seemed to think that they were working for only Mr. Adams, and not for other members of the House. I am going into all the Government offices and in the Courts and let them know that I am not elected by dogs, but that I am elected by human beings.

There are pensioners who are drawing between \$40 and \$50 per month. Give us a comparative table of such pensioners as a guide. Do not say that this increase is going to cost us \$150,000 more. This is a slack way

of producing an Addendum before this House. It is not good enough.

Pensioners have waited for two and half years for this increase. I am going to move the postponement of this Resolution. The public must know that none of us in the Opposition can increase anything. If the Government had put before us a comparative table, we would be able to work out what more it would cost for the people who gave us of their best and who through no fault of their own but through the increase in the cost of living are in this plight. I am sure hon. members on this side would not object to what I have just suggested and I doubt whether hon. members of the Government would object to it. Although it would not be palatable to some of the pensioners, I think we should postpone this Resolution and ask the Government to go back with it and work out a comparative table and see whether it would cost \$10,000 more. You have worked this out at 75% on the cost of living allowance. Take it back and work it out at 20% on the consolidated pension. I am sure you have not done that. There is no Comparative Table before us for our guidance; therefore the most rational thing for us to do is to move the postponement of the Resolution. It may take another two months but it will be better. Why pass this Resolution to give a pensioner who is now getting \$48 a month just an increase of \$6 when that person should be getting \$9.60? Sir, this is not a speech for any catch votes. How many pensioners are they and what difference would it make to any pensioner? I do not think that there are more than 100 pensioners who are getting under \$40 a month. Take this back and give them \$3.60 more. I am sure that seven-eighths of them are renting houses and \$3.60 a month more would mean a tremendous lot to them.

Sir, I go further and say that I hope the Government would appreciate the stand I am taking in this matter. I repeat: seventy-five percent on the cost of living is not good enough. We consider that 20% on the consolidated amount which they are getting is what should be given them. This is in respect of those pensioners who are getting under \$60 per month. It is better to give people who are getting \$40, \$50, \$60, and under, an increase of 20% than to give people who are getting between \$300 and \$400 an increase of 1%. No person who is getting \$300 or \$400 can starve. I am not saying that those pensioners who are getting \$300 or \$400 should not be given an increase; every one of them should draw an increase; but when you retain the basis of increase with which you have come before us of allowing 75% on the cost of living, it will not work well for those pensioners in the small brackets. I think we would be discharging our consciences, and these people would feel better if we give them 20% on the consolidated pension which they now are getting. It can be worked out. You can give those pensioners who are getting \$200 and over, 75% on their cost of living; but those who are getting under that amount - let the Government work out something to give them an increase on the consolidated amount which they are now getting. Sir, as I have said no comparative table has been given to us. In what Legislative Assembly other than this would a Government dare to come down here with a Resolution like this and tell us nothing and put before us nothing? They come and tell us that the Auditor General has worked hard on this matter but what has he produced? Nothing. He has produced nothing so far as we are concerned. If you have kept these pensioners back for more than 2 1/2 years now, you can keep them back for two months longer.
4.45 p.m.

I am therefore seconding the motion for the postponement of the Resolution on the ground that the Government should present the facts to us. At least, if they want to convince us that it cannot be done, then they must show us why it cannot be done; let them show us that it would cost so much more. Pensioners are people who have already worked for the Government and given of their best and now they are on retirement; therefore, you owe them something. They are people who cannot do any more work and they cannot qualify and get Old

Age Pensions. In fact, a lot of them have been applying for the Old Age Pension given by the Government.

I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the postponement of this Resolution in the hope that the Government will bring down an improved Resolution. We are not asking for anything which is unreasonable; we are not asking that a man who was getting a salary of \$80 a month to be given a pension of \$40 a month. All we are saying is that they should consolidate the cost of living allowance and pension and give him his 20% on his consolidated cost of living allowance together with his pension, which would give him \$9.60 a month more. If you had 100 or 200 people drawing \$40 a month, that would not bankrupt the country; what is \$40 a month to a pensioner today? I am not one of those who would tell my children: "you want \$1 to buy a kite; I know when I could not get four cents to buy a kite." An increase of \$1.80 or \$3.60 a month would mean a lot to some people; there are those of us who know what an increase of \$1.80 or \$3.60 would mean; to give a pensioner \$3.60 a month more means a lot to him. My speech is in the nature of an appeal to the Government to give us the comparative table; let us see how much it would cost, let them come down here and tell us how much what we have proposed would cost. It will mean quite a lot to a few pensioners who, instead of getting \$6.00 were to get \$9.00 were to get \$9.00 a month more.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be long. I want to register my protest against this Resolution. I do appreciate that it is extremely difficult to devise any scheme by which pensioners who have toiled in the Government Service of this country might be adequately rewarded. Of course, the Government might very well have been engaged with other matters and therefore it might not have had the time to study the result of this Resolution as it ought to have studied them. I am heartily in agreement with the motion for the postponement of this Resolution, and now that the matter has been pointed out to members on the other side, I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to consult his members in spite of numbers and let us get better terms for these people. You cannot have a better statement than that which has been made by even the hon. senior member for the City. (A MEMBER: How do you mean, even the hon. senior member for the City?) I apologise; I should have said and also the hon. senior member for the City. There is only one inaccuracy in the hon. member's speech, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I did not know that a kite costs \$1.00. We have fought for an increase for the Old Age Pensioners and today we are taking the stand and asking the Government to be reasonable to people who, in the good old days, as we speak, got the next thing to nothing for their labours.

We will never tire from fighting for what we think is right. I suggest to the Government that they postpone the consideration of this Resolution and I would ask the pensioners to be a bit more patient. The motion which has been made for the postponement of the Resolution is purely a method which has been adopted by the Opposition to get a better increase in the pensions. It has happened that when we have a Resolution like this, it is the Devil's own job to get it re-considered. If the pensioners do not get their money this year, I do not think they will get it until next year under the present circumstances. When the Government has set its House in order, as it will soon do, let it go into this matter thoroughly. I do not see any sign from the Hon. Leader of the House that he is willing to accept the motion for the postponement, and therefore, we will continue to fight this matter.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the pensioners, the public and the members of this House had very good reasons for believing that the Government would have come down here with a much more liberal scheme for increasing the pensions of retired Civil Servants. It has been a long time since they have been waiting for their increases. We have had many letters appearing in the Press and everyone, including the Government,

is well aware of the plight of these pensioners, many of whom have resigned from the public service many years ago on small salaries and therefore, on small pensions. We have been forced to realise that the increased cost of living bears heavily on all of us. I, for one, really thought that after the Government was such a long time in coming down with this matter, the pensioners having waited patiently for this increase, they would have been rewarded with the increased sum of \$9.75 per month. I think that hon. members of the Opposition have put up a very good case whereby the Government should go back and reconsider this matter and bring down another Resolution somewhat like what the hon. senior member for the City has suggested. The cost of living which now exists on the pensions should be consolidated, because there is no reason to expect that the cost of living will come down. The cost of living should be consolidated with the pension and then a new cost of living allowance should be granted on the consolidated pension. That is the commonsense point of view, and it cannot be refuted by anybody.
4.55 p.m.

Now I know that it might be operating in the minds of the Government members that they cannot afford any more. To that I will say that a statement was made very recently that the finances of the colony are in a rather healthy state; so you cannot say today that Government cannot afford it when this should have been under consideration 2 1/2 years ago. This should have been taken into account when this statement was made, but I can see from the laughter on the other side that when they make these statements they do not always mean them. I am going to hold them to the fact that the finances of the island are in a healthy state because the Governor's Speech included that. If you cannot afford it, let us economise somewhere else but not on old age pensions. You should not ask the old age pensioners, the Civil Servants and those who are drawing small sums to pull their belts to reduce their cost of living in order for some other things to take place. I would only refer to a statement made at the Empire grounds by no less a person than Mr. Griffiths, the ex-Colonial Secretary, that a Government is known for the soundness of its Government by the manner in which it treats its old people and its youth. These are retired people who are in the evening of their days and this money will be returning into circulation in buying the essentials of life; so this is something that we should have no quarrel about on either side of the House. We are not making these people feel that, if for no other reason, they are deserving people and should enjoy an equal standard of living which they laid down in the service. The claim which we are making on their behalf will not even put them there, because the cost of living has risen higher than what the hon. senior member for the City is asking for. In a week or two a Bill will be introduced here whereby the Vestry of St. Michael is consolidating the existing cost of living and coming with a new one which is an improvement on the last. We are asking for 20%, 10% and 5%. If Government does not wish to feel that they have taken it from the Opposition, they should go back and bring something else, because I know that the pensioners who have waited so patiently will be content to wait a few more weeks. It cannot cost more than \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year more, but if it did, we would be happy to pay that, because these are things which we should be paying attention to. If we have to economise, let us pull in somewhere else, but not on old age pensions.

I am supporting the motion for postponement with the genuine feeling that Government will go and come back in a short time with an improved scheme for these pensioners.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I too intend to join the ranks of those who feel that the Leader of the House should take this Resolution back and discover if there can be any further action taken upon it, now that we have seen actually what it means.

Sir, as I see it, those pensioners who at a certain

time were in receipt of \$40 a month in 1951 by a Resolution passed in this House, went to \$48 a month, and now they are going to get \$54 a month; those who were in receipt of \$25 went to \$30 and now it is proposed to send them to 33.75 a month; those who were getting \$20 went to \$24 and today they are going to \$27 a month; those in receipt of \$10 went to \$12, and now it is proposed to give them \$13.50 a month. Now, I do believe that the majority of these pensioners are in the bottom grade - that is, receiving \$40 a month - and we do find many retired nurses, postmen, policemen and other people drawing smaller pensions. I do not think that it would do Government any harm whatever now that they have only asked for \$150,000 to take back this Resolution with a view to improving the amount that is being offered here. All hon. members who have spoken already have been very clear in their remarks, and I do not believe that there can be any feeling of rancour expressed; all of us have been pressing Government to reconsider this matter; it must eventually redound to their credit. It is not for reasons of propaganda or electioneering that hon. members have spoken, but it is because the majority of those people who were drawing around \$20 a month and who have already been advanced to \$24, are going to get \$27 a month. We do feel that a re-examination of this matter will remedy the conditions under which the people are suffering. I will not rehash the arguments used on how much more money was worth six, seven or eight years ago than today, because that is common knowledge; members of the Government know that as well as members who are not in the Government. I would beseech the Minister to accept the postponement of this Resolution. I do not think up to now that he has given us any hint over here, but I do feel that it would be of great advantage to the Government - and of course those who are living on a very small pension at the moment would be able to eke out a more tolerable existence, much more tolerable than heretofore. I remember that the hon. junior member for St. Michael asked a question very early in this Session that probably to some extent has made Government come down with this Resolution.

5.05 p.m.

Well now, we do see some action is about to take place and we are able to examine it. We are thinking of the pensioners who are getting around to \$40 a month. We do feel that these pensioners can still be given a further increase. At present we are only increasing the cost of living allowances. That is all this Resolution purports to bring about. The time has not arrived, but I hope it will soon arrive, when there will be a revision of pensions. This is not a revision of pensions at all; this only sets out to increase the allowances on pensions. This Committee can clearly see that those pensioners who got \$40 a month pension, went to \$48 through the cost of living allowance and now by this they will be taken to \$54 a month. Those who got \$20 pension went to \$24 with the cost of living allowance and by this will go to \$27. There are some pensioners who only got \$10 a month pension and they went to \$12 with the cost of living allowance and by this way they will only get \$13.20 which is only an increase of \$1.20. I do feel that the Hon. Leader of the House after he has heard what we had to say on this would be willing to accept the postponement of this Resolution.

Mr. BRANCKER: Irrespective of how hon. members of the Government may feel about their own pensioners, that is to say, pensioners of this Government, it is obvious that this proposed increase is a very niggardly proposal. This Government should realise that the basis on which they recommend increases is the basis on which private employers who give pensions to their employees are going to base their own. So the result would be that this meagre raise, this infinitesimal addition to the cost of living allowance, would not only be given to pensioners of the Government but the Vestries and other private employers will be working along the same meagre lines of the Government in giving an increase to their pensioners.

Sir, it was only last week that as a result of a majority vote in this Chamber an Address was passed in

reply to the Governor's Speech and in that Address there was a sentence stating "that the House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economic advancement of the island." Now, Sir, if we only last week allowed it to go on record that we noted with satisfaction the financial stability of the Island and its economic advancement, I wonder what justification do we have today for passing this niggardly amount which is for just a slight additional cost of living allowance to be paid to persons in receipt of pensions from the Government. Mr. Chairman, I think when we have recalled in our minds that we were very satisfied and very happy at the thought that the financial stability of the Island was very much in order and now today in respect of these old people, because of the inadequate salaries which they receive, because of the low scale of salaries which were paid in the days when they were working, they have to eke out a living on a very small pension - if we were so happy as we professed last week over the financial stability of the island, how can we feel happy and what justification can we have to pass this Resolution as it stands today with such a meagre increase for these pensioners in the lower brackets? As previous speakers have said, you will note that it is only proposed to give 75% increase on the cost of living allowance. When that is worked out on a person who is getting a pension of \$30, that is only an increase of 3/- per week or \$3 per month. Let us, having recalled to our mind how satisfied we were last week of the Island's financial position and having brought back to our minds - and nothing has happened since then to make us feel different - let us all agree to send this Resolution back to the Cabinet so that something better can be done for these people. Let us hope that the Cabinet which will be under different leadership as from tomorrow will have wiser leadership, and that they will send back this Resolution to us in the shape and form which is predominantly socialist.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before you put that question, I must apologise to hon. members for not listening as attentively as perhaps I should but, as you will see, sometimes like other hon. members, we of the Government are engaged in discussing some item which may be of as great importance as perhaps the one which is now under discussion in the House. I understand from hon. members on the other side that it is their desire that this item be postponed. I must confess that I cannot say that I can agree with the postponement because, as I pointed out earlier, this is an item to which a considerable amount of care was given. It was discussed at length. It came up to the Cabinet on two occasions and we sent it back. As I have said, we were aiming at fixing a minimum pension but after going into quite a number of small pensions, we found out that we could not fix a minimum pension. I will quote a case in point. You have a pensioner getting \$10 and another \$12. You have some getting \$18.34. If you round it off at \$20 then it would mean that those who are getting \$18 and some cents will only be getting \$1 and some cents more, whereas the other fellow below would be getting \$12 and some cents, and that would mean that you will completely throw these pensions out of order. The amounts would be out of favour. No doubt we are in sympathy with the views expressed by the Opposition but we still have to consider that there are many other things which have to be done and for which money has to be found.

5.15 p.m.

As I have already said, we went into the matter carefully and the Government does not feel that it is in a position at this stage to postpone this Resolution. I would like to suggest to hon. members to agree to the passing of this Resolution, because we have already intimated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that after this meeting it is my intention to adjourn the House for five weeks. (Mr. TUDOR: You are going to move the adjournment for five weeks.) I have the assurance given me by the Opposition and it was agreed that we should have the House adjourned for five weeks; therefore, I would not like the pensioners to have to wait much longer before they receive this allowance.

Members on the opposite side of the House were no doubt pressing the Government to make these increases for the pensioners; we all know the plight of the pensioners and we are willing to do something for them and to do it quickly. It is for that reason that I am suggesting to hon. members that they agree to the passing of this Resolution and what I would propose to the Government is that we go into the whole question of the pensions paid to these people and we may be able to arrive at something which would be acceptable to members on the other side. The suggestion has been made by the hon. senior member for the City - he points out that if one got an additional \$6 now, it means 75% of \$8, and he is saying that we should add another \$3.60 to that. We do not know what that would involve.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I did not say that. I said that if you take what you have in the Resolution, if you say that you are giving 75% on the cost of living and the cost of living is \$8, 75% of \$8 is \$6. All we are saying is that you should consolidate the cost of living and give a 75% increase which would be \$9.60.

Hon. M. E. COX: That would need quite a lot of working out even if we could adopt it. One of the things which has escaped the minds of hon. members who have spoken is the fact that in all of these cases the pensioners have already drawn lump-sums and are already receiving a reduced pension. (Mr. MOTTLEY: We know that.) Ninety-nine per cent of these pensioners have already drawn substantial lump-sums and then they get a reduced pension. There is only one case mentioned by the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he was dealing with the position of a man who retired in 1956 as against one who retired in 1952. I mentioned that in my opening remarks. We have the case of a grade where a person gets \$7.80, and in 1948, he got \$3.00 plus \$9.41 making a total \$12.41. In 1952, he also got \$12.81; but if he retired in 1956, although his salary has been increased and his reduced amount is \$13.40 as against \$7.80 in 1948, he would only receive \$12.60 as pension. That means that he would get something like \$19 less than what he got in 1952 or 1948. In this case, that individual would also come in with those in 1951 to whom we are now giving an allowance of 75%; so that he would not fare any worse under the Godsall recommendations than he fared either in 1952 or 1948.

Those are the anomalies which we discovered and for which we explained to hon. members the Government has made provision. I think that this Resolution should have been passed in this House long ago. I know that the pensioners are very anxious to receive their allowances although they may be considered to be small. There is no doubt that whatever is brought down to this House some hon. member or hon. members will say that it is too small. If we had brought down an increase of 100%, they would ask why we did not make it 150%. Whatever salary structure we brought down here from 1948 it was too small. In 1951 the allowances were too small and yet we passed these allowances - 20% on the first \$480, 7 1/2% on the second \$480 and 5% on the third. Now we are giving 75% on the allowances paid and as far as I can see, the Government feels that that is within the resources of the colony; at the present time the Government cannot do any better. I promise hon. members that I will take up the matter and go into it very carefully; I promise them that we will go into the whole structure of the Pension Scheme and we may be able to present something which might be more satisfactory to hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: We cannot allow the Hon. Minister to sit down on that note. He has said that if he had brought down something greater we would have asked for more. Well, he brought down something for the Attorney General and we did not ask for anything more; we asked for something less. (Laughter). When the amount of the salary for the Chief Justice was brought down here, we did not ask for anything more; therefore the hon. member must not say that whenever they bring down anything we always ask for more. We did ask for more when they

brought down the 26 cents an hour rate for the other people; we asked for more then.
5.25 p.m.

I am glad that my colleague is here because last week when the hon. member brought down in a Resolution the rate of 26¢ an hour, we asked for more because we said it was not enough and you went back

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. We did not bring that down in the Resolution; that was recommended by Godsall which we put to the House. We brought down the recommendations put up by Godsall, but the Resolution brought by the Government was for more than that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will remember that a Resolution went back from this House which introduced an amount for 28¢ an hour and it was increased to the present rate of 30¢ an hour. Godsall recommended 26¢ in his Report; Government brought down a Resolution for 28¢ to which we did not agree and it was withdrawn and brought back for 30¢ an hour. That is as true as John 3:16. What I would say to the Hon. Minister is that it is not our fault, neither can the members of the Opposition be blamed, because we have been pressing the Government on this matter since the elections in 1956, and those of us who were members of this House before we went out made mention of it. I said here earlier that on an occasion when the hon. junior member for St. Michael was visiting Westbury Road and a man asked him about pensions, he said that it was one of the things they were going to see about so the hon. member cannot say that working out these pensions is not a matter for them.

Three shillings a week is nothing to give a man in these days. The seriousness of it and what the hon. member does not realise - and I speak as a Trade Unionist meeting these employers - is that if the Government in money matters appear to be parsimonious after high taxation, they have to be parsimonious too. You are the Minister of Labour, but I cannot say anything more now because in some other matters we will have to meet, but it is this same attitude that is pervading the atmosphere. What we are concerned with is that you feel that you cannot pay anymore wages and are satisfied with that. The hon. member made a statement which he should correct. The question of a lump sum of money has nothing to do with the Resolution. How much do you think a man will draw as a lump sum when he is getting \$20 as a pension, or even if he were getting the maximum pension? As the hon. junior member for St. Peter pointed out, a postman's salary never was more than \$80 a month; it was \$60 a month as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has pointed out. What would be his lump sum if he worked for thirty-four years in the service? Some can only buy a 14' x 9' house with it. What we expect from you is that if a man is getting \$24 a month you will give him an increase in pension that is more than 3/- a week. The total amount of money which you pay to anybody under the Act is \$13, that is, \$9 plus \$3 plus \$2, which is the maximum. For a man who is getting \$120 a month, the total cost of living allowance will be \$13, because you give 20% on the first \$480, which is \$8, 7 1/2% on the next \$480 which is \$3, and 5% on the next \$480 which is \$2; so he gets nothing for any amount above that. I am saying therefore that you have frozen the amount of pensionable allowance which you are going to pay. When you go to those below, you are only paying 75% on the allowance which you paid in 1951. By changing the figures, 75% of the allowance is equivalent to 12 1/2% of the total sum, because 12 1/2% of \$48 gives \$6. All I am pointing out is that I cannot see how the member can say that they gave this careful consideration and all they can arrive at is \$3 a month. The hon. member says that he has other things to do; by all means, but if you have something to do you should give it just treatment. No one can tell me that another \$50,000 added to this can bankrupt this country, because you can bring a lot of cheer to the poor pensioners here. I do not know when we are going to start in Barbados to lift our people up from this low wage economy. No mat-

ter how you look at it, in this year of grace \$24 a month as pension cannot buy food; therefore when we ask you to give him more than another \$3 a month, are we asking you to do too much for him? I do not consider that too much and I do not see why you cannot give it to him.

The question of a lump sum does not arise, so that when you give him this small amount, you are working on the assumption that somebody has left him a home and he can live along on the allowance. That is why I am drawing to the attention of the hon. member that the highest percentage figure which you are paying is on a salary up to \$40 a month. You gave an amount of \$8 seven years ago, but you are not coming back to give another \$8; you are only giving \$6. If you gave him 20% of the rate seven years ago and you have raised salaries, why is it that you are only giving 12 1/2% now? What are the circumstances that make you feel that he is better off now than when you had to make an adjustment seven years ago? I do not understand how the Minister looks upon these matters.

5.25 p.m.

Can the Hon. Minister say that to increase this would mean that it would stop them from doing other things? This is something which they have been considering for two years. They have finished considering it and they have now brought it down to the House. As the hon. senior member for the City has said, we do not have the breakdown as to how many pensioners there are, nor the number of pensioners who are getting less than \$60 a month. We know that with the salary structure which existed, most of the pensioners would fall within that category, and we are suggesting that they should be given a minimum pension. The Hon. Premier said more than once on the floor of the House that the reason why they did not come down with this increase for pensioners before was because it was not their intention to increase any of the pensioners in the high brackets. Do you realise that by this Resolution you are increasing all of them? by this all pensioners would receive this 75% on their cost of living allowance. For a man in the category of the Chief Justice, this increase in pension will only be for income tax purposes because when you add on \$13 a month to a man who is in receipt of a high pension, it can only be for income tax purposes. You are doing this or ought to be doing this for the man who is in the salt fish bracket, because this is only paying for salt fish and pork. Imagine a man who is getting \$24 a month as pension. No matter how much lump sum that man may have drawn before, what type of budget do you imagine that man is living on? All that he can be eating is lard oil food. All that man can do is to put a lot of grease in his food so as to make him feel that he is eating a lot of ingredients. We all have different outlooks. I do not want to divulge any Executive Secrets, but I heard the Hon. Minister make a statement regarding wages and implying that I was the person who was against the paying of more wages. I have a very important document in my possession dealing with more wages, and if any one wants to challenge me, I am quite prepared to release that document with the date.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, what I said was that his advice at that time weighed heavily because he, being Secretary of the Trade Union - the only one in the Island - was the person to whom the Government looked for advice and that advice invariably was accepted.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am very glad the Hon. Minister said that that advice was invariably accepted because, as you know, the very advice which was not accepted may be that on a very vital matter. If the hon. member wants to challenge me when that advice varied, I will remind him when it varied. I do not think he has forgotten.

However, Mr. Chairman, I say that in passing to remind the Hon. Minister that I cannot see if I were in the Hon. Minister's position how I could come to the House with any increase of 3/- a week for any pensioner. He knows that before we were on the Executive Committee, the Cuke Committee came in with some recommendations and we did not agree to them. It was something

like four cents or eight cents a day increase which that Committee was offering to people. We did not accept them. Similarly I cannot agree with the Hon. Minister coming down with this Resolution with a proposal of 75% increase on the cost of living bonus. I do not know if the Financial Secretary instructed the Cabinet to increase it this way, but can we reasonably ask a man getting a consolidated pension of \$24 to accept only \$3 more?

I want the Hon. Minister to bear this in mind. I would vote against this anyhow. Of course it will not be on the basis of your bringing down something for the pensioners. I will also tell you that the people can always vote against me so long as I exercise my conscience. I cannot see how this Government can bring down a Resolution to give a pensioner who is getting \$24 a month more.

I am saying this now to hon. members of the Opposition. Owing to the light-hearted way in which hon. members deal with these matters, too many of us are losing sight of the economic position of our brethren. When we are speaking on this Resolution, we do not realise that there are men and women who are pensioners who go to sleep hungry because their pension is very low. I repeat that the distribution of \$50,000 more on this item is infinitesimal; we should increase this Resolution by another \$50,000. That additional amount would bring more cheer and would distribute something more to each pensioner and along with that cause more money to be circulated in the community owing to these people being able to buy more food and clothing. If an analysis is taken of the savings of the pensioners, I would bet that not more than a few - perhaps not more than 2% - of the pensioners who are drawing between \$20 and \$48 have any savings in the Savings Bank or any Bank. We are pleading with the Government to see the light. You cannot make this increase on the basis of 75% to the man who is getting a pension of only \$20. I am going to make this serious appeal now. Those of us who enjoy a salary or income better than these people know what it cost us to live. Some of us spend more than \$20 a month on a child. The school fees which some parents pay are more than \$20 a month. You are giving a pensioner who is getting \$24 a month \$3 more and you are asking him to make that do. I am wondering when we say and do these sorts of things how people in other parts look upon Barbados. We are aspiring towards nationhood; yet we are still carrying on with the colonial mentality in that we still regard low wages as the order of the day. I cannot understand it and I am worried about it. My colleagues on my immediate left seem to have taken a cue from the Government, and when they pay better wages to their employees they think that their employees are well off because of what they are getting.

5.45 p.m.

I could not support this Resolution in these terms, and I hope that the Hon. Minister will not say that we should wait until they review it. If they review the Resolution, however, they will be satisfied in their minds that it is not enough. You have to pay a boy 3/- a week for washing off your motor car, and a good motor car will take washing off more than twice a week. You even pay \$1.00 a week for washing off your motor car.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should just like to put the record straight. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the Government came down here with a Resolution fixing rates of pay at 26 cents an hour. (Mr. WALCOTT: I corrected myself and said that they came down with rates of 28 cents an hour.) The Godsall Report recommended 21 cents an hour in the first category of the Key Scale; the existing rate along with the cost of living allowance brought the rate up to 20.4 cents and Mr. Godsall recommended 21 cents. In the second category, he recommended 26 cents an hour, in the third category, 28 cents an hour, and in the fourth category, he recommended 29 cents an hour. That was the Godsall Report. The Government came down here and had a Resolution passed and I am quite sure that that was the only Reso-

lution in this connection. In 1948, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member of the Government; we had to go into the Adams' Report and we made adjustments upward on the increases given by Commissioner Adams. In 1952, the hon. member was connected with the Turner Report and after that Report, we had the Dos Santos Report which dealt with those people who had not been considered in the Turner Report. We made adjustments before we came into the House. The Godsall Report was presented to the House, and I know that hon. members looked at it and voiced their opinion even before the Government was able to bring down its proposals. The proposals were agreed to on the 6th November, 1956 and assented to by the Governor on the 13th November. The Government increased the Key Scale rate in the second category from 26 cent an hour to 30 cents an hour.

Mr. WALCOTT: The rate of 26 cents an hour was circularised to hon. members, not 28 cents an hour. That is what I was at pains to point out. We eventually agreed to 30 cents an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I just wanted to make the record straight.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think that the hon. member has cleared the record, because he has not said anything that I did not say. The hon. member in clearing the record said that Mr. Godsall recommended 26 cents an hour and they brought down the rate of 28 cents an hour. The hon. member will remember that we had already dealt with the salary of the Chief Justice and the rate of 26 cents an hour was amended. If the hon. member would refer to the debates, he would recall what I am saying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If they are clearing the record, we said that they should give workers a minimum wage of \$15 a week instead of \$14.40 a week. Did we not say so? I still feel, whatever conservative you want to call me, that a minimum wage of \$15 a week is what a man should earn.

The question that this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in an equality of votes, the division being as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. HUSBANDS, WALCOTT, DOWDING, MOTTLEY, GODDARD, TALMA, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, F. G. SMITH and BRANCKER - 10.

NOES: Mr. SPEAKER, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs HOLDER, THORNE, SEARLES, T. W. MILLER and BRYAN - 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in an equality of votes, ten hon. members voting "Aye" and ten hon. members voting "No". I vote with the "Noes".

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee. 5.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

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

The motion was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

On Resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask you to direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The CLERK rang the Bell and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to introduce a Resolution to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to introduce a Resolution to the House, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

BE IT RESOLVED that on the occasion of the inauguration of the Legislature of the West Indies on the 22nd of April, 1958, the House of Assembly of Barbados records its appreciation of, and extends its congratulations to all those who have worked towards making the Federation a reality.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House extends its good wishes to both Houses of the Legislature of the new Federation with the hope that the long-standing traditions of the Legislature of the individual units will be happily blended in establishing a stable foundation for the Federal Legislature.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit the text of this Resolution to His Excellency the Governor-General of the West Indies for communication to the Federal Parliament of the West Indies."

I propose a little later on with the permission of the House to have this Resolution passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, to move the passing of a 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 are not yet printed and circulated and I therefore ask leave to postpone Order No.2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to postpone Order No.2, and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, 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.

MARKETS AND SLAUGHTERHOUSES ACT, 1957.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that in the Five Year Plan Government has seen fit to establish markets throughout this island, and in that scheme of things, Sir, we have built the first one which is commonly known now as the Fairchild Street Market. We have a second one which is nearing completion, and that happens to be in St. Philip due to the fact that we have land there, and the next one, I think, should be in St. Thomas where we are now negotiating

to buy some land. It is a fact, Sir, that with the advent of markets throughout this island, the peasants will be able to sell their produce at various vantage points, and the housekeeper will know for sure where she can get quite readily what provisions she wants daily. It is a new thought and a new experiment, because markets in this island were confined more or less to the City where we had just one central market and people said it was ill-placed.

Now, Sir, with the revised thought, it is hoped in a short time under the Five Year Plan to have a string of markets throughout the entire island. I hope hon. members will not think it selfish in me to have the second market in St. Philip. I repeat that it was due to the accessibility of the land at Six Cross Roads which Government had purchased previously; but I think there are many other features of this market system which would have to eradicate certain conditions and situations which we have had to endure in the past. For instance, Sir, we are taking this opportunity to check up on the sanitation of certain areas. We are taking this opportunity also of seeing to it that people who handle meat should have a proper certificate, and we hope in due course to have a very strict inspection force to make sure that animals which are diseased and not fit for human consumption are not slaughtered and passed on to the buying public. It is true, Sir, that in this respect the House will agree with me that we have to go slow - and hon. members might have read the savings Clause, - because Barbadians have perhaps for time immemorial been accustomed to the practice that when a householder raises a pig, sheep or goat, he is allowed by Law to slaughter that animal and to go around to his friends and "engage" that meat.

6.30 p.m.

He does not really keep it in his house or store for sale; he makes a quick delivery of it. That has become a custom; as a matter of fact, it is now a tradition. But I would like particular emphasis to be placed on these remarks of mine, because I feel that they are very vital to this question. It is this: that practice, although it is carried out with the approval of all the inhabitants of the island, when we would have tightened up our regulations, would become the loose end of the Act. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I do not propose to impose such a strict carrying out of the Act at present, but I do say that the time will come when we will have to rescind that Savings Clause which we have inserted in this Bill. We will have to rescind that Savings Clause in case we have such a disease as swine fever. We have to guard the health of the community, and if we must retain a high standard of health we cannot really relax on our laws. I would like the public to read and to know that at the first instance, after this Act is passed, of there being swine fever or anything like that, we will have to stop people from slaughtering their own reared animals. It is the duty of the Government, however much they might be criticised for the stopping of a communal practice in the community, to stand up to these situations and teach people in the right way. It is not always that the habits of people are in the best interest of the community. Everybody knows that science is moving on: as we know more about science, we know more about better living, and as a result certain age-old customs will have to be eradicated. It is a known fact that as soon as a Government in power imposes its will on the people, although it might be in the best interest of the community, there is a hue and a cry that Government is imposing a hardship on them. Well, of course, there is no hardship in this Bill as it stands now: but I am throwing out the warning that it might well be that we will have at some later date to take out this Savings Clause and prevent people from slaughtering their reared animals before they are inspected.

I may say that a few things in the old Act are being retained. Not all the old things are taken away. Some people think that everything that is old is of no use, but that is not true. We have another Savings Clause put in this Bill, which if it comes into force this year will enable butchers who have already paid their licence fees for this year to operate until January next year. The people need have no fear if this Bill is brought

into operation at once, because there are two saving clauses which we have put in which would cause no hardship to them.

There is another aspect to this Bill. Those of us who have a strong civic pride will realise that there are those people who have put up by the wayside, small crude houses and as a result, they have made some ugly sights. We hope to get rid of that. For instance, just in the Square opposite the bus stand in Fairchild Street, you will see a collection of boxed houses and all sorts of unsightly buildings. We hope to remove all of them by this enactment. Let me say here now that this Government is not unmindful of the plight of these people in these places where vegetables are sold. We promise you that until we have made all of the market space available for all of the hucksters we have on the streets, we will not prohibit them from selling on the streets. However, as soon as this Bill comes into force we are going to prohibit the sale of vegetables and fruits in those shacks on that particular area in Fairchild Street because they will be able to make use of the Central Market there. There will be a regulation, as soon as this Act comes into force, to provide a prohibited area for hawkers from selling their wares and that area will be right along Roebuck Street, High Street running towards the Chamberlain Bridge on to the market site. It will not prohibit those who are selling in Broad Street; so hon. members will see that until the Cheapside Market is reconstructed, hawkers along the area of Broad Street will not be taken off the street. Hon. members would remember that we have voted \$72,000 to renovate the Cheapside Market. As I have said, we are not chasing all of the hucksters off the street until we have provided all the market space necessary for them. However, we do need a more tidy city. We are not going to prevent hucksters from moving hither and thither with their trays but we do want to make people market conscious. We want the people in the country districts who grow their provisions to bring them to these market places where buyers will be awaiting them. We also want householders to be aware that we have places where they can send and buy their vegetables and provisions, meat and other things as they may choose and in comfort. This, as I have said before, is a new departure and as soon as people become market conscious more vegetables would be sold in the market and we will be creating a better way of market life.

This brings me to another point, Mr. Speaker, very often there is a scarcity of certain items in one particular district when there is a glut of the same item in another district. The only answer to that problem is a proper market system. I can tell you that there are certain people who plant certain vegetables, and they do not know where they can dispose of them: while there are people in another place who would be glad to buy those things. Therefore, if we make the people of this colony market conscious, they will know the places where they can carry their wares and sell them and make a day's pay out of what they sell. More often than not, there are some people who push the prices up and up to meet their daily wage. I too have been a gardener, and I know for sure that I have had to sell string beans on my farm at 12 cents per pound when they were sold to the consumer at 30 cents per pound. If we have a proper market system that sort of thing would not prevail.

6.40 p.m.

Some hon. member has said that it is only a question of supply and demand; I think you will agree that if you have a strong competition, where people know they can buy and sell and compete with each other, what I have mentioned will not happen.

I do not think I have much more to say on this Bill. This Bill gives the Superintendent of the Market certain powers, some of which he has always had. You must have law and order. One of the things which will come down in the Regulations is that we are going to see to it that these markets are not places where abusive language will be the order of the day. We are going to see to it that the people who go to buy whatever is sold in

these market places will go and shop in comfort and in dignity. People will not be able to use whatever language they like in these places, and we will spend more money so as to enforce these Regulations. When people go to buy their articles, they must not be abused and so on. We are going to put special emphasis on that. We are hoping that the people who are employed there will have the authority to arrest people instead of having to call on a policeman for that purpose. Too much abusive language is used in these places. The whole structure is getting out of hand and some of us deplore the manners and the mannerisms of certain people in this colony; their conduct is degenerating and we must have some discipline in these places. I may be cursed and scoffed at, but I say that these things are necessary; therefore, I do not mind being cursed and scoffed at.

Regulations are to follow this Bill. I should like to remind hon. members that this building has been officially turned over to my Ministry from the Public Works Department. It will be finished within a few weeks and we are getting ready for the opening ceremony. We cannot attempt to open the new market until we have the new Act on the Statute Book and we have to bring down new Regulations. If we dare open this new building without the new Regulations, then we are doing nothing. I am therefore appealing to hon. members to see the wisdom of passing this Bill, so that we can get the hucksters out of the sun and the rain and put them in a proper building whereby we can create a more sanitary condition where articles are being sold. I think that in the future we shall have to erect more markets all around this island. I think it will be appreciated that we have to make the people of this colony market conscious and provide the means for those who depend upon their small garden plots to be able to take their crops to certain central places where people congregate to buy them. I do not think that I should say anything more on this Bill. As I told hon. members last week, I intended to deal with this Bill today, and I hope that they have read it; if there is anything on which they want information, I think I shall be able to give them that information.

Another aspect of this Bill, I should say, is to see to it that the people who handle meat provide proper health certificates. That is the latest in health matters. That is no hardship on anybody; it does not cost much to go to a doctor and get a certificate. This is an advance in health matters. The only hardship I see will come from this Bill, is that those bad-behaved people who use their tongues on anybody at will, will not be able to do that, because of the strict Regulations which we will bring down here.

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

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is long overdue. I have listened very carefully to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and having paid great attention to this matter for some time myself, I must agree with him that we have got to take steps to have Regulations made for controlling markets. There is not much that can be said more than the fact that, in perusing this Bill, you will find that it does provide for new markets and what should be done. I think you will find some difficulty, however, with regard to the sections dealing with prohibiting people from selling on the premises with the permission of the owners or occupiers. In other words, it has been a long time since this matter has been giving me some concern. With the provision of markets you will still find people coming out of the various parishes and offering their wares under unsanitary conditions, although the market will be in the vicinity. I feel that something should be done in that respect. As soon as we go into the Bill, I will draw the attention of hon. members to what I consider to be the defects in it. As the Bill provides that the Government should run the markets, no private citizen can establish a market without

the permission of the Government, but as to persons who offer their wares for sale on business premises rather than go into the market, I think you will find some difficulty there, and these particular sections should be gone into very carefully. I think that this is a very important Bill, and I do not think that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will object to what I am saying. 6.50 p.m.

This is a sort of innovation. For years we have Market Regulations. For years we had one market on which we improved and later had to abandon, and started off the idea, I think, during Governor Waddington's time, on the recommendation of the Commissioners of St. Michael, of District Markets instead of the Central Market.

While I know that the Hon. Minister wants to open the Market at Fairchild Street, I am going to make the suggestion that we send this Bill to Select Committee. You have the Market at Fairchild Street and in the Estimates you have an amount to reconvert the present Cheapside Market into another market. I am wondering, as this Bill deals with butchers, cold storage and what not, whether it would not be a correct thing to have a small Select Committee to discuss the matter. There are butchers who have been working along this line for generations and who have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the Minister. Since I have had my Bill, I have attempted to discuss it with people in this line of business, and I think no harm can be done, because the House is going to adjourn, I understand, later tonight for five weeks, and during that period a Committee could meet and discuss this matter with the Minister and give people who work in this line an opportunity to go into the Bill and give evidence before the Committee.

There is a section in this Bill which deals with prohibiting people from offering wares in shops and doors; nothing in this Bill could prevent people from going to counter-markets. In other words, hawkers would still be allowed to go into the street and backyards to sell. You cannot prohibit that. After the Government had set up a market in a particular area, a person can apply to Government for permission to set up a super-market; but there is nothing to prevent the man from giving permission to people to trade on 1,200 square feet of land next door to the market. If he wants to establish a market, he has to apply to the Cabinet, but on the other hand if there is an open space next to the market, permission can be given for people to trade on it. You will have to draw this tighter. My colleague had a lot to do with this from the point of view of the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael, who made several recommendations which I believe the Minister has seen. This included data on how many people used the area on the various days in each week. I have served on several committees on this matter.

The Minister might not know, but I will draw to his attention that there is something new in Barbados today. Originally you had cold storage for meat and there were regulations under the Public Health Act which allowed you to sell it at the market; now, you have frozen chicken which is sold in the City in pickups. I should like to ask him, now that he has made certain amendments here, how these cut across the Public Health Act. Nobody should keep fish on cold storage and bring it off to sell except within a limited time. This cuts across the Public Health Act, and that is why I suggest that it should be sent to a Select Committee, for the reason that there is a Public Health Act which provides that the Sanitary authorities shall see to it that fish is not removed from cold storage unless it is kept on ice for the purpose of selling. No harm can be done if this Bill is sent to Select Committee for the purpose of getting the response of butchers or hawkers. You should consult the Director of Medical Services and see how you are cutting across the Public Health Act. It is all right to give power to the Market Superintendent if a person is selling sweet potatoes, onions and so on; but the moment you are dealing with frozen foods, it is a

matter of public health.

The Hon. Minister has discussed this with me, and as I had some interest in it, I went into it but did not have the time to tell him what I thought should be done. If we had gone into it, I would have been able to tell you which Section cuts across the Public Health Act, but it is not necessary for me to tell you now.

I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will agree that it is best to send this to a Select Committee, and I therefore beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

I feel, Sir, that the hon. member should accept that. There are other Sections with which I will deal when we go into Committee. There are things named in this Bill which are contrary to the suggestions which Government made when they came with the Resolution dealing with the items which could be sold in the market. What I am principally interested in is how this cuts across the Public Health Act and how frozen foods can be taken from the market without chilling and kept for long periods. The question of ptomaine and food poisoning which can affect people arises, and I consider it a matter of great importance; so that when it comes to the Committee reading, I will make a suggestion to the hon. member which I hope he will accept.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I have to say in this Bill, except that at this stage I have given fresh consideration to this Market legislation and the more I see when I leave Barbados, the more I am convinced when I return that it appears that the Executive Committee has undertaken a task now which they could well leave to other people to do, and let the Governor-in-Executive Committee deal with matters of more important national interest.
7.00 p.m.

I say that because I know that the fine, up-to-date markets which I see whenever I go away are not run by the Central Government. They are run by local authorities and by other bodies. If we centralise all these activities which can very well be carried out by local authorities, they will cost the country more money.

On the question of cold storage, I have been discussing the matter with people who know about it and some feel that the Government will be advised to assist some people, probably through the Development Board or some corporation, with funds to enable them to operate some of these things all over the Island. Some of these people in the know seem to think when this Government puts up a Cold Storage Plant of its own, it might be putting up a white elephant and it would be better for private people to put up cold storage plants which would be of assistance to the people as a whole. If that is done, Government would not have to meet the recurrent costs and maintenance of such plants. These people even think that it would be better to provide small cold storage plants in various parts of the island than to have one large cold storage plant because the small cold storage plants would be more economical and of greater benefit to the island as a whole.

I do not agree with the hon. Introducer of the Bill as regards what he said about people using obscene language. He ought to know that some people in their ignorance use obscene language more in emphasis than in an obscene way. In this community in which we live, there are some people who use words which are not the best words they should use to express what they wish to convey; therefore, you will find that the use of obscene language is only symbolic of lack of knowledge of the Queen's English. Of course, Barbados is still a young country; it still has to be developed along certain lines. I am not dealing with people who set up themselves to be purists; I am dealing with people who are lacking in certain virtues and certain things and, as a result, they are lacking in their expression. I live in Barbados and I know that in many a conversation which the working-class people carry on, use is made of obscene language, but only as emphasis to what they are expressing; it is not used because they are violent. As a matter of

fact, they are not as violent as some people who do not emphasise themselves in that sort of way. If you go to London, you will hear how a cockney speaks and how he expresses himself. He has his own idiosyncracies and colloquialisms in expression. These are things which we have to understand. They exist anywhere in a country with certain people.

As regards the question of people selling on the streets, we have got to understand that if there are certain practices which we say we do not like, we should not entertain the idea that we can weed them out overnight. I have not been any part of the world where I have not seen people peddling on the streets. In New York on Fifth Avenue, sometimes in the middle of a day you see the whole street crowded with Jews selling people stockings and all that sort of thing. I do not know from whom they got permission to do it. I do not think they got that permission from President Eisenhower. Sometimes you pass a street in New York and see nobody on it; but as soon as you pass back, you see everybody on it and a buying and a selling taking place. I have also seen the same thing in London. I have seen newspaper vendors having an area blocked off and other people at other spots selling certain types of merchandise. Again, I say that I do not know who is responsible for that sort of thing, but it seems to me symptomatic of certain countries. It is true to say that they have certain City markets. What we have to bear in mind in Barbados is that as long as there is no abuse of the situation, you can permit a trader or peddler on the street. You have to bear in mind that he is making a certain trade for himself which you should not try to discourage. I will say that for some time to come, we will not have sufficient markets to serve our needs. The City of Bridgetown is a very congested area. The Hon. Minister should be able to tell me the area and the population. I think it is not more than three square miles, but it has a congested population of about 20,000 to 25,000 people.

The hon. Introducer of this Bill should bear all these things in mind. He has lived in the U.S.A. which is a big country. He ought to know that markets are not regulated by the Central Government but by City Councils. I do hope that he will give some consideration to this for the simple reason that I do not feel that the Minister of Agriculture whose responsibility it is for markets should be asked to see after them. If you are asking the Minister to see about markets, it seems to me that you will be asking him to devote all his time to them. I come to the conclusion that if a Minister is controlling markets or if markets come under his administration, then it is getting on the small side. I hope when Local Government comes into being that these things will be put under the control of that authority. If you do not hand over these things to Local Government, what would you ask them to do? When you look after these things yourself, it looks as if the Central Government does not have enough to look after. I do hope the Hon. Minister would take what I have said in the right perspective. The time will come when you will have to review your policy on these matters.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the principle of the Bill, but my view on the matter is that in the absence of sufficient market accommodation more especially in the City of Bridgetown, this Bill would work a great hardship on the thousands of hawkers and licenced sellers who may be found in Busby's Alley or Roebuck Street or some other part of Bridgetown. To attempt by one stroke of the pen, just because you have established a Central Market, to bring in a Bill like this which seeks to impose heavy fines on anyone who is found infringing or is found selling without permission or is found selling on pavements will be too hard.
7.10 p.m.

The question of permission does not arise when you find people selling on a pavement; it is only a question of a building. Perhaps, I had better read the particular Clause. I am referring to Clause 22/ which is the material Clause and which will create a lot of injustices and hardships to people who are accustomed to selling

on the streets. I want to emphasise that until we have district markets in places like Busby's Alley and Roebuck Street - until we have two other markets at least - you cannot enforce the provisions of this Bill. This Bill will create a hardship on people who are trying to earn a living; it is imposing an injustice and working a hardship on thousands of unemployed people who are trying to scramble a living. If they are found selling in the lanes they will be prosecuted. That has happened in the past, and the Government, knowing that the people who sent the Labour Party into power were suffering, had to make an adjustment.

Anybody who thinks that the establishment of this Central Market on Fairchild Street will suffice the demands of the people of Busby's Alley, Roebuck Street, Lower Broad Street and all the Alleys in Bridgetown, - anybody who thinks that these people can find accommodation in this Central Market, is living in a Fool's Paradise. I am stressing the fact that until you have more District Markets, this Bill cannot be entertained. I have had something to do with this Bill, but it was not practical to bring it down at the time, and therefore, I did not bring it down. The Ex-Premier and the present Leader of the House had intervened so as to save a lot of these people from being distressed. This Bill is not going to carry the matter anywhere; time is the material thing; and unless this Bill is sent to a Select Committee and sellers are consulted in the first place, it is going to work a hardship on them. It is for that reason that I am supporting the motion of the hon. senior member for the City that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

I will now read the material Section, Section 22, which says this:

"No person shall sell or offer or expose for sale any marketable commodities or any goods, wares or merchandise, in any doorway of, or entrance to any building without the permission of the owner ..."

If he has the permission of the owner, he can do that, but people are in the habit of selling at the entrances to buildings. The Section goes on :-

"... or occupier of the building, on the pavements or sidewalks of any street, lane, alley, road or public place within the limits of the City of Bridgetown or within the limits of Oistins, Speightstown or Holetown."

Every person who contravenes the provisions of subsection (1) of this section shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars."

I can see that in the absence of a sufficient number of markets, this Bill will not work.

Again, no provision has been made in so far as the existing cold storage is concerned; there is no saving clause here. That, too, will work a hardship on people. The question of cold storage is not covered in this Bill, and for an offence in that respect there is a penalty of \$500. While I agree that we need to tighten up the provisions in respect of the slaughtering of animals and in respect of fresh meat and fresh fish, I do consider that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, and various people in the community should be consulted before this Bill is passed.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I think that what this Bill endeavours to do is worth while in itself. There is no doubt that there is a great need for the protection of people in matters where food hygiene is concerned; but I do not think it can be brought into force overnight. The Hon. Minister did not give me that impression either. I am suggesting that it is a good idea to consider referring this Bill to a Select Committee. The butchers throughout the Island should be allowed to voice some opinion in this matter and it is not going to be an easy thing to enforce this Bill overnight. I am speaking specifically of meat being exposed for sale. The hawkers

who are taking their vegetables to the people are doing a good service to the community; but the exposure of meat is a very dangerous thing. It is in the light of past experience that this Bill has been brought before us.

It is not a matter so much of timing as it is of placing. I think it will possibly have to be the matter of the placing of the markets first and of timing afterwards. The placing of these markets is the most important reason for their being used, and unless they are placed in relation to the number of persons who do their shopping in the particular areas, then they are going to fail. That is one of my main reasons for speaking on this Bill at this juncture; but I do think that while the idea of placing markets all over this island may be a good one, the question is: is it going to be an economic success? I have my doubts about that.

7.20 p.m.

I have grave doubts that markets all over this island are going to be an economical success because regardless of what you do, the markets should be concentrated first of all either within the city limits or near to them, and then they are liable to be used; but if they are situated in the country or far out, I have my doubts that the people who know that they can go to town and get more money for their goods are going to stop at a country market. There is no doubt in my mind, Sir, that people who come to Bridgetown will pay more to get certain marketable goods, vegetables etc., than they would in the country.

The placing of a market in St. Philip - and I cast no reflection on the Hon. Minister's constituency - for the mere reason that the land was available is not sufficient argument to convince me that that is a suitable spot. The Government may have land available not only in St. Philip but in any other parish of the island, but just because it is available does not mean that it is going to be suitable for a market. For these markets to be successful in the country, they must be provided with cold storage equipment which is very costly, and to adopt cold storage buildings throughout the parishes is going to be a very costly move.

I personally feel that an effort should be made to learn a lesson from the first market which I hope will soon be opened, and that we should not rush into erecting markets throughout the country for the mere reason that we want to take these people off the road. I personally believe that in a small island such as this - and here, Sir, it is a matter of timing - country markets will not be successful until you see a certain amount of shops moving into the country where you can not only go to the market, but to the drugstore, grocery store, cloth store or any other store as you have now in the United States of America and in other parts of the world. The mere erection of a vegetable and meat market is not going to draw customers to it; there will have to be other conveniences alongside of them, and I advise the Government to take care in spending the taxpayers' money on what could very easily be white elephants. I would much sooner prefer seeing money of that sort being spent first on things like old age pension. It is the placing of these markets that is important, and this one will never suffice Bridgetown. The erection of one at St. Philip before the erection of others strategically placed throughout the town area is in my opinion a step backward and not a step forward. I do hope, Sir, that consideration will be given to entertaining further opinions on this Bill from the people whom it is going to affect and that an opportunity will be given for it to go to a Select Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is really one small point which I would like to make. In my opinion, the principle of the Bill is wrong. Certainly, Sir, the administration of markets is a matter for your Local Government Body. If the Central Government has time to be concerned with the day to day administration of a market, then it has nothing to do.

The Objects and Reasons begin by stating that since the establishment of markets has been undertaken by Government during the past few years, it is considered

that the operation and management of such markets should be the responsibility of the Central Government. Because Government has established markets they must operate and run them. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the Government cannot advance the money for the establishment of markets to the Local Government Bodies and then let them be responsible for the administration. The Minister or the Government has no time to be concerned with the day to day administrative details of a market; so what you are actually doing is putting wider powers into the hands of the Superintendent of the market, and if he is inclined to be a dictator, unjust or impartial in his dealings, he has all the power so to be. Merely because they are going to underwrite the direction of these markets does not mean that in consequence of that fact they have the time or the necessary ability to administer them. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me very logical to believe that your Local Government Body with its members elected from the specific districts in which the markets will be situated will know more about the day to day administration of the market, and would be more easily available for complaints and appeals from the Market Superintendent than the Executive Committee. It seems, Sir, to be the height of absurdity.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. If for every reason, every position and every time that the Central Government advances money to the Local Government Body it is going to demand responsibility for its administration - they are going to have to advance money for Cottage Hospitals and for other aspects of Parochial administration - in each and every one of these aspects is it going to demand responsibility at an administrative level.

Section 9 of this Bill reads as follows:-

"No person shall sell or offer or expose for sale any fresh meat except in a public market or in such shops or premises as are licensed by the Superintendent in that behalf."

If you want to sell meat in a private shop and the Superintendent does not like you or he gets for some reason or other hostile towards you, he does not give you a licence. That is putting too much power in his hands. 7.30 p.m.

Well now, look at the power you are putting in his hands. This power should be put in the hands of the Superintendent in the first place and, in the second place, there should be the right of appeal to your Local Government Body who are on the spot; certainly, they should be able to carry their complaints to them. Do not leave it to your Market Superintendent who might be prejudiced in his feelings towards someone and with that person's redress being a long drawn out appeal to the Executive Committee. The Government has no case at all for assuming control over these markets.

There are many other aspects of parochial life in which the Government puts its hands in the Treasury and give financial assistance to the municipal authorities without conferring on the Local Government authorities the job of administering these particular aspects of municipal administration. It is short sighted policy. As a matter of fact, the tendency to centralise affairs such as these in the hands of the Central Government cannot make for good government. On the one hand, in this island the tendency was to decentralise the administration of various aspects of Governmental affairs; now, if you notice the entire structure, the premise is that every single aspect of Local Government must be controlled by the Central Government.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt to say this on a point of order. This matter to which the hon. member is pointing has been settled as a matter of policy since 1954. It is a law on the Statute Book that Central Government operate markets throughout the island. That matter has been positively decided.

Mr. CRAWFORD: By whom?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: By this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If this House decided that and we feel it is not right it does not follow that it is right and it does not prejudice my right to say that I think it is wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. senior member for St. Philip realise that no hon. member must reflect on a vote on the House?

Mr. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, Sir, it is highly conceivable that many of the hon. members who might be in here today may not have been in here in 1950.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whether an hon. member was in here or not when something was done he will still be reflecting on a vote of the House if he spoke against it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the logicity of what the hon. member is saying cannot commend itself to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can only do that if you are going to amend it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That means in the same session. Do you mean to say that you cannot say what was done in 1902 was wrong? I respectfully submit if the principal is rational, well then your Honour's protest in 1936 against the Located Labourers Act was wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will read Rule 123. "No member may reflect upon any vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded."

Mr. CRAWFORD: That would mean in the same session.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you intend to move an amendment for the purpose of rescinding a vote, well then it is all right.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Rule 120 reads as follows:- "No member is to allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by indulgence of the House, for personal explanation." Then you have Rules 121, 122 and 123 springing from that.

Mr. SPEAKER: At any rate, the hon. member may proceed; but be careful.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, my reference and the only one which I am making, constitutes my own decisions with the proposal for the Central Government to assume the responsibility of the administration of markets. Do you mean to say that a Minister is there to see how a market is run in Eagle Hall, Jackmans and in Bridgetown? Is he a market Minister? It is true, you give them more travelling allowance; but if they spend their time in running from market to market, then they will need more than what they are getting now for travelling. It is not correct to say, Mr. Speaker, that your Central Government will have time to deal with all these minute appeals which may be made from time to time against the decision of the Market Superintendent. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a hawker or fishmonger or a boot lace seller who has been wronged by the Superintendent is going to worry to send in appeal to the Executive Committee. The poor person will not know how to make such an appeal. Whereas, if your Local Government body is responsible for that, it would be so easy to button-hole the Local Government body king pin, like the hon. senior member for the City or the hon. junior member for the City, by their jacket and say: "look here old top, the Market Superintendent has done so and so to me and I want the matter redressed." He will say, "O.K." and the matter is fixed.

Why put the power in the hands of the Market Superintendent to exercise partially or impartially as he thinks fit? I do feel that merely because the money for putting up these markets must come from the Central Government - and it could not come from anywhere else

unless you amend the Vestries Act to give them power to levy rates for things other than what they have to do now - the Central Government should not run these markets but hand them over to the Local Government. Therefore, I hope a Select Committee will be asked to deal with this matter because that Committee will be able at least to consider the whittling down of power now committed in the hands of the Market Superintendent and will be able to provide proper sources for appeal in every case of complaint.

7.40 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City has seen fit to inject that argument into the debate - I mean the argument for referring this Bill to a Select Committee. That used to be the strategy employed when I was first in this House, with the idea of killing a Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister must sit down when I have risen on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot tell the hon. member that he must sit down. Can you?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I can do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you will be out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: However, Sir, the hon. member should never attempt to measure my corn with his bushel. I do not want to kill any Bill; that is a matter for him. With the best of intentions, the hon. member knows, I suggested to him that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, and my particular argument is that it cuts across the Public Health Act. If he does not see that, it is a matter for him. I said, I regretted that I did not tell him that before, but he should not suggest that my motion for referring this Bill to Select Committee is because I want to kill it.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: All of that will not stop me from saying what I want to say, when I want to say it. I have been in this House for too long to be fooled. I have not lost anything. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody wants to kill the Bill.) These are good tactics.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. If that is in his mind, he should not say it. That is stupid.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is there in the Bill to kill?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I cannot understand what is happening. It happens now that the Superintendent of the Market, because he is being employed by the Government, is the biggest criminal, but if he had been employed by the Vestry, he would have been a Christian gentleman. In other words, you should entrust the market Superintendent with the affairs of the market when he is in the hands of the Vestry, but not when he is working for the Government. That argument suits people who are gullible and who cannot think for themselves; that is not for the intelligent people. You cannot get Christians working for the Vestry and crooks working for the Government. Let hon. members throw that argument out of their minds; some people are so accustomed to people who are gullible that they cannot help -

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Is the hon. member referring to me or to the hon. senior member for St. Philip?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am replying to remarks which have been made in this House. (Laughter). First of all Dr. Raeburn is entrusted to carry out the Regulations which are to be made under the Act. I hear a lot about Directors, but we do not want to go into the private lives of individuals; all we want is proper administration according to the Rules and Regulations. Who would not be accused of being too stringent if he carries out the letter of the Law? A certain hon. member in here

has been trying to carry out the letter of the law according to what he has been preaching and if he is not careful, it might prove to be a boomerang. Therefore, you do not know everything. We do not indulge in personal matters; we want to get things done. No administrator can please everybody; if he does, then he is a lackey.

The hon. senior member for the City has suggested that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee and let the butchers have their say.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I have not said that. I said that it is the best thing to have the Bill referred to Select Committee, as in the case of any Bill, and let evidence be taken from the people concerned.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The words I use are those of the hon. member; I wrote them down. What does the ordinary layman know about Public Health and such matters? Even the Sanitary Commissioners find it difficult to enter upon certain people's premises in order to get them to keep their premises in a proper condition so as to safeguard the health of the community. Human nature rebels against regimentation and even inspection.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What did the hon. member say? I wish he would repeat it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I myself did not catch it; I should also like it repeated.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I suppose the hon. member is getting on the old side; human nature will always retaliate. I want to make this House realise that it is incumbent upon us to see that law and order is maintained. In my opening remarks, I particularly emphasised that some things are unpleasant to do. People have certain habits and you try to break down those habits, because of certain scientific knowledge you have gained; but you cannot get popular in these matters. I realise that bringing down certain things will make me unpopular, but I have a duty to perform. I am not so easily moved like trash before the wind. We cannot be so easily moved like that; the people have confidence in us, and we have to direct them in the right paths. (Laughter).

7.50 p.m.

Why have you got a Police Force? Because you want to protect life and property. You must be organised. This is here to organise people and let them know that they must have a proper means of getting their goods in a market. You must get the producer with his wares there; you must get the buyer there and then get the consumer to habitually go there under proper organisation. What is wrong with that? We are creating a place for the people in St. Andrew who grow string beans and other things to sell them. If you have a market established, he would get so market conscious, that he would grow more market vegetables. Let us be practicable; do not let us always try to fool the gullible public. There are things which we are responsible for in this community and I have lived long enough to see them. I do not care whom it hurts; but if hon. members are going to throw any aspersions at me, I will say to them that I have been over there in the Opposition with cheap jibes. You know the outcome; too cheap, and I lost my seat. We must stand up like men, face the battle, tell people the truth and God will be on our side and right will never lose.

In this matter, I realise that there may be a few hardships that will come to a few people, but nevertheless, when a man goes into an aeroplane to be a pilot, he leaves his family deserted to work for a livelihood by transporting people hither and thither. Before I forget, I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. George heard me when I made the full statement, but I said that the only reason why the one at Six Cross Roads happened to be the first in the country district was because we had the land there available; but it should have been at St. Thomas. We had a little hitch with the purchase of the land and therefore we wanted to get the ball rolling, and as the land was available we made St. Philip the first. So far as that is concerned, we have other things to do which I would really do in St. Philip if I was playing politics; but I am not doing that. Let me tell you some-

thing. It is not always nice to play cheap politics; you pay dearly for it. Whatever I do should enhance all of the members in my Party; so I have not got to go to St. Philip only. I have to go to every parish and do something for everybody, because we represent the Government. The hon. senior member for the City ought to take pride in the fact that his Parish is getting three of them. We have passed in the House a vote of \$72,000 to change over the one at Cheapside, and we have another one coming up in Roebuck Street, not far away from the Combermere School, so we will have a chain of them in order to provide proper facilities for people who have things to sell in the markets. These people must not be allowed to remain exposed to rain and sun on the sidewalks. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You are flogging a dead horse.) No, I am not. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, answer the question I asked.) The hon. member asked whether this cuts across the Public Health Act. I say that even if it did at the moment, we could pass the Bill and then I will promise to bring the necessary amendments if I am here. I am not saying that it cuts across the Act, but it might. The hon. member likes to shut up people and not hear them, but a saving Clause has been put in against the Public Health Authorities and that is where he says it cuts across the Act.

When the Health Authorities in the Department were asked about certain things in this Bill, they said that if you wanted to ease these people a bit by doing a particular thing, you had to cut across the Public Health Act; but he has only mentioned that because in truth and in fact, I told the hon. member that as man to man, I had no idea that the paragraph which I had inserted would cause hardship to anyone. I should particularly like to emphasise on the floor of this House that if we have the first indication or rumour about swine fever or any other disease, we would have to take out that Clause for safety. Suppose there was swine fever and in a district there were two or three pigs lying and sleeping. The owner may not be well off and he might go and engage this pork; but nevertheless, we are here to prevent that and to protect the people. I will appeal to the hon. member since we really want to get this place going. People can say anything about me or about you; I do not know if there is anybody whom they would not say something about. I am not concerned with what people say about me. We have just passed Good Friday and Easter; they said bad things about Christ, so who are you that people will not talk about? If you are nobody, nobody talks about you; but so long as you are somebody, somebody will talk about you.

Now as regards the hon. member's question concerning the exposure of frozen chicken, which is being sold in pickups, you will always get illegal trafficking in any business. If you are a merchant and somebody wanted to buy two boxes of chicken parts, you would get rid of them. But we have Regulations against those things. Archangel Gabriel cannot stop these things because you would have to have an authority at every store to stop them, and even so with a little collusion you know what would happen. So we cannot be too meticulous.
8.00 p.m.

I say, Sir, in this Bill we are attempting to do what we have not done in the past. We are attempting to have a proper organisation for the sale of fresh fruit, meat, fish and so on. It might hurt some people in the first instance, but they will be glad to know in the course of time that it is done.

Before I sit, I am going to remind this hon. House that there were responsible people in this island when the plantation owners first brought in mechanised equipment and there used to be a hue and a cry because of it. People used to say: "What are the people of this island going to do now?" The Island has not gone down because mechanised equipment has been brought in; as a matter of fact, even the agricultural workers want the use of them now. There were certain other things, when they first came into being, over which a hue and a cry were raised but which have now become a blessing in disguise.

I say that this Bill tries to draw a line of demarcation right around a certain area of the new Central Mar-

ket, and until we renovate the market at Cheapside we are not attempting to stop anybody in Broad Street or in that vicinity from selling on the streets. Do you think that we are such noodles over here as to remove those really strong centres of selling that operate here before we make ample provision for accommodating them? We cannot do it. All these things we intend to do in the course of time, but we want to open the new market as soon as possible; we want to modernise. We want to change the minds of people to better things; therefore I appeal to hon. members not to do anything to hamper the Bill. Do not send this Bill to Select Committee. It will not be in the interest of the people who are squatting on the streets. They have come to me in droves and have asked me: "When are you going to open the market?" We want to get all these unsightly things off the road. With all the motor cars which we have moving along the streets from day to day, do you know the trouble the police have got to get this traffic flowing easily? Use your sense of fair play. I expect the hon. senior member for St. Philip to criticise every piece of legislation I bring in whether his criticism is logical or illogical; therefore, I will not answer him on that score at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Minister has brought in several things before and I have said nothing against them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see anything in that of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister says that he expects me to criticise anything he brings in. He has brought in several things which I have not said one single thing about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say again that I do not see anything of order in that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, I did not criticise him; I criticised the Bill.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: In this market business, Dr. Watts who has been loaned to us from the Colonial Office has gone around the length and breadth of the island and has interested himself in seeing the sites and giving us advice on the location of markets. (Mr. F. G. SMITH: I want a fish market is St. Andrew.) All of these things would come in due course, if you assist me in getting this Bill passed. We do want to get ahead with this job because we have a lot of work to do. The hon. senior member for Christ Church may have had a hand in it but what did he do about it? I am doing something about it.

Mr. TALMA: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Minister understands the Queen's English, he would realise that I said that until such time, until certain district markets are set up in certain places, you cannot move such rigid regulations with such hard penalties against the people.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I have a right to reply to any remarks made by the Opposition. Why should the Opposition like to rant and rail and then I get up and say nothing in reply? Sir, no hon. member of the Opposition can stop me from talking. It surprises me that some hon. members from over on that side think that I have lost some of my sting since I am a Minister. Forget about it. I can say anything.

Sir, you cannot bring down everything that is palatable. If in due course you see anything which is not quite palatable to you, let us get together and discuss it. Hon. members know that is anything is found which will create a hardship that we will bring down a Bill to rectify it. As regards what this Bill seeks to do, I wish to say that I have given more latitude than what the Board of Health has given. I think I have gone far enough; therefore I do appeal to hon. members not to send this Bill to Select Committee. The people want to come off the streets and I want to get it done. So far as the Superintendent of Markets is concerned, do not let us fool ourselves, he would not be always there. I do not think he will be here too long. I am appealing to hon. members to let the Bill go through all its stages.
8.10 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I could scarcely have thought that it would have taken the Hon. Minister so long not to answer the points which have been raised by the Opposition. We have long become accustomed to the pontifical role which he plays in this House. Our points are simple, but he has not answered them. We are saying that the sending of the Bill to a Select Committee is justified for the following reasons:

In the first place, there is the question as to whether the Central Government is best suited to administer the whole marketing system of this island, and, secondly, we argue that the powers set out in the Bill for penalties ---

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member in order in arguing the case for sending this Bill to a Select Committee?

Mr. TUDOR: I am speaking on the second reading of the Bill; I am replying to the Minister, I am not speaking on a motion which has not yet been made; I am drawing to the attention of the Hon. Minister the points which have been made and which would justify us in allowing the second reading of the Bill to go through, and then refer it to a Select Committee. My main point of course, was in relation to the powers which are given to the Superintendent of the Market under this Bill. It has become the fashion of this House for Ministers to fly to the defence of public servants when they imagine that they are being unfairly attacked. We are not unfairly attacking the Market Superintendent; we are saying that, so far as we have been informed, there are certain disquieting features about his administration of the market and his dealing with the people - that he is frankly discourteous and rude and, from some of his actions, he gives the impression that he does not like black people. Complaints which have come in to hon. members on both sides of the House suggest that he is very short and discourteous in his attitude, and when it comes to the butchers who are now working under his supervision in the market, there is much to complain about as to his handling of the administration of the market system as it is now.

We feel therefore, that so much power should not be given to him; we feel so precisely on the same basis as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture felt some years ago when, as you may remember, Mr. Speaker, there was an announcement asking for people to join the Police Force. When some people from St. Philip attended at the Central Station, Mr. Holmes-a-Court, then a Police Officer here, treated them with discourtesy and told them that they could not be in the Police Force until they had caught Lloyd Linton. The Hon. Minister himself heard about it and ranted on the floor of this House about the behaviour of Mr. Holmes-a-Court. That is what we feel about Dr. Raeburn now; and if that is cheap politics, then his was cheap politics as well.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I am sure that the hon. member has not paid sufficient attention to what I have said. I am not concerned particularly with Dr. Raeburn; I recall when the Act was amended establishing the administration of the markets by the Central Government. I repeat, I am not concerned with Dr. Raeburn particularly; I will go and Dr. Raeburn will go; what you have to do is to kill me if you want to get me out of Local Government or out of this House. The hon. member will realise, and he must find from his file, that I have always taken an active interest in this matter, and in 1943 I was clamouring for markets, because I saw the insanitary conditions under which people were selling their ware. I say that it is a simple question. You take into consideration the opinion of Dr. Raeburn and Mr. Skeete, and rightly so. Did you ask the Director of Medical Services to come in and discuss the question? You take the idea that I just

want to oppose this Bill, but I know what I am talking about. I ask how does this Bill cut across your Public Health Act? You provide for the storage of meat and fish; do you know how dangerous it is for people to remove frozen foods from cold storage and take them to the community? That is why this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. There are amendments which I would like to suggest, but if the Hon. Minister wants to go on with this Bill, I will not suggest one amendment.

I take the matter of dealing with public health as a hobby; if you are bringing down regulations dealing with cold storage and you bring in your Veterinary Officer who is in charge, is there anything wrong in saying that we will hear the opinion of people who are in the trade? We know that you will bring in Dr. Raeburn; but is it fair to suggest that what I am proposing is trying to hold up this Bill? Is it fair to say that this is strategy for the purpose of killing the Bill? You are removing meat and fish which has been in cold storage and placing it back in storage and running the risk of killing people; is that right? But instead of listening to me, or answering me, the Hon. Minister says that I just want to kill the Bill; is that fair?
8.20 p.m.

I am asking you if there is anything wrong. Is it because you have power? You asked Dr. Raeburn to come and discuss this matter. Do you remember, when the Government wanted to appoint Dr. Herbert's son I asked what is the use of letting people take the R.S.I. and then taking somebody who was not qualified to be an inspector? I killed that because I did not think you were doing right, and rightly so because you had a set of people who did not know what they were doing. After having the Colonial Office Adviser, you had Dr. Raeburn and you have done the same thing; you have done the same thing to the Director of Agriculture. Is there anything wrong now that you are building these new markets to ask the forty or fifty people in the trade to meet a small Committee under your Chairmanship to discuss with them any of these implications? You pass it! I would not even make an amendment if that is the attitude which you are going to adopt when somebody asks you to go into this matter. I should like to see men like Dr. Byer on the Committee. Are you saying that because the Minister has said everything, people are not entitled to go into matters of this sort? The Hon. Minister knows that I am the last person who would offer him any opposition in passing this, because I feel it is long overdue and said so at the beginning of my speech. What is wrong in asking Dr. Raeburn to give you information.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. May I remind the hon. member for the third or fourth time that the Director of Medical Services was on the Committee too? He gave evidence, wrote Minutes and had discussions with us.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Minister for saying that. That is the first time he has said it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard him say it before.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But not tonight. Has he answered the question which I asked? I personally feel that it should go to a Select Committee. If you feel that I am sending it to Select Committee to kill it, what would it benefit me? I have to do with the inspection of markets, and I know where all the Regulations are found, and I know too exactly where it cuts across the Public Health Act. I have been Chairman of a Board to do with inspection of meat and fish being removed from cold storage and sold in other places where there is no cold storage, and I am saying that if it is removed and kept a certain time, it is injurious to public health.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: May I interrupt the hon. member again? You do not get that in the Act itself; you get that in the Regulations. This is only the Act but the Regulations will follow.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Night follows day and death follows poisoning too, and all that will follow. I know that the hon. member has adopted that attitude because he has gone into the Government. Is there anything wrong with sending

this Bill to a Select Committee and allowing the butchers to have a say? Let us make it quite clear that we are providing somewhere for hawkers, but it is more than removing hawkers off the road. I can show him something in the Bill which I mentioned just now where a person can get permission to use side-walks. You can go by-General Traders and put all your trays in the door, but when you prosecute them, all the owner has to say is that he gave them permission. What is wrong with appointing a Committee of members of this House? The Opposition is part of the Legislature of this island too; but as soon as any member suggests sending it to Select Committee, you talk about killing the Bill. This is Bridgetown and it is important that we have these markets and Regulations, but you do not have to wait for the Regulations to open the market. You can open the Market tomorrow; you have no right waiting for this to open it.

I feel this should go to Select Committee, and I want the Hon. Minister to believe me that I am not trying to send it to Select Committee to hold it up. I would be delighted to serve on the Committee to show what has been happening. You, Mr. Speaker have served in this parish and you know what difficulties there are. You can pass it and put up your cold storage! I mentioned just now that chicken parts were being taken off cold storage and carried in the open and sold without being chilled; you might be lucky everyday with a certain type of fish, but not all. Your saving Clause is a wonderful Clause; but I am going to suggest further that it destroys the whole Bill.

I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. I do it with the highest motives and in the interest of the people. If you think it is holding up the market, you can open it tomorrow. You can get a small Committee and in two weeks' time come back. I do this with the highest motives, and he knows that I would not attempt to use tactics to destroy it. How can any sane person be playing politics in this? Nobody is saying that you should not remove the hawkers from the streets. I have been advocating for eighteen years to establish markets, and I am surprised that he should adopt that attitude. I feel you should send it to Select Committee and invite your Medical Officers of Health. The Director of Medical Services is not a Health Officer. Public Health is a special study and that is why I contend this Bill should go to Select Committee.

What the hon. member for St. Lucy has said is true. I am not concerned with Dr. Raeburn. This Government will go; I will go; but the markets and Regulations will remain.

I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. TALMA: In seconding the motion of the hon. member, I should like to say that a Bill of such importance and which concerns the life and death of a community is a Bill which we should refer to Select Committee. For the Minister to believe that anyone on this side is attempting to kill this legislation, is really unkind, because it is a very important piece of legislation.
8.30 p.m.

If you recall to mind, it was late as 1890 when first this Bill was passed in this Chamber. It is now 1958; therefore, what harm can be done in delaying this Bill by sending it to Select Committee for consideration and to provide greater safety for the lives of the community? As I have said, the bringing down of this Bill is something for which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture should be commended, but what harm would be done if you refer a Bill like this to a Select Committee of this House which is constituted of members who are interested and who can summon butchers, food inspectors, hawkers or the various people who may be affected by this Bill, to ask their views on it? That will only be a means of trying to improve the Bill and to see that no harm is done to the greater number of people who will be affected by this Bill. The suggestion and motion made by the hon. senior member for the City is sound, reasonable and feasible. By so doing, the Opposition would not be stealing the thunder from the Government. The suggestion that not

until the Bill is passed can the present Central Market be opened is really absurd, to say the least, because the present Central Market, if finished, can be opened right away. There is no clause in this Bill which refers to the present Central Market.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I inform the hon. member that we have to make regulations to control and conduct the affairs of the market, and until this Act is passed we cannot make such regulations? We cannot make the people move from the triangle in Fairchild Street until we pass this Bill.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I do not think the Hon. Minister is correct in what he just said. Provision is made for that in the present Market and Butchers Act. I may say that these things were not enforceable owing to the fact that there is a dearth and scarcity of markets. Each and everyone of us in this Chamber commits breaches of the law, but many of these breaches are not enforceable. I am saying that when you pass this Bill as it is and it comes into force, you will be creating a lot of hardships. We say that you can go ahead and open your Central Market, but before you pass this Bill you should try and establish one or two more district markets. Let the hucksters and hawkers operating in the various streets continue to do so. Surely you cannot expect the thousand and one hawkers, hucksters and fish vendors we have in Bridgetown to crowd into the Central Market. If you crowd them in there another stampede will exist. It would just be like your attempting to remove the slums in Cats Castle and by so doing create a slum in another place. If you were to attempt to do that it would become just like that little Shanty Square which you have now in front of the present market. Let us enforce it, but in a reasonable way, seeing to it that as little harm as possible will be done to the people for whom we are making provision. You have regulations for governing these things now; but if you pass regulations, drawing them up under the present sections of this Bill, they will come into force at once. Let this Bill go to a Select Committee comprised of members who are competent and interested in the people.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. The attitude of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is one of "make do"; in other words he is going to make people go into these markets. I fail to see why we cannot encourage and cooperate with the persons mainly concerned by sending this Bill to a Select Committee and taking statements from such people and having it published in an effort to encourage and make a success of these markets. I hate the idea of making people do things, and the dogmatic manner in which the Hon. Minister seems to adopt is not any more than the outcome of a swollen head. The people who are directly concerned, such as the butchers, hucksters and hawkers should be given a say in the matter. Hon. members of the Government prefer to give members of the Chamber of Commerce a say in the matter when it comes to implementing new legislation, but when it comes to these butchers and hawkers, Government cannot give them a say. These people have as much right to have a say in this legislation as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Raeburn, or any other doctor brought here from overseas, or the Director of Medical Services, because they are the people it concerns. They have a right to have a say in it. One day this Government will learn that you do not make Bajans do things too easily; but if you treat them right and encourage them you will get them co-operating with you. Sir, my reason for supporting the motion for this Bill being sent to Select Committee is because the people whom it concerns should have the opportunity and the right to have a say in it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, all of us on this side of the House are going to support the motion for sending this Bill to Select Committee. Earlier, I referred to the very extensive powers which the Market Superintendent will have under this Bill and I quoted Section 9. So far as I can see, there is no appeal from him. If the Market Superintendent refuses to give you a licence to sell meat in a shop, there is no appeal from him.

I am not here to protect any Government official, neither am I here to wrongfully accuse either one of wrong doing; but I am here to represent the people of this Island if reports are brought to me about an unjust manner in which a head of Government performs his duty. If that happens, I am going to say so in this House whether he likes it or not, or whether the Minister likes it or not.
8.40 p.m.

I think you will agree with me that for all the years that you and I have been in this Chamber we have never opposed a Bill, because a particular person brought it down, because if you opposed it on that basis, you would have nothing at all to say. My opposition invariably springs from opposition to a measure, and I explained why my opposition is based on that particular line. There are many complaints about the Market Superintendent imposing the law in some cases, and in others allowing it to be broken. One of the reasons why the Government is afraid of referring this Bill to a Select Committee is that they do not want to hear what they will hear. They will hear, for instance, that some people are allowed to flout the Law with impunity having regard to the slaughtering of animals. If some people are allowed to do that, then there is so much the more reason why we should not put more power into the hands of certain people.

I am submitting that no harm can be done and a lot of good will be derived if a Select Committee goes into this Bill carefully and summons before it people who will be concerned with the exercise of the powers which are granted under the Bill and get their reaction to it. Therefore, I feel that this House will be well advised to refer this Bill to a Select Committee especially since this House has been reminded, contrary to the information which it had before, that the temporary delay in passing this Bill need not hold up the opening of the new market.

The question that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee, was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. DOWDING, MOTTLEY, TALMA, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, F. G. SMITH and BRANCKER - 7.

NOES: Mr. L. E. SMITH, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. THORNE, HOLDER, SEARLES and BRYAN - 9.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clauses 1 to 16 inclusive, were called and passed.

Clauses 17 to 28 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 27 be recommitted.

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

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 27 deleted and the new Clause which reads as follows stand part:

"Provided further that all licences in respect of premises at which fresh meat may be sold or offered or exposed for sale issued under the provisions of Section thirty-three of that Act and in operation at the date of the coming into force of this Act shall continue in operation until the fourteenth day of January one thousand nine hundred and fifty nine, and shall then expire, and until that date the provisions of the Market and Butchers Act, 1890., applicable to such licence shall, notwithstanding

the repeal of that Act, be deemed to continue in operation with such modifications as circumstances may require."

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

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

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of a Bill in Committee with an amendment, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
9.00 p.m.

On resumption,

Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum.

Mr. Speaker caused the Bell to be rung and a quorum was obtained.

RESOLUTION RE INAUGURATION OF LEGISLATURE OF THE WEST INDIES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I propose to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice today and after that to proceed with the appointment of a Deputy Speaker.

The Resolution read as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that on the occasion of the inauguration of the Legislature of the West Indies on the 22nd of April, 1958, the House of Assembly of Barbados records its appreciation of, and extends its congratulations to, all those who have worked towards making the Federation a reality.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House extends its good wishes to both Houses of the Legislature of the new Federation with the hope that the long-standing traditions of the Legislatures of the individual units will be happily blended in establishing a stable foundation for the Federal Legislature.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit the text of this Resolution to His Excellency the Governor-General of the West Indies for communication to the Federal Parliament of the West Indies.

I do not think that there is much more I can say on this Address.

I do not think that there is much more I can say on this Address. What I think I can say is that this House is unanimous in sending its best wishes for the successful inauguration of the Legislature of the West Indies and the founding and continuation of the British West Indies Federation. Sir, this action started since 1947 when the first Conference was held at Montego Bay. Since then, members from the various Units have worked assiduously together to bring about this Federation and make it an accomplished fact, and I am sure we all welcome this occasion to send the various members of the new Legislature our good wishes. We hope that the Federation will prove a success and will be a boon to the many inhabitants in the area who are looking forward with great hope to this new nation. With these few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion that this Resolution do now pass and in supporting the point expressed by the Hon. Leader of the House, I would say that it is a very great pity that on a night like this when we are considering such a Resolution, the late Mr. Christopher Brathwaite of revered memory is no longer with us.

Sir, you would recall that long ago, in 1938, he raised in this Chamber the question of the Federation of the British West Indies and British Guiana. In those days he received very little support, but he at least demonstrated his far-sighted opinion that the realisation of such a Federation was a possibility. Now that it is established, it is a certainty.

Now, Sir, with all due respect to those who assisted in the framing of the Constitution - I saw in one of this week's newspapers the picture of a man whom I greatly esteem, Sir Stephen Luke, and he was referred to as the "Father of Federation" - it is unfortunate that there are many of us, West Indians, who only think in terms of Englishmen as being "fathers of federations" and important movements such as this. When we, Sir, as West Indians think of the "Father of Federation", we must think inevitably of the "Grand Old Man from Grenada," the real living father of Federation and the conception of the West Indian nation, the man whom we familiarly know as "Teddy" Marryshow. It would be a source of disgust not only to me personally but to many thinking people in this West Indian community if the first President of the Senate were not Mr. T. Albert Marryshow. Although I am a Barbadian, I am grateful that I possess none of the typical insularity of the Barbadian and to suggest that the President of the Senate should be a Barbadian - and I have nothing against the one who has been suggested; that suggestion could not be reasonable and no other suggestion would be reasonable except to suggest that the President of the Senate should be Mr. T. Albert Marryshow.

After all, let us face facts. This is Federation of the West Indies. Mr. T. A. Marryshow is not one of those coloured persons who have never tried to be regarded other than what he is, and what he looks, as the grand old man of the prospective West Indian nation.

So, Sir, when we are considering the passing of this Resolution, we must consider those who have done so much in the past. There was, before the matter was raised by way of a question that caused the initiation of a full-dressed debate by the late Mr. C. A. Brathwaite, a move for Closer Association originated by Mr. Rawle of Dominica and at which conferences the Barbados representative was the late Mr. Charlie Elder. Well, Sir, as we know, the late Mr. Charlie Elder was not a radical, but he was referred to in those days as the "Gladstone" of Barbados. He and Mr. John Sainsbury took an active part in the work and deliberations at those conferences which took place in Dominica. The late Mr. John Seymour Sainsbury, father of the former Assistant Comptroller of Customs, the late Mr. Charlie Elder and Mr. Cecil Rawle of Dominica have all passed to the Great Beyond; but they still remains with us, happily so, Mr. T. A. Marryshow, C. B. E. Therefore I feel, if the Senators of the West Indian Parliament have a full sense of their responsibility and an awareness to history, what they owe to Mr. "Teddy" Marryshow unanimously and unhesitatingly is the proposition seconded and carried that the first President of the Senate should be Mr. T. A. Marryshow.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree in extending not merely our good wishes but our best wishes to both Houses of the Legislature of the West Indies with the hope that the long standing traditions of the Legislatures of the political Units will be happily blended for the establishment of a stable foundation for the Federal Legislature.

Sir, I am asking that the text of this Resolution be sent to Lord Hailes who, we believe, will do his best to allay the criticisms of his detractors and those who criticised the appointment. I think Lord Hailes is fortunate that he has a wife who will assist him in bearing the onerous burden of the State. His Excellency the Governor-General has started off well by taking the advice of the

Governors of the various units who have put themselves to the trouble of being well informed and advised by all sides.

10.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have very little to add to what has already been said except to say that on this day we extend our congratulations to those who are making this Federation a reality and as a result of whose efforts the Federal Parliament is to be inaugurated next week. Around this Table at the moment, I am sure that you share my joy in seeing with us the hon. senior member for St. Philip, as we will recall the part which he played in the initial stages at the Montego Bay Conference in connection with this Federation (Cheers) and the work which he did in the early stages along with your immediate predecessor, the Premier of this Island, and Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke. At least, we have in this Chamber tonight the hon. senior member for St. Philip who has served for the same number of years in this Chamber as yourself. I do not think that this matter needs any further comment from me, and I therefore express my complete satisfaction in seconding the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the unanimous approval which is being given to this Resolution by the fact that both sides of the House welcome it, is underlined by the much more important fact that the Legislature in which this Resolution is being moved is the oldest in these territories which now comprise the Federation. It is therefore fitting that in a Unit like Barbados, whose parliamentary traditions go back over 300 years, some expressions of our good wishes for what is now the youngest Legislature in the Federation should be made. In so far as the traditions of parliamentary life are concerned, if the Federal Legislature follows very closely the recent traditions which have been laid down by the oldest Legislature, it will find itself being off to a bad start; but I think generally speaking, it will develop traditions of its own and it is well that we put at our disposal all the best we have.

Sir, in a Resolution like this, as it is worded, one reflects that a lot of the members of this Assembly have made substantial contributions to the Federal idea and the Federal reality. The hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for Christ Church have themselves exemplified the beginning, so to speak, and the end of the Federal preparations, one of them having attended the Montego Bay Conference and the other having attended the final Conference in London, when the Federation Committee finalised the plans for coming into Federation. Leaving aside party feelings for a moment, we reflect that two other members of the Legislature have played substantial parts in the shaping of the Federal idea - the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has been a member of the Standing Federation Committee and I think he is still a member of the Governor-General's Advisory Council; and I think that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has had quite a lot to do with the writing of the Rance Report. As a Legislature, we have done our bit in bringing the Federation into being. The Other Place has also made its contribution, and it is noticeable that two members of that Place are Senators representing Barbados, at least one of them is representing Barbados, and the other is the alternate delegate for St. Vincent. At any rate, both of them are members of the Other Place. It is no idle gesture that we make tonight in moving the passing of this Resolution wishing the Federation well. We have good reasons, both from the age of our own Legislature and the part which members of our Legislature have played - we have good reasons for sending the Federation our best wishes.

I am sorry that the Hon. Mover of this Resolution is not now in his seat - he is now in his place - and there is one suggestion which I would like to make with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of paragraph 3 of the Resolution. Paragraph 3 of the Resolution reads as follows:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit the text of this Resolution to His Excellency the Governor-Gen-

eral of the West Indies for communication to the Federal Parliament of the West Indies."

This is the suggestion which I should like to make. It is quite in order for the text of this Resolution to be transmitted to the Governor-General, but I have been made to understand that the Governor-General himself has sent personal invitations to certain members of this House to attend the inaugural ceremony in Trinidad on Tuesday next. I understand that the Hon. Mover of this Resolution and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - both of them have been invited by the Governor-General to attend the ceremony. I hope, Sir, that you will attend it. My own suggestion therefore is that you convey to His Excellency the Governor of Barbados the request of the House that the three members of this Legislature who have been given special invitations to attend the ceremony, be deputed to transmit the text of this Address to the Governor-General, and to hand it over to him at the request of this House. I think that that would be a very good idea; it would be better for the three members of our Legislature who will by chance be in Trinidad attending the Inaugural Ceremony to seek audience with the Governor-General and transmit to him in person the text of this Resolution which we are passing today.

10.10 p.m.

I just pass that suggestion on for what it is worth, and I hope it will be taken up and treated seriously.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am supporting the suggestion, but I have another note to sound. Do not think that I want an invitation to Trinidad. If I wanted to go to Trinidad I would have offered myself as a candidate and been elected, in spite of what they say, or could go otherwise. I think it is rather discourteous. I understand that members of the Government have been invited to the opening of the Federal Legislature, but I think Government is rather discourteous and lacking in good manners not to have said in a Message that certain members were invited to the opening of the Federal Legislature. We had to read it in the "Trinidad Guardian" to know. I am sure that you as Speaker will agree with what I am saying. I understand that two members from the other side booked their passages and were disappointed in not being invited. I am not one of the persons whom you can accuse. If I wanted to go I could pay my passage, thank God, or I could have been a candidate; but to be quite serious, I feel that we should not have to wait to read in the "Trinidad Guardian" that the Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Government had been invited. At least somebody should have courtesy enough to inform the House that Barbados had received three invitations and who have been selected.

As far as I am concerned, I am not giving anybody my blessing. As far as I am concerned, nobody from Barbados is going with the knowledge, blessing and consent of this Legislature. The Governor-General is spending the money we subscribed, and if invitations came to Government, at least they could have been decent enough to say that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture or somebody else has been selected by the Barbados Government to represent Barbados at the Opening of the Legislature. Nobody expects - and least of all I - that you will select members of the Opposition in place of Government members, but I am sure that you as Speaker will agree with me that in this matter we should have been notified by some method. I should like to have it recorded that I deprecate the attitude being adopted. I understand the Leader of the Opposition has an invitation from Lady Hailes. I beg your pardon, Sir; I do not mean to be facetious. I understand that the hon. member has an invitation from Her Excellency. I am sure that Lord Hailes must know about that. (Laughter). You, Sir, I understand, have an invitation as Speaker; I do not know from whom yours came, but seeing that you have long passed the age of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, yours could hardly have come from the same channel. I feel like the hon. member in the passing of this Resolution. The hon. member mentioned the name of Christopher Brathwaite. Those of us who sat in the Gallery and heard him will remember that he was a strong advocate of Federation; and that brings me to a point which

I will never forget as long as I live. The public of Barbados should know that Mr. Christopher Brathwaite was a strong and powerful advocate of Federation; then he lost his seat. The time will come when all of us would have to be out of here. When Mr. Brathwaite died and we came here and asked the Premier, or ex-Premier, Prime Minister Designate or Lord Premier of the West Indies, to adjourn the House, he could not do it out of decency to go to his funeral, but he could do it for a two-cent, washed-out 'nothingarian'. Jealousy is the lowest thing in the world; it is lower than the earth. I know what I say will hurt and burn, but I am going to speak. I am nothing to do with who cursed him last night. I curse anybody in front of his face.

Anyway, I am very glad that we are passing this Resolution. The Government is delaying time to make the appointment tonight of Deputy Speaker. It is not fair and I do not know why they are doing it. They need not make that appointment tonight, and the Governor is going to announce who is Premier in the Press tomorrow morning. I am happy, however, to associate myself with the passing of this Resolution, but I do hope that whoever becomes Premier will in future see to it that we know when people are selected to go away who are spending our money. They must be courteous to tell us who are selected, how many invitations there are and so on.

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

10.20 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SPEAKER

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the next item is to move the appointment of Deputy Speaker. I have decided to do that item now in order to give hon. members on the opposite side the opportunity of going home earlier.

I beg to move that the hon. member for St. Joseph be appointed Deputy Speaker of this House. I think I can say that the hon. member soon after he came to this House was made Chairman of Committees and I may say that he took a job which no other member of the House wanted because it was a very cumbersome job.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Did I understand the Hon. Leader of the House to say that he was proceeding with the appointment of Deputy Speaker now? So far as I know, we still have one, because earlier today, Your Honour said that the vacancy does not become due until midnight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Have the hon. member read Clause 96? It says:-

"At the first sitting of every General Assembly or from time to time as necessity may arise, the General Assembly may appoint a Deputy Speaker."

Mr. CRAWFORD: The question is this: can you appoint one when you have one? When the necessity arises we would appoint one but the necessity cannot arise now. When do you say that letter takes effect from?

Mr. SPEAKER: I said earlier today "until Tuesday expires."

Mr. CRAWFORD: We are still on Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying, Sir, that the hon. member for St. Joseph has no doubt been Chairman of Committees for many years, and I am sure that all members of the Opposition will agree that he has done a good job under very difficult and strenuous circumstances; and I do think, now that the necessity arises in the absence of the Deputy Speaker to appoint a Deputy Speaker, that he is the ideal person for the post. I have very great pleasure in moving that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Deputy Speaker of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order? With the greatest respect to Your Honour, I just like to say that I would not have risen were it not for the fact that I asked across the Table "where is the Deputy Speaker" and an Hon. Minister said: "I do not know where he is." I do not want to see you put yourself in any false or difficult position. I am submitting that you cannot now appoint a Deputy Speaker. The time for you to do so is either one of two things. It was either after 12 o'clock last night or after 12 o'clock tonight.

This is the letter dated 10th April, 1958 from the Deputy Speaker. It reads as follows:-

"His Honour The Speaker,
House of Assembly,
BARBADOS.

Your Honour,

Owing to the fact that I have been elected a Member of the House of Representatives of the West Indies, I beg to give notice of my desire to withdraw from the General Assembly of this island as from Tuesday next 15th April, 1958.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Yours faithfully,

Your Honour ruled earlier today that that means 12 o'clock tonight. Either one of two things must happen. You either wait until after 12 o'clock tonight or Your Honour's Ruling is wrong. If the hon. Deputy Speaker walks in here before 12 o'clock, he is still Deputy Speaker. I am not questioning Your Honour's Ruling, but I feel that as soon as the 15th began, the post became vacant. I personally feel that the Deputy Speaker retired as from the 15th April; therefore on the 15th which is today he could not come in here. However, I understand that you have said that this takes effect as from 12 o'clock tonight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I said up to 12 o'clock tonight.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If that is so, you cannot entertain the motion. It is a technicality. I personally feel that the Hon. Leader of the House can make the motion because the seat was vacant since the beginning of today; but because of Your Honour's ruling, the resignation of the Deputy Speaker really starts as from 12 o'clock tonight. I will tell you something. I have sent to call the Hon. Deputy Speaker to attend the House because I want to see him face to face with the new Deputy Speaker. (Laughter) Sir, I submit to you that you cannot proceed to make that appointment now.

May I ask Your Honour another question? What is the use of making a Deputy Speaker now? The House has a Speaker now and there is no question of the House in need of a Deputy Speaker. At the present, you have no Premier, no Deputy Speaker. It is common knowledge that Your Honour will be Premier; therefore, the Speakership will be vacant very soon from now according to your ruling. What is the point of making a Deputy Speaker now? 10.30 p.m.

After the bye-election, then you can come in and appoint your Deputy Speaker. For what reason are you appointing a Deputy Speaker now?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that hon. members do not want to go home before 12 o'clock midnight, I will ask leave to withdraw my motion and put it later on.

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

SOIL CONSERVATION (SCOTLAND DISTRICT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and

Fisheries:- To move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the improvement and conservation of the soil and for the prevention of damage or deterioration by erosion to land in certain areas of the island and for matters connected therewith.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, I hold, is not as controversial as the other one which we have passed tonight. It is a little more technical and practical; it is removed from the city areas into the deep ravines of St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. John. I do not think that some hon. members have really visited the site to see what good work we are doing down there. I remember inviting an hon. member down there on one occasion, but he was like a young married man who was so pre-occupied at home on his honeymoon that he could not leave to see these areas. I cannot over emphasise what this Bill means to this Island. This Bill deals with the reclamation of land in those parishes which I have mentioned. It deals with the proposition of making an attempt to stop the sliding of land from one area to the other, and it deals with reclaiming and making more arable land available to the people.

So far, it has been a costly job. When some people feel that we are parsimonious in certain things, I think that this is one of the things which they should remember, that we are also engaged in spending money in this particular field. We are trying to put more land into cultivation so that we can feed our people better. Even the implements which we use are very costly; I think that the last piece of machinery we bought cost over \$100,000; but the Government is willing to spend money in that direction, because up to now, we can see what soil erosion can do and what soil conservation can do. If I go to sleep tonight with a fruit tree in one place tomorrow I wake up to find that it is in another place. That is something to which attention has to be paid. We want the reclamation of land to be a matter of fact, and therefore, any money which is spent in that direction will be money well spent. I do not know how many acres we have already reclaimed, but I am sure that the appearance of that area looks somewhat different from how it used to look. Those of us who have seen it before and who will visit it in the future, will be surprised, and pleasantly so, to see what a good job we are doing.

Somebody says that I am a gospel preacher or something like that; well, I am proud of it. If Nature acts in certain ways with some of us and she acts in other ways with other people. I am not responsible for others; I am responsible for myself; I am proud of myself. However, I should just like to read from the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. Clause 2 says this:

"The high and increasing population density of the Island requires that all land capable of use for agricultural purposes should be so utilized as to ensure maximum productivity, thereby deriving the maximum benefit from the land. It is therefore the policy of Government to attempt to rehabilitate areas in the Scotland District which have been destructively or not properly utilized in the past and to check the erosion which has resulted from non-use or misuse of land. The Government were able to secure the services of a person who has had experience in soil conservation measures in other territories and in order to proceed with conservation measures, it is necessary to set up by legal authority the requisite machinery."

I feel that when you think of this area being one-sixth or one-seventh of the total area of Barbados, it becomes more than necessary to see that we reclaim this land. I must confess that the gentleman who is in charge of this work seems to have been cut out for doing this kind of work. I have visited the places many times and seen the work which is going on; although this gentleman has long passed my age, he is more energetic than I am. He lives close to Nature, and I think that if everybody would do that in spite of age, he would be just as energetic as this gentleman is. I think that what I have said is the consensus of opinion of those who have been there. Somebody says that it is a waste of money; but of course, he does not live in this area. I

think that this is a Bill which will commend itself to all of the inhabitants of this colony. It is true that it is belated, but there are many things to which we have been attending elsewhere. I make the confession that we have been doing work elsewhere, when we should have been attending to this matter. We are making Regulations which are very liberal; we do not want to take away anybody's land.

10.40 p.m.

The Government has to continue this work, and we think it will be a stabilising factor in that area if we can reclaim some of the land, plant fruit trees and make it look more habitable. I once said earlier in my life that if I had ten acres of land in St. Philip and somebody offered me 100 acres in St. Andrew, I would not want it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need say any more, but if there are any questions which hon. members would like to ask, I shall be willing to answer them. (A VOICE: Explain about compensation.) We do not know what amendments will come from this Act; therefore, we cannot introduce the Regulations now. I do not have the file here, but you can take my word for it that the terms are very generous, and I do not think that they will work any hardship on anybody. I said before that if there are any charges to be made, the people have up to ten or twenty years to pay them. I think it is almost a gift to them. I did not think that I would be able to get both of these Bills passed today, but I do say, Sir, that hon. members need not have any fear, because now that we are spending so much money to reclaim this land, we are doing it as a matter of duty. We are not speculating and I want hon. members to have a little more faith in me. I have not changed my view on how I feel about people. What I mean by that is that we would not set out in a Bill to create hardships on people by what we are doing now. It has always been the practice that you cannot lay Regulations before passing the Bill, because nobody knows which Section will be changed, so that if you make Regulations before-hand, you are not doing anything. The Regulations may be drafted by the Attorney General; but we cannot bring them down before we know how the Bill is going to be accepted on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say no more, because I think that in truth and in fact it has the approval of the whole House. I should say that the entire population except for a few dissenting voices agree with it, and I feel it is a good job. This is set out in the Five Year Plan and we have to continue until we have got the work done. When we finish that area, we will move on to another one.

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

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the general principles outlined in this Bill are very far-reaching and will in process of time contribute an immeasurable amount of good in so far as the agricultural economy of this island is concerned. It is a Bill which I am afraid contains so many principles that listening to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I must say that I feel rather disappointed in the manner in which he presented the Bill, because it is of such a far-reaching nature. I have during my tenure of office as Minister of Agriculture done a great amount in this connection, and I made my contribution as far as getting this scheme inaugurated. I had no idea that we were going to do this Bill tonight, but speaking from memory of the last eighteen months or thereabouts from work which I did from the same files in this connection, I will attempt at this stage to assist the Minister in explaining it.

If the Hon. Minister had read the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, they would show him what it was about. The object of this Bill is to set up a Soil Conservation Board in the first place, and the constitution of this Bill is comprised of the Director of Agriculture as Chairman, the Soil Conservation Officer and five other members appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee who shall include representatives of the Agricultural community. They shall see after the general working of this Board, but in each area sub-Committees will be set up.

So you will get this Soil Conservation Board as the Governing Body, but there will be sub-Committees for various districts, as the case may be, comprised of persons whose land will be affected under this Bill, and they will have the right to appeal to the Soil Conservation Board which governs the entire scheme. The question of compensation is paid both ways. Compensation is paid to the land owner, and in the case where the land has been brought back into cultivation the owner of the land will have to pay the Government compensation.

Clauses 23 and 24 explain the question of compensation which is a very important question.

Clause 23 reads as follows:-

"In determining the amount of compensation to be awarded on a claim for compensation made pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Court by which such claim is heard and determined shall act in accordance with the following rules -

(a) the value of land or of any chattel house, article, erection or thing on the land shall, subject as hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount which the land or such chattel house, article, erection or thing if sold in the open market by a willing seller might have been expected to realise at the date immediately preceding the execution of the work;

Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the assessment of compensation for disturbance or any other matter not directly based on the value of the land, chattel house, article, erection or thing;

(2) No allowance shall be made on account of -

(a) the carrying out of the work or exercise of the power being compulsory or the degree of urgency or necessity which has led to the carrying out of the work or exercise of the power;

(b) any disinclination on the part of the claimant to permit the carrying out of the work or exercise of the power;

(c) any outlay or improvement on such land, chattel house, article erection or thing which shall have made, commenced or effected or effected years before the carrying out of the work or exercise of the power with the intention of enhancing the compensation to be awarded therefor in the event."

Clause 24 reads as follows:

24. (1) All compensation awarded under this Act shall bear interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from the date of entry of the award as a judgement of the Court until payment to the claimant or payment into the Court under the provisions of subsection (3) of this section.

(2) All compensation under this Act and all costs, charges and expenses lawfully incurred or payable by the Director of Agriculture shall be paid out of the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

(3) If there shall be no person able to give a good discharge for any compensation payable under this Act, or if no person can be found to receive the same, after the amount of compensation has been determined the Director of Agriculture may pay the compensation into the Court to the credit of the person entitled. Any compensation so paid into the Court, may, on the subsequent application of any person claiming to be entitled thereto be paid out to such person on the order of the Court. 10.50 p.m.

The whole question of compensation is set out here but, as I mentioned just now, it will be on a mutual basis.

As regards Clause 25, I am not in agreement with

the principle enunciated in it. It says that the occupier of the land will for all intents and purposes be regarded as the owner. That will cause any amount of litigation because the possessor or occupier of land is seldom the owner of the land. I believe that you should insert something similar to what you have in the Statute of Limitations. By that I mean that if some words or phrase were inserted to the effect that the occupier of the land will be so regarded only in cases where ownership cannot be established. You say in this Section "that the person having the ostensible possession or enjoyment of the rents and profits of such land or building shall, for the purpose of this Act be deemed to be the owner of the same until the contrary is proved." Anyone who has a working knowledge of the law will know that being in possession of land does not necessarily mean that you are the owner of land. If words were inserted to the effect that "the person who has been in ostensible possession for the past ten years or the person who satisfies the Court of the District that that is so," then law suits may be avoided.

I say again that this Bill, although highly desirable and one which should be brought into force as soon as possible - because until it is on the Statute Book the hands of the Soil Conservation Expert are tied, I will still suggest that as the Bill is an intricate one and because it makes provision for the appointment of various Boards and sub-committees and because many Sections may need to be drafted, it may be wise to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. Sir, I am not going to make that motion now but I am going to make it at a later stage and I hope the Hon. Minister in Charge will see the wisdom of it. I am suggesting to him that in the absence of his having all the files on the matter and in the absence of proper explanation to the points put forward that we should either postpone or refer the Bill to Select Committee. I am going to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. The Bill does mean when it is put into effect that one-seventh of the arable area of the island will be brought back into cultivation at once. The whole object of the Bill is to bring land which has been eroded back into cultivation after a number of years and at the same time to prevent good arable land from slipping into erosion. It is a laudable one, and one which would entail the expenditure of millions of dollars from which we will not be able to derive benefit overnight.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, one would naturally expect that I should have something to say on a Bill of this nature. As regards the purpose and intention of this Bill we can have absolutely no quarrel; but there are one or two features of it with which I am not entirely satisfied in my own mind and that is the reason why I am in favour of sending it to Select Committee. This Bill is giving to the Director of Agriculture powers which the Government almost possesses under the Land Acquisition Act. If the Bill is properly read by hon. members, they will see that this Bill transfers to the Director of Agriculture far-reaching powers, such as to take away a man's land from him and to give him such compensation as the Director thinks fit. Any Bill which hands over to Civil Servants such wide powers as this Bill, laudable as it is - there must certainly be a lack of enthusiasm for its quick passing through the Legislature.

I should like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention certain aspects of this Bill with which I do not agree at all. I think he will appreciate the fact that it is giving very wide powers to the Director of Agriculture. The first Section with which I am not in entire agreement is Section 19. I can understand giving wide powers to the Director of Civil Aviation where the lives of people are involved in the case of animals straying on the runway; but I am not agreeing to give any Director of Agriculture if he finds a sheep straying on any land of the Conservation Area to seize it, destroy it or otherwise dispose of it as he pleases. Mr. Speaker, you will find that this Section is giving the Director of Agriculture wider powers than what is given under the Petty Trespass Act of this country, because the Director of Agriculture has power in the case where sheep, goats, cattle, horses or any other animal may be found on any land in the conservation area, in respect of which any con-

servation measures or works are being carried out under this Act or which on any such land in contravention of any order made under Section 6 of this Act or of any regulations made under this Act, and subject to the provisions of the next succeeding sub-section the Director of Agriculture may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of any animal so seized in such manner as the Director of Agriculture shall think fit.

"2. If the owner of any animal so seized shall claim such animal within five days of the seizure thereof, the Director of Agriculture shall, on payment to him of the sum of one dollars together with the reasonable expenses incurred in seizing and impounding such animal, deliver the animal to the person claiming it."

"3. On the sale of any animal so seized the Director of Agriculture shall, after deducting the sum of one dollar together with the reasonable expenses incurred by him in seizing and impounding such animal, hold the balance of the sale moneys for the owner of the animal sold."

"4. The Director of Agriculture of any person authorised by him to seize any sheep, goats, cattle, horses or other animals shall not be liable for the death or injury of any such animal when seized not in the even of his delivering such animal or paying the balance of the sale moneys to any person other than the owner thereof shall be liable to the owner thereof if he had reasonable cause to believe that the person to whom such animal was delivered or to whom the moneys were paid was the owner of such animal."

11.00 p.m.

I am not agreeing to this, Mr. Speaker. Despite the fact that the Government is trying to do a good job by way of reclaiming land, I am not agreeing to give the Director of Agriculture the power to seize cattle and do as he likes with them in an area which is predominantly fitted for a cattle area. There should not be any canes grown in the parish of St. Andrew; that should be a cattle-rearing district. I repeat, that I am not agreeing to give such wide powers to the Director of Agriculture to deal with animals which must necessarily stray in that area. The period for a claim for compensation to be made should not be after one year, but after two years as was recently done under the Land Acquisition Act. If you can extend the period for claiming compensation under the Compulsory Purchase Act to two years, then I think that this is an excellent case for giving a period of two years. I know that when this question of compensation comes up, you will find that some people will give a lot of trouble and they will even neglect the advice of their legal advisers. In some cases, they will say that the legal adviser should grant a period of more than a year. I am suggesting that a period of two years would be a reasonable time for making a claim for compensation.

As to Section 25, that Section has already been referred to by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and anybody who drafted this Bill would see the folly of this particular section. This is what the Section says:-

"Where any question shall arise touching the title of any person to any lands which may be entered upon for the purposes of this Act or touching the title of any person to any building, including a chattel house removed from any land pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (f) of subsection (1) of section thirteen of this Act, or touching any estate or interest in such land or building, the person having the ostensible possession or enjoyment of the rents and profits of such land or building shall, for the purposes of this Act be deemed to be the owner of the same until the contrary is proved."

That is a provision which the Lawyers love. Where a person is in possession of the rents and profits of land, and then the Director of Agriculture goes to this land and uses it for the purposes of the Act, this Section says that the person shall be deemed to be the owner of the land until the contrary is proved. You will be able to see how much litigation is going to take place. Of course, in a very short time, Section 22 of this Bill will have to be amended, because in a very short time the Assistant

Court of Appeal will not be of any use, because there is now going to be a complete remodelling of the whole judicial system. The Assistant Court of Appeal, as I said, is going to cease to exist and therefore, that whole section and all the relevant provisions dealing with Section 22 of this Bill, will have to be amended. If an action has been filed even a month or two before hand, the re-organisation might find a person in the midst of a claim which has been made; therefore, the relevant sections dealing with the Assistant Court of Appeal and any sections in which the Assistant Court of Appeal is mentioned, will have to be amended in the process of time.

Section 11 says this:

"Where the Director of Agriculture carries out, completes or executes any measures as provided in section 9 or in section 10 and it appears just and equitable to the Director of Agriculture having regard to the matters referred to in the next succeeding subsection that the owner of any land should pay or contribute towards the cost of such measures the Director of Agriculture, may after consultation with the Board, and subject to the provisions of this section, claim from the owner the amount of the cost of the work or a just and equitable proportion thereof."

Again, if a Board is established and if as far as possible the Government avoids putting on this Board persons who are likely to be affected by any soil conservation scheme, this matter should be a matter for the entire Board and not for the Director of Agriculture after consultation with the Board. That is my opinion as regards this Bill. The Director is just like the Governor-General in the Federation; he takes advice, but he can ignore it. I think that it is the decision of the Board, or it should be the decision of the Board, to say whether a man can pay or not. This Board is to be appointed and according to section 3, it will consist of the Director of Agriculture, who shall be Chairman, the Senior Conservation Officer, and five other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, who shall include representatives of the agricultural community.

I am in favour of this Board, but I am warning the Government that they do not appoint to this Board people who are likely to be affected by any soil conservation scheme in these areas; although the agricultural interests should be represented, the Government should also see to it that it appoints proper persons to this Board; otherwise, you will get skirmishes existing among the people. The Hon. Minister in an attempt to dig at me talked about my lately being married; he will remember, however, that his invitation to me to go to St. Andrew was given before I was married. I am asking him to exercise the greatest care in the matter of the selection of the members of this Board because the success of the scheme will depend upon the impartiality, ability and interest of the members of the Board.

11.20 p.m.

It is a good piece of legislation, and I shall not even attack my colleague tonight on a personal line, because whether it is her land which is being conserved or that of Mr. John Brown, the necessity for soil conservation in St. Andrew is a very important matter, and in fairness to her it should be said that the soil conservation scheme in St. Andrew did not start with her land first. If by the way her land was contiguous to the land, and touching, abutting and abounding on land on which the scheme was started, one would expect her to get hers done also, because if I were in her position, I would hope that Government would allow the plough to roam from one piece of land to mine. It is not her fault; and so long as she is prepared when it is reclaimed to pay compensation and to grow such crops as could be used by the community in St. Andrew and elsewhere, I could have no quarrel with that.

This Section, which deals with the various orders which the Director of Agriculture has power to make, strikes me as giving to the Director quite a bit of power. Section 8 reads as follows:-

8. Any owner or occupier of land in respect of which the Director of Agriculture makes an Order who fails or neglects, without reasonable cause (the proof whereof shall be on such owner or occupier) to carry out any measures provided by the Order, within such reasonable time as shall be fixed by the Director of Agriculture, shall be guilty of an offence and on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction shall be liable to a fine of one hundred dollars and the court may order such owner or occupier to carry out the said Order.

The question of a reasonable time should always be a matter for the Court. The Director is not only going to make the Order, but he is going to say that such and such a time in his opinion is a reasonable time. I am not agreeing to this. If you had said that "if any owner or occupier of land subject to the Order fails or neglects to carry out any Order or any measures provided by such Order within a reasonable time," then no such reasonable time is fixed by the Director of Agriculture, and in this case, it would be the Police Magistrate to say whether, taking the circumstances into account, two or three weeks is a reasonable time; but you are giving the Director the power to make an Order and to say what is a reasonable time, and not giving the owner on whom proof lies an opportunity of contesting whether it is a reasonable time. If the Director says that one day is a reasonable time, you have to take that. A correct piece of drafting would be to say "within a reasonable time" and the Court would say with all the circumstances in the case of Section 8, what is a reasonable time. Here the Director is allowed not only to make the Order but to fix a reasonable time; that is too much power because the question of what is reasonable is always a question of fact which should be decided by the Court; but you are sending a man to Court and giving the Director the power to decide a question of fact.

I hope the Hon. Minister will see what I mean and not think that I want to put obstacles in the way, but I have to safeguard the liberty of a person to enjoy his property with the necessary safeguard. I think you will see what I am driving at and I shall move an amendment to that particular Section when the time comes to read "within a reasonable time" instead of "within such reasonable time as the Director shall determine," so as to allow the Court to decide whether or not such time is reasonable.

Now, Sir, it goes further than that and that is why I say the Court should be given the power to decide what is a reasonable time, because I have no doubt that the Magistrate who would have to adjudicate on this matter will take into account the financial position of the parties involved. If the Director has such wide powers to make these Orders, he might very well impose them on an unfortunate tenant or occupier or owner who from his financial position might not be able to carry them out. That is why I should prefer the Court which would take evidence of the man's means and ability to decide it rather than the Director.

Then Section 9 reads as follows:-

"If any owner or occupier of land subject to the Order fails or neglects to carry out any Order or any measures provided by such Order within such reasonable time as the Director of Agriculture shall determine, the Director of Agriculture may subject to the provisions of section 16 of this Act, for the purpose of carrying out or completing any measures necessary to give effect to the Order, carry out any works pursuant to the provisions of Sections 12 of this Act or exercise all or any of the powers conferred on him by section 13 of this Act."

Here you are giving the Director the power instead of the Board to prosecute as well as to decide a reasonable time.

I hope the Hon. Minister will appreciate that in any

Bill before any Legislature, especially if it is viewed from a Lawyer's point of view, his first consideration should be that the person whose rights are being taken away should not only be represented, but that no action should be taken to cut away or even to infringe the democratic rights of the party involved, and those, of course, include the enjoyment of his property. I agree that the interest of the community is paramount rather than the interest of an individual, and there are cases such as in time of war, or a national emergency, where it requires giving to any Government or individual members very strong measures both for the safeguard and the security of the community as well as for their general interest.

Now, Clause 14, Mr. Speaker, is also another indication of what I am talking about. I am sure the Hon. Minister must have seen this. The Clause reads as follows:-

14. (1) The Director of Agriculture may make grants or loans to any person or body for all or any of the following purposes:-

- (a) Fencing any land so as to protect vegetation thereon for the purpose of conserving the soil.
- (b) Constructing defences against water and any other works for preventing the erosion of soil;
- (c) Purchasing, planting, and maintaining trees, shrubs, plants, or grasses for the purpose of conserving the soil;
- (d) Executing any other works or doing any other act or thing which in the opinion of the Director of Agriculture it is necessary or expedient to execute or do for the attainment of any of the objects of this Act;

(2) Any grant or loan made under this section shall be made upon or subject to such terms and conditions as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit.

(3) Any loan made under this section may be made either without security or upon such security as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit.

This is giving the Director power to lend out taxpayers' money. Why don't you give that power to the Board? If the Board is there with him as Chairman, let people like me or the five agriculturists have a say whether the money to be lent out should be lent out. What do you have the Board for? You appointed the Board and put him as Chairman, and yet you are giving him these powers instead of the Board. I am not criticising the Director, but if you appoint a Board for the lending of money, let it come from them. It goes further because it reads that "any loan made under this Section may be made either without security or upon such security as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit." Why not the Board? I do not agree that you should lend out money without security. How are you going to collect it back? If you are doing work on a man's land which will help to improve it, you should try and get some security for it, because if you do not have security and you bring an Order against him, he can ignore it.

11.30 p.m.

If you appoint a Board, all of these powers, so to speak, in Section 14 should be vested in the Board instead of being put in the hands of the Director of Agriculture. That is why I am saying that to send this Bill to a Select Committee is a good idea. The mere fact that you have been carrying out soil conservation projects without this Bill shows that if it is held up for a little time it will not do any harm to your carrying out your projects.

There are matters in this Bill which call for some consideration. You tell of the composition of the Soil Conservation Board under Section 3 and you say how to fill vacancies. Under Sub-section 6 you say that the powers conferred on the Board by this Act shall not be affected by reason only of there being a vacancy in the membership thereof and you go on to say in the next sub-section that three members shall form a quorum.

Then you say that the Chairman of the Board may at any time summon a meeting of the Board and shall summon a meeting within seven days after a request so to do by any two members. Further down in the Bill you pick the Director of Agriculture apart from other members of the Board and give him powers to do everything; so he can go and sit down at a meeting of the Board, listen to all that is said and then walk out and lend John Brown money without consulting any one member on the Board. Why should I sit down with him as a member, waste a whole morning and then he can go out and lend a plantation owner £100 without my knowledge? Further than that I would not be able to tell any one person a word about it.

Sir, there are certain sections of this Bill with which I agree. There are Sections which call for a specialist knowledge and the Director of Agriculture should be allowed to have the say when it comes to those matters, but in the case of lending out money, why should he have that power without the knowledge of the Board? That is what you are saying in the Act. If he follows the Act, you cannot do him anything for it. (A VOICE: The Minister must know about it.) I agree that there is ministerial responsibility but this is giving the Director the power. If he lends out money without your knowledge, are you going to fire him? I am not saying that the Minister would not have overriding views on policy. Every decision the Director makes, he does not have to run up to the Ministerial Building to the Minister and say before carrying it out that he is going to do that. I am saying to let the Board do it. Even if the Minister is overlooking whatever the Director does, let the Board do it. A member of the Board should be able to know that money is being lent out to So and So and how it is being loaned out. The Director runs up to the Minister and says: "Mr. Minister, I want to lend John Brown so much money." I am a member of the Board and the next thing I see is a fencing being put up on a particular area. Section 14 (1) says that the Director of Agriculture may make grants or loans to any person or body for all or any of the following purposes:-

- (a) fencing any land so as to protect vegetation thereon for the purpose of conserving the soil;
- (b) constructing defences against water and any other works for preventing the erosion of the soil;
- (c) purchasing, planting, and maintaining trees, shrubs, plants, or grasses for the purpose of conserving the soil;
- (d) executing any other works or doing any other act or thing which in the opinion of the Director of Agriculture it is necessary or expedient to execute or do for the attainment of any of the objects of this Act.

Sir, just consider that I am a member of the Board and I do not know anything about it. You are telling me that is good enough! That could not be good enough. That is a joke Board. I think it would be a good idea to give them some power. If the Minister is overlooking the whole thing, say, instead of the Director of Agriculture, that the Board may make plans. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: I do not agree with that.) That does not worry me. You will hear more about it on the floor of this House or in the Law Courts. I am sure that nobody would sit on a Board in which you give the Director of Agriculture all the power.

Section 18 is as follows:-

"The Director of Agriculture shall have power -

- (a) to take on lease land for the purposes of this Act and to cultivate and manage such land;
- (b) to cultivate and manage land as agent of the owner or occupier and to enter into agreement with the owner or occupier for the payment by him of the whole or any part of the cost of management and cultivation;
- (c) to lease or sub-lease land at his disposal on such terms and conditions as he shall think fit."

There are a thousand and one things with which this Bill deals. I regret that it is now so late an hour when we are dealing with this Bill, but I do appeal to the legally-minded members of this House not to allow the law and the general procedure of the law to cause this scheme to fail. I repeat; it is my opinion that someone must be able to act and act quickly in every case which is quoted in that particular Section of this Bill. Somebody must have wide powers under this scheme. There is no doubt that eventually that area can and will be one of the main cattle-producing areas in the West Indies, but in order to make it so we must do exactly what we are told by the Soil Conservationist and by those of us who know what advantages can be achieved in this area. If that is not done, we will find that the land will move away and the same conditions as exist today will recur within a year or two.

This scheme has big possibilities. I have discovered that there are quite a number of fishing ponds in St. Andrew in the area where this soil conservation is being carried out. I do not know if the hon. member has heard this, but I have been fishing in his constituency with a net and caught out of a fishing pond three large gobies. As far as I can find out by a group of his constituents, that is the first time that such a thing has happened in history as far as that parish is concerned. There is the possibility for such things as fishing ponds in that area and his constituents will be able to go outside their doors and catch fish as they do in Jamaica and in other parts of the world; but it all depends upon this Bill.

I hope I have made clear to hon. members the importance of this Bill and I hope that the legal members of this Hon. House will realise that in order for this scheme to be successful, it will be necessary for wide powers to be given to someone or to some parties to whom these powers can be delegated and transferred. I am in favour of these powers being delegated to the Director of Agriculture who happens to be or should be a man of specialised knowledge along this particular line. I think that what I have said is about all I have to say on this Bill. There are some points with which I agree. It seems to me that lands should be under the control of the Director of Agriculture. If an occupier is not doing what he has been told to do, and if it is necessary in the interest of the scheme to fence lands and so on, then the money must be there because hundreds of acres will be ruined if this work is not done and done quickly. The same thing applies to the construction of fences against water and other things. If there is any refusal on the part of anybody to cooperate, it must necessarily follow that the Director of Agriculture must be able to move into the area and do certain things immediately; otherwise the scheme will be hampered in its operation. I do not know how many people realise it, but most of this scheme is dependent for its success on the control of the water. If the water is not controlled, then the whole scheme can be washed away. I had made another note but I cannot find it now; however, I shall leave that for another time. I hope and I feel sure that hon. members will realise the importance of this Bill.

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

ADDRESS RE VACANCY IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY SIR ROBERT DUNCAN HARRIS ARUNDELL; Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Barbados.

May it please Your Excellency,

A vacancy having occurred in the General Assembly owing to Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, Kt., A member for the Parish of St. Joseph having vacated his seat:

We, the representatives of the people in General Assembly, pray that Your Excellency-in-Executive Committee will be pleased to issue a New Writ for the election of a Member to serve in the General Assembly for the parish of St. Joseph in place of the said Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, Kt.,
12.20 a.m.

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

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

Mr. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the Hon. House the fact that as a result of the coming into operation of the resignation of the Hon. junior member for St. John, that constituency of which I am senior member will not now have full representation in this House, and I therefore beg to move that the following Address to His Excellency the Governor do now pass:

TO HIS EXCELLENCY SIR ROBERT DUNCAN HARRIS ARUNDELL; Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Barbados.

May it please Your Excellency,

A vacancy having occurred in the General Assembly owing to Victor Bovell Vaughan Esquire, a Member for the Parish of St. John having vacated his seat:

We the representatives of the people in General Assembly pray that Your Excellency-in-Executive Committee will be pleased to issue a New Writ for the election of a Member to serve in the General Assembly for the Parish of St. John in place of the said Victor Bovell Vaughan, Esquire."

Mr. SEARLES: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the two hon. members to present the Address to His Excellency.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SPEAKER

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated to the House earlier, I was proposing that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed as Deputy Speaker of the House. I need not repeat what I said just now, except to say that I believe that each and everyone of us in this House agrees that the hon. member as Chairman of Committees has done a very good job indeed under peculiar circumstances from time to time.

I have much pleasure indeed in moving that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed as Deputy Speaker of this House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in seconding that motion, which I beg now formally to do, I will say this: this is very much overdue promotion. I was surprised in December 1956 when it was decided for reasons which I have never been able to understand and which I believe

to be machiavellian and diabolical, that the hon. junior member for St. Peter should not again occupy the Chair in accordance with British tradition, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was not proposed for that promotion. It was just an obvious thing to do. He has served in the Chair for, I believe, ten or twelve years; he has displayed a most remarkable impartiality combined with his unfailing sense of good humour and his treatment of all members alike, irrespective of Party, which I believe has caused him to lose a certain amount of favour with his Party. We feel that because of the impartiality which is so common and inherent in him, his promotion is long overdue. We know that there are still a few members in this Chamber who are more interested in service generally than in serving themselves and the fact that he, in accepting the promotion, would be losing financially is not a matter which would weigh with him as it might weigh with other people. Apart from his politics, we all know that the present Chairman of Committees earns an honest and industrious livelihood, and this is overdue promotion. There is nothing more at this particular moment, although I am not sure if there is not, which is available to him, but he certainly deserves the more leisurely duties of Deputy Speaker which would fall to him if he is so elected. It is a source of gratification in me to second and support the nomination of the hon. member for St. Joseph for the preferment which is obviously his due.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before ...

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, ...

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said, "Mr. Speaker", and the hon. member said "On a point of order; whom did you hear first?"

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order is always given preference.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My point, Sir, is this: according to your ruling; the resignation of the Premier is now effective; we understand that your name has been submitted to the Officer administering the Government as Premier

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not on a point of order or disorder.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will proceed. Will you tell me something before I start, Sir? The Hon. Leader of the House nominated the hon. junior member for St. Joseph as Deputy Speaker; will you tell me whether the hon. member can be Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker also? He has not resigned his original post. I want you to rule as to whether the hon. member is still now sitting as Chairman of Committees. Can he hold a dual posts?

A VOICE: If he happens to be elected, he will resign the other post.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am addressing you and I will not have them trying to rule.
12.30 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a few weeks ago, we had the same sort of thing happening. The Hon. Premier was elected to the Federal Parliament. He was still Premier. He was given opportunity to resign one.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member for St. Joseph is still sitting in the House as the Chairman of Committees of this House. Is that correct?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Chairman of Committees happens to be elected Deputy Speaker, naturally he will have to resign one.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking you to rule on this mat-

ter. I am sure you did not see the point before it was suggested to the Hon. Leader of the House to regularise it. Let the hon. member for St. Joseph resign the office of Chairman of Committees first. Do not let us be the laughing stock of other legislatures.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion, it is all right to proceed as we are doing. It is quite all right.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Then you rule that it is all right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that it is all right that the Chairman of Committees can be elected as Deputy Speaker and then you call upon him to resign one of the offices.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you cannot tell him to resign one of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: But, he cannot hold both offices.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The minute you elect him Deputy Speaker, you have one person holding two offices.

Mr. SPEAKER: The resignation of one is automatic.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is not automatic. At present the Chairman of Committees is the hon. member for St. Joseph. Some hon. members say that he is now the senior member for St. Joseph. I am calling him the hon. member for St. Joseph. It has been proposed that he be appointed Deputy Speaker. I have asked you to rule on the matter. You are saying that it is automatic as soon as he is appointed Deputy Speaker that he will resign one of the offices. That is not automatic at all, if he does not resign either one, what can you do about it? I am sure that the hon. members for St. Joseph knows that I have nothing against him but he must resign the office of Chairman of Committees first before he can be proposed as Deputy Speaker. If he is not elected Deputy Speaker, he can always be re-elected Chairman of Committees.

Let me make myself clear. One office - the office of Chairman of Committees - carries a salary of \$275 a month and the other, the office of Deputy Speaker, carries a salary of \$250 a month. Suppose he is elected as Deputy Speaker and there is no resignation of Chairman of Committees, will he go to the Treasury and draw both salaries? You cannot say that it is automatic. Let us regularise it first. The hon. members on the other side can suck their teeth at what I am saying. I am suggesting to Your Honour that you will be sitting in the Chair today for possibly the last time as Speaker. Go out with blazing colours. Rule that the hon. member resigns the office of Chairman of Committees first. You must regularise what seems ridiculous. It is ridiculous. It is the same thing as if you are the Speaker and I get up and nominate you as Chairman of Committees.

Mr. SPEAKER: Have you heard of one person holding two offices?

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what I do not want to happen. I am suggesting that you do not listen to the voices over there. What is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph now?

Mr. SPEAKER: Chairman of Committees.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What will he be after you have taken a vote on the proposition?

Mr. SPEAKER: Automatically he will resign one.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I am coming to the assistance of the Government. The motion should be conditional. It should be put this way: I beg to move that the Chairman of Committees be appointed Deputy Speaker on the condition that he resigns the office of Chairman of Committees. That is really what you are attempting to do and unless you do it like that there will be plurality of offices.

Hon. M. E. COX: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, immaterial. If we accept the proposal by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, at some time we are bound to cross the border. There will bound to be a Deputy

Speaker and Chairman of Committees at the same time at some point even if we put it on condition that if he is elected he will relinquish the post of Chairman of Committees. There is bound to be some overlapping.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will realise that I am right. What is wrong with regularising it first? I am not going to sit down on this because I know I am right. I am not suggesting that the hon. member will retain both offices; I know he would not do that; but you must put it right first. He must resign first as Chairman of Committees. You cannot be Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker at the same time. The two offices carry different salaries. What there is to prevent the hon. member from holding both offices? I am suggesting to you to put it right. What is the objection to it?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking the hon. senior member for the City to give way.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Ask that I give way on a point of order. I am not sitting down until that is done.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit that the suggestion by the hon. senior member for Christ Church is all right and I accept that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not taking that. He must resign first.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, let the hon. member for St. Joseph resign first.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not agree that he should resign first. Your Honour has just stated a case which is one of the highest order. The Hon. Premier was elected to the Federal Parliament.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order? The Hon. Minister is making a speech. Let him do what you just suggest. There is nothing in what the Hon. Minister has said about the Premier being elected to the Federal Parliament when he did not resign the office of Premier and while he was in here.
12.40 a.m.

The law says that he has 21 days within which to remain a member here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the House withdraw his motion?

Hon. M. E. COX: I challenge any hon. member from the other side of the House to produce any law, rule or anything else to show that we are out of order. I referred to the Federal Elections just now, and they are telling me that that does not apply here; but let them produce one thing to show that we are wrong tonight in proposing that the Chairman of Committees be the Deputy Speaker of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing against it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Therefore, we are right. The hon. member has already admitted that if the Chairman of Committees is appointed Deputy Speaker of this House, he is going to resign his office as Chairman of Committees.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What do I admit?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister withdraw his motion? Let the Chairman of Committees resign his office.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is a matter for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister withdraw his motion?

Hon. M. E. COX: Under what Rule? If Your Honour wants me to withdraw my motion, then I withdraw it.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: I am quite willing to do anything. I cannot understand the argument used by the hon. senior

member for the City; I have not been elected as Deputy Speaker of this House yet; I have only been nominated. I intended, no sooner than I am elected as Deputy Speaker, to get up and tender my resignation. (*Cheers*). I am not Deputy Speaker until the majority of hon. members vote that I should be Deputy Speaker. Be that as it may, I respectfully beg to tender my resignation as Chairman of Committees of this House of Assembly. (*Cheers*).

Hon. M. E. COX rose to speak.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. Should not the resignation of the Chairman of Committees be accepted?

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed as Deputy Speaker of this House.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want a ruling again on this matter; I would like to know one or two things. We are now on the eve of a change over. I think it is within the knowledge of everybody in this country that the Hon. and Learned Premier has had to resign from this House; he has resigned as Premier of the Island and therefore, we understand that he has named his successor to His Excellency the Governor. That is in keeping with his office. I do not know whether it is true or not ---

Mr. SPEAKER: That is nothing to do with what is before us; that is irrelevant.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That may be a matter of opinion, but, in my opinion, there is nothing irrelevant about it when I am dealing with the appointment of the Deputy Speaker. I have no intention of embarrassing anybody, but I would like to know why is it that there is all this haste about the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. With the greatest respect to the hon. member, the hon. Leader of the House who proposed the Deputy Speaker (Mr. THORNE: He was Leader of the House) well, if the hon. member is continually saying so, then there is no Government according to them. Who is the Premier?

What I am trying to say is this: if the hon. member is not Leader of the House, then there are not Ministers at all. Surely, the hon. senior member for St. Michael would have some knowledge of what is happening and he is not merely getting up and nominating the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Chairman of Committees, as Deputy Speaker.
12.50 a.m.

I am sure you never like stifling discussion. I am going to grant you that the office is vacant; the office of the Premier is also vacant, but it is true that this House cannot fill the office of Premier; this has to be filled by the Governor on the recommendation of the Party in power. According to the Bushe Experiment the Governor should call on whom he considers can command a majority.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody will stop me from talking.

A VOICE: The Rules are against you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anyway, I was hoping that the hon. member would tell us the reason for the haste in appointing a Deputy Speaker. We understand that this House will be adjourned for five weeks tonight. At present there is no Government, but the hon. member said that Her Majesty's Government must be carried on. I should therefore like to know from the Hon. Leader of the House the reason for appointing a Deputy Speaker when he has not yet intimated to us officially that His Excellency the Governor has selected a Premier.

Hon. M. E. COX: That will be officially communicated to the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There must be some motive for appointing a Deputy Speaker tonight. I am nothing to do with any rows in their Party; I am delighted to hear that there is a row, and there is nothing that I am more pleased to hear. You have just passed Addresses to His Excellency drawing to his attention the fact that there are two vacancies and asking him to issue New Writs for bye-Election. The most important thing to my mind would be to select a Premier to preside over the Cabinet and to carry on Her Majesty's Government. It has not been officially communicated to us who will be Premier, although we all know. Is this a sop for the hon. member for St. Joseph? We cannot help hearing. You want him to back down through this from running Mr. Coward in St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It does not matter; neither one of you can ask me anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: What concerns this House is whether the House wants to elect the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking the reason. Let them go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I am concerned, all that concerns me is the election of the post.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, neither one of those members is capable or competent of telling me what to say. I am not going to speak in derogatory terms about the hon. member for St. Joseph, but I must ask a question. If you have two members of this House elected to the Federal Parliament, the Premier and the Deputy Speaker, which is more important, the Premier or the Deputy Speaker? Are we not entitled to ask that? In the absence of official communication to this Chamber of who will be Premier, what right has this House to appoint a Deputy Speaker? There is no haste in announcing a Premier to preside over the Cabinet to conduct the affairs of the country, but there is haste to make a Deputy Speaker! I am sure the hon. member would not think that I have anything against him when I take this line of argument, but if he does, it is a matter for him. Can the Minister tell me why a Premier has not been appointed? I am not going to use the word "subtle" because that was bruited about too much last night, and anything I have to say about anybody, I say it before his face.
1.00 a.m.

What I want to say is this: What is the use of appointing a Deputy Speaker tonight? Everybody knows that there are going to be bye-elections. Is this a sop which the party is offering to the hon. member for St. Joseph?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already told the hon. member that that does not concern me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am entitled to ask that question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is definitely out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How is it out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not concern the House. What goes on in the Party does not concern the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you mean to say that what goes on in the Party does not concern the House or the public?

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not concern the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking you a simple question now. Does this concern the House? Is there a vacancy in St. Joseph and another in St. John? Does it concern the public to hear that the hon. member for St. Joseph is running Mr. Coward for the vacancy in St. Joseph? That must concern the public. Therefore I am asking, is this a sop which the Party is offering the Chairman of Committees to prevent him from running Mr. Coward?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am telling the hon. member again that you are out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like you to rule me out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule you out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you suggesting now that a member cannot pose a question to be answered by members of the Government? Are you going to rule that a member of the opposition cannot pose a question to be answered by the members of the Government because it does not suit the Government to answer it? Am I not entitled to ask members of the Government? Is it true to say that Your Honour is named as Premier? What is wrong with that? I see nothing wrong in my asking that. With the greatest respect to Your Honour, do you mean to say that a member of the Opposition cannot pose a question to the Government to answer? I ask a simple straightforward question. I think the most important office to be filled is that of the Premier. We have no official information relative to that yet. With all honour to you, or anybody else who is called to be Premier, all I can say is that I have been made to understand that you are recommended to the Governor to be Premier. I say that, Mr. Speaker. I too feel that it is more important to the public and to this House to fill the office of Premier immediately than that of Deputy Speaker.

You have had two resignations. If you were in my position, you would come to the irresistible conclusion that it is more important to fill the office of Premier than that of Deputy Speaker. I think you must come to that conclusion because the Premier is Chairman of the Cabinet. Your filling the office of Deputy Speaker tonight will cause people to speculate as regards the indecent haste of doing so. Then they will look all around for a motive. The only thing they could conjecture is that it was filled so as to hand out a sop to the hon. member for St. Joseph. I am absolutely certain that hon. members of the Government Party are all sane gentlemen; therefore, they have not just decided suddenly among themselves to appoint the Chairman of Committees to the office of Deputy Speaker. You therefore must ask the question: "why?"

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall ask the Hon. Minister to let the House withdraw that motion and proceed with one to appoint a Premier!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, are you getting sarcastic? I appeal to you most respectfully, do not try it with me. I am the last man with whom you should try to be sarcastic. I am addressing my remarks to Your Honour in the most dignified way I can. As far as I am concerned, I will never suggest that the House appoint a Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then quite reasonably, let the House proceed with whom they can appoint.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Am I not entitled to argue logically and to draw conclusions or to ask members of the public or members of the House to draw conclusions? I know as well as the world that nobody can appoint a Premier from this House and that that is a matter for the Governor and the Party concerned. What I am saying is this: there is a vacancy in the Premiership, the Deputy Speaker and now the Chairman of Committees. Which do you think should be filled first? We know everybody from that Party wants to be Premier. Mr. Speaker, you had better watch yourself, you never know what will happen if you are appointed Premier. I will only issue the warning to you that you have got to be careful. Sir, I am not interested in any row which goes on in the Labour Party. You ought to know what happened to you a few nights ago. As I was saying, Sir, I am not interested in any row that is going on in that Party; but unless hon. members from that side give me some reason why we should proceed to make this appointment now, I feel that we are doing wrong. On the other hand, if the Government insist in proceeding with the motion and if Your Honour rule that we are perfectly in order so long as the person nominated does not hold any other office, I feel that it points in every direction, when the Chairman of Committees has resigned that office and the filling of the office of Deputy Speaker is rushed through tonight, to the conclusion that you are offering a sop to that hon. member.

The public ought to realise that he is offered this office because of some sop. He has resigned the office of Chairman of Committees which carries a salary of \$275 a month to accept Deputy Speaker which carries a salary of only \$250 a month. Is this a stepping stone to the office of Speaker if Your Honour is removed from that Chair? Hon. members want to know what is the reason. Is that a stepping stone to something higher? Is it that Your Honour will be appointed Premier? Let me say I shall be very pleased to know if that happens. Sir that is an honest expression; that is what we all have been hearing.

Sir, I therefore feel under the circumstances, without any official information being given to us, that there must be some catch in this. What, for instance has happened about the hon. junior member for St. Michael? He has been in here for 10 years. His very demeanour, his gentlemanly manner, all that recommends him to that Chair. The hon. member for St. Joseph knows I have nothing against him but you are looking for someone to fill the office of Deputy Speaker. I see everybody has been pitched-forked into something and has been given some office. Is this done to keep out the hon. junior member for St. Michael? Are you pitch-forking the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to the office of Deputy Speaker in order to keep out the claim of the hon. junior member for St. Michael? Is that really a stepping stone to his being promoted Speaker? Sir, you cannot continue to treat people as you treat the hon. junior member for St. Michael. Sir I look across the Table and see the hon. member who can be described as the gentleman of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are trying to stir up strife.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A lot of strife was stirred up last night. You abused the Hon. Premier last night.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I object to that remark. I am definitely sure that no decent, honest, truthful human being could ever say anything like that. I object strongly to that and say that it never happened and I will go as far as to say that it will never happen. I still have respect for decency, culture and things of that sort, and especially for persons who have done a lot to help the underprivileged from whom I have sprung. I have never done so. It is a damnable lie and it can only come from a cancered stomach.

1.10 a.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You know, Sir, -- I am only going to say thank God, that you were one of the people who were present. You hear this talk about a damnable lie. The hon. member has said that I was to stir up strife; when I want to abuse the Premier, I abuse him, but when you talk about a damnable lie, I was not there. His party was there and the matter is all over Bridgetown. What I said was that at the meeting last night, I heard that Your Honour had to step in. I also heard ----

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that got to do with this matter? If the hon. member wants to speak on the office of Deputy Speaker, he may speak on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think you were contending with the hon. member that he would not sit. I know that you never wash your dirty linen in public. The hon. member seems to take umbrage because I said I heard something.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not taking any umbrage because he said something; he made a categorical statement that I abused the Premier behind his back. I go further and say that even if I felt that the gentleman to whom I referred has done me anything wrong - and he has not done me anything wrong - I would never abuse him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was not there; I heard so. You have members of your party; let them get up and help you to deny it. I would put it as strongly as this: you, Mr. Speaker, had to go to the Premier's rescue. What about the hon. junior member for St. Michael? There is no censure for me. I do not go around stooping and asking for any favours; if I heard something, I would say it is

impossible for anybody to make me believe ---

Mr. SPEAKER: Has that got anything to do with the Office of Deputy Speaker?

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Mr. Speaker. On your appeal ---

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not appealing; all I am saying is that what you are saying has nothing to do with the Office of Deputy Speaker.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are looking at the motive. I am inclined to nominate the hon. junior member for St. Michael to this Office. (Mr. BRYAN: Leave me out of that.) The hon. member says that he is not in that. I am not thinking about stirring up any strife; it does not make any difference to me; you will never live long enough to see me asking anybody to take me into a Party. I am telling you what I have heard, just as we heard that it will be announced in this morning's paper that Your Honour will be the new Premier; we cannot help hearing these things. You cannot ask the former Speaker of this House to become the Deputy Speaker; I cannot do that. I am only paving the way, because a lot of people want to get in this matter. I am only mild as to what is going to come.

I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City be Deputy Speaker of this House.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the nomination made by the hon. senior member for the City of his colleague as Deputy Speaker of this House. I do so wholeheartedly for reasons which I shall enumerate during the course of my speech. In supporting the nomination of the hon. junior member for the City for the post of Deputy Speaker, I am in no way casting any aspersions on the character or suitability or otherwise of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Perhaps, of all the members of this House, he and one or two others and I have close ties which would prevent me, even if I wished to say anything against him, from doing so.

1.20 a.m.

These restraints need not be applied, because I have nothing but goodwill towards the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. However, Sir, I cannot countenance his nomination to the post of Deputy Speaker for those reasons. The very fact that at this time of the morning we are having this kind of election is the worst that can be said against it. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that we are proceeding in the dark, that we are doing the second thing first and I am going to tell you what I mean by that. Even supposing we elected any member of this House as Deputy Speaker now, when the Chair is vacant or when it is declared to be vacant - because I am of the opinion that the Chair is vacant now - the Deputy Speaker will be powerless to act and to perform the duties of Speaker if we have no Speaker; and I want to emphasise that if members on the other side and even some members on this side persist in the nomination of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and I am saying it quite frankly, it is because the exigencies of the political party of which the majority of them are members require that the particular member should be Speaker of this House when it is known that Your Honour is no longer Speaker. In other words, he is being nominated now for Deputy Speaker, because they wish him to be Speaker in a few weeks' time; that is the whole truth of the matter.

Now that raises a further question, because a lot of people - I am not one of them - who even at this moment might be prepared to give him a vote to make him Deputy Speaker, will not be so well prepared in a few weeks from now when the question of the Chair is considered. I will be consistent in not voting for him now as Deputy Speaker or when the Chair is known to be vacant. He will not be receiving my support and he knows that because I have told him.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that is even more significant and it is this: this House has received during the last twenty hours or so very grievous affronts

to its dignity and to its privileges; and if I say what I am going to say in the next few minutes, I make no apology to Your Honour or to members of the House for saying them because I believe them to be true. I would be saying them because if I did not say them, there would be no point in speaking on an occasion like this. Every single person sitting around this horseshoe table knows that at this moment, Your Honour is Premier of Barbados, no matter how they may hide it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a little more than I know.

Mr. TUDOR: That is a little more than you know and therefore I must take it that you do not know it. It is going to appear in today's issue of the one daily paper which we have in this island. To me it is a most grievous affront to the dignity of this House that a member of it whom the House elected to be its Speaker, and whom they presented to the Head of the Administration for his own approval, should while he is still the House's Speaker be appointed to be Premier. But you see, Mr. Speaker, that is the whole point of the thing. If somebody had taken the trouble to sort out this whole constitutional tangle which arises out of the departure - thank God for it - of Sir Grantley Adams, we would never now be in this embarrassing situation. Do you realise, Mr. Speaker, that we are the laughing stock of the West Indies? I am going to be much more provocative than this to show you a case in point. Suppose it turns out that I am right that while you are sitting there you are Premier of this island; do you realise that even now, if you are, that you have lost all the signatory power over this House as it is now?

We are supposed to go into recess for a few weeks and we are doing so on the surface without having a Deputy Speaker and the possibility of the now Speaker retiring from the Chair. No Message has come to us that the Chair itself is vacant, and yet every member of this House knows by reflection, that a Deputy Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly as indeed of any Legislature is Deputy to the Speaker that there is. He is not a Vice-Speaker, and my contention is that when you have no Speaker, you have no Deputy Speaker; and if Your Honour had died in the course of the last twenty-four hours while sitting in that Chair, the House would have been powerless to do anything to proceed on its business, the Mace would have laid under the table and the Clerk would have to find some way of taking the direction from members to adjourn the House. So it is the Chair itself which is most important, and the whole procedure, therefore, of filling the Deputy Speaker's post is thrown out of slant and gear because of reasons which have not been disclosed. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can get the Deputy Speakership, he is welcome to it; but he would not be getting it with my assistance; and it may well be that we shall hold ourselves to great ridicule for what we are doing here tonight, and I think that part of the blame must fall on the shoulders of that miserable wretch at Government House. Do not ask me to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, because you know very well to whom I am referring.

Mr. SPEAKER: Tell me to whom you are referring.

Mr. TUDOR: I am referring to the Head of the Administration and I repeat the words "miserable wretch at Government House".

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken offensively against the Governor and I will ask him to withdraw the words.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely decline to withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. senior member for St. Lucy refuse to withdraw those remarks?

Mr. TUDOR: Categorically.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then I must take some steps. 1.30 a.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: (*Sitting*) (*sottovoce*) Cammie, with-

draw that.

Mr. TUDOR: I am not going to do it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: *Sotto voce*. You have to do it.

Mr. TUDOR: I am not going to do it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: *Sottovoce*. The people are not going to be satisfied with your action. Cammie, do what we tell you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I have given the hon. member sufficient time to reflect.

Mr. TUDOR: On what? Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you, or do you not intend to withdraw those remarks?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, can I speak on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no debate.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the wish of hon. members, not of my own, that I withdraw those remarks. That I now do and substitute "pitiable specimen".

Mr. MOTTLEY: *Sotto voce*. Cammie, don't do that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, can I rise on a point of order. I was about to do so before the hon. member withdrew the original words. The words which he has now substituted actually carry the same meaning.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. You have substituted the words "pitiable specimen". Do you intend to withdraw those words?

Mr. TUDOR: What is your objection?

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not properly withdrawn the original words complained of.

Mr. TUDOR: I said that since it is the wish of hon. members that I do so, I now do so and substitute therefor the words "pitiable specimen".

Mr. SPEAKER: I am also asking you to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. TUDOR: What about the words "object of pity"?

Mr. SPEAKER: You are bandying words.

Mr. TUDOR: You interrupted me in the middle of my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am giving you all the opportunity I can.

Mr. TUDOR: I withdraw the words "pitiable specimen" and I now substitute "object of pity".

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking you to withdraw that too.

Mr. TUDOR: Are you telling me to withdraw "object of pity"?

VOICES: Leave that out. Leave that out.

Mr. TUDOR: Well, Sir, I withdraw the words "object of pity" and substitute therefor the word "gentleman". I trust that that is not offensive. I will go on to say that we have found ourselves in this embarrassing situation and that is due to the negligence of the gentleman at Government House. The conventions which guide us in a time like this lay down clearly what should be done and under what circumstances. If, therefore, we find ourselves doing the wrong thing at the wrong time, we must put the blame very fairly and squarely where it should be.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to interrupt the hon. member. All that you are saying does not apply to the office with which we are dealing.

Mr. TUDOR: It does. Mr. Speaker, I think that even my political enemies will say that I understand how to put words and phrases together. You have again interrupted me in the middle of my speech and did not let me develop my theme.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say that you should address yourself to the office of Deputy Speaker and the two persons nominated to the office. The Governor has nothing to do with this.

Mr. TUDOR: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling that you address your remarks to the office of Deputy Speaker and the persons appointed to that office.

Mr. TUDOR: You cannot do that. You are not treating me fairly. You want me to switch my argument in a way which I do not intend.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as this particular office is concerned, what you were saying just now is irrelevant.

Mr. TUDOR: But irrelevancy is a matter of opinion. 1.40 a.m.

I was continuing, Mr. Speaker. I said that the very fact that we are forced to do wrong things has made it necessary for us to consider this question of appointing a Deputy Speaker for this House even before the Chair is vacant and with this unnecessary haste. As regards the nomination of the hon. junior member for the City, that is a nomination of convenience, but it is something which cuts across party affiliation in this House, because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been proposed by a member of the Government Party and seconded by a member of my Party. However, the hon. junior member for the City is well qualified for the post under review, because of all the backbenchers of the Government Party, he alone, considering the short time during which he has been a member of this House, has shown that he has anything in him, and his contribution to the Debates of this House has been, even if unfortunate at times, at all times has been interesting, at any rate. It does not do any harm to recall that his greatest single service to this House and to the community has been his exposure of the Adie affair, and it was exposure in the teeth of opposition from the members of his own Party and from Sir Grantley Adams when that miserable wretch was a member of this House. All of that stands to the credit of the hon. junior member for the City. He has shown his courage and I, at least, am not supporting him because I fear that it might make or widen any breach between him and his colleagues; I am supporting him because of all the backbenchers in that Party he is the one who shows the most promise of the new members on that side of the House who have come into the House since the last elections. He has shown the most interest in the work of this House, apart from a new member who is a Minister of the Government. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to support his nomination and I invite all hon. members to give him support by their votes when the time for casting votes comes.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to give any occasion for your ruling and I do not think that at this early hour in the morning, I will create any inconvenience for Your Honour. I have risen to say a few simple words and I am raising this matter or the appointment of a Deputy Speaker of this House. I am sorry that I did not raise this point before, but I am only dealing with the matter in so far as it affects our own constitution. The reason for making of this appointment is due to the fact that there has been a vacancy caused by the resignation of the hon. junior member for St. John from membership from this House. What I regret to state - and this is not with any reference to any internal rowing because, as you will realise, I am not interested in Parliamentary rivalry; I have too many rows to settle already.

What worries me is the matter of the new constitution and the new conventions which we have adopted. I am sorry that so important a matter is being treated so lightly in that in accepting the resignation of the two hon. members, a very important omission has taken place; that is to say, in accordance with our constitution, the Premier is supposed to be a member of this Chamber and with the resignation of the Premier we are still meeting today. In so far as our conventions are laid down by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Government which is in operation when the Premier has resigned and the new Premier has not been named or has not recommended his Government to the Head of the Administration. That is a very serious omission.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member was here earlier in the afternoon, but when the Premier and the hon. junior member for St. John tendered their resignations, those resignations were to take effect as from the 15th of this month. I asked if there was any objection to that and there was no objection to it; therefore, the time is not now under discussion.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was only taking the line that today being Wednesday and the House is meeting I am only dealing with an omission. It is not a matter for any argument; it is a fact that today is Wednesday and under the British Government, the Queen immediately called someone to form a Government, and a Government was formed. It is for the Minister to make a study of this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you addressing your remarks in connection with the office of Deputy Speaker? So far you have not done that.

Mr. WALCOTT: As a result of this situation, I am mentioning the thing which has created a big omission. That is the point I want to make, because for technical reasons, no matter how we look upon it for convenience, something has gone wrong along the line where we are meeting in a Parliament with certain important features of our convention being practised and are not adhered to. It is on that basis that I want to draw this matter to the attention of hon. members. We need no law in this case; that is the point which I am making. 1.50 a.m.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise not to thank the hon. senior member for the City nor the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, although I do not mean to be discourteous to either one of them. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is the sole right of every member of this House in appointing a Deputy Speaker or a Speaker to vote for whomever they choose. I say that so that it would be perfectly understood by the general public that it is not a question of Party; on the other hand, I do not deny any member of the Party from voting as he likes, and proof of this is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who was nominated by the Leader of the House was seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. They know that it is not a question of a majority Party coming into the House when a Speaker or Deputy Speaker is to be appointed, and voting as such, because if it were so the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have objected when the Leader of the Opposition seconded the motion. I believe there are members of my Party who know that I have not the slightest intention of voting for the hon. member for reasons best known to myself, and to many of them, which is not the business of this House. I will not sit here and vote for myself, come what may, even though I would lose, neither can I remain here and abstain from voting. Therefore, I will have to leave, and I do so now.

Mr. MILLER left the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two nominations and the second one takes precedence.

The question that the hon. junior member for the City be appointed as Deputy Speaker was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. F. G. SMITH and Mr. TUDOR - 3.

NOES: Mr. L. E. SMITH; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. BRYAN; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. DOWDING and Mr. BRANCKER - 12.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed as Deputy Speaker was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. I. E. SMITH; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. BRYAN; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. DOWDING; Mr. F. G. SMITH; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 14.

NOES: Mr. TUDOR - 1.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday May 27th, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Speaking on the adjournment, Sir, I am aware that hon. members are very anxious to get away at this hour of the morning, but I do crave their indulgence for a moment to refer to the grave situation affecting the Sugar Industry in this colony.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I should like to appeal to the hon. member. I think he knows that negotiations are going on now between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association, and I do not think that we should say anything which might worsen the situation. I would appeal to the hon. member, therefore, to desist from commenting on the situation, because if negotiations break down, obviously it would have to be reported to the Ministry, and then the Governor through the Ministry may have to decide on arbitration or something. As the situation is very delicate at this stage, I do not think it should be aired on the floor of this House before the Union and the Sugar Producers' Association have reached some agreement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not think the Minister is aware that reports are that negotiations have already broken down.
2.00 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has appealed to me not to bring up the matter. I will like to hear from the hon. senior member for St. Peter what he would say as regards that.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member will give way, Mr. Speaker, I will prefer at this stage not to answer any question.

MR. CRAWFORD: The Government can rest assured that I do not have anything to say which would prejudice the successful conclusion of the negotiations which are going on. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the strike is now reported to have spread to other areas than those at first affected, and I myself foresee little possibility of an amicable settlement between the two contending parties. Therefore I want to suggest as a representative of one of the affected areas that the Government ---

Mr. SPEAKER: As the hon. member is aware, I think I have mentioned it already, when an hon. member is speaking on an adjournment there are certain restrictions. I think that this is a case in point, under the restrictions, of a matter for which the Government has no administrative responsibility.

There are certain general restrictions: (1) anti-patation, (2) matters which would entail legislation, (3) matters for which the Government has no administrative ability. (4) matters which may be debated on a substantive

motion, and (5) matters which have already been discussed on the same day.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If that is so, on two grounds this motion will qualify.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling that this comes under the restriction "for which the Government has no administrative responsibility." In due course, when that arises, the Government will take action.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is what I was saying. I was saying that this comes under the ground of a matter for which the Government has no administrative responsibility at the moment, but I suppose it would eventually. Therefore, I am in a position to suggest what line of action I think as a representative of the House the Government should take. I am therefore suggesting that a Committee be appointed immediately to go into the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that this comes under that restriction which I just mentioned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I really for the life of me cannot see how. As a matter of fact, I have done it before.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have also stopped members from doing it before.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not mean in your time. I am drawing it to the attention of the Government and am urging a particular line of action. My particular suggestion is that the Government should appoint a Committee of Enquiry to go into all aspects of the sugar industry immediately in order to investigate and discover what are the maximum wages paid in the industry.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled the hon. member out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I respectfully submit that the gravity of the situation has caused me to raise this matter now. Hon. members do not appear to realise what we are in for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you questioning my ruling?

Mr. CRAWFORD: No Sir. I am merely suggesting what is the outlook in this matter at present. I have no desire to question or flout your ruling, but I see the gravity of the situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling for the last time that you are out of order in raising this matter, because it falls in the category of matters for which the Government has no administrative responsibility.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is precisely why it is not out of order. That is why we should not allow it to drop. The Government has power to take action under the Trade Disputes Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Government has not been so informed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said that they were informed. I am not concerned whether they were informed or not. What I am saying is that under the Trade Disputes Act, they have power.
2.10 a.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise to say this. We think we should bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I am suggesting that it is all right for the hon. member to make an appeal. It strikes me that the hon. member having started off, the Trade Union Leader has to say something. It looks to me that the situation is very tense; I am therefore appealing to Your Honour to allow the hon. member to say something and make an appeal in public. I do not think that he should do anything irrational, but just to say that everybody is

doing everything to bring about some settlement in this matter. I do not think it is good enough ---

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want the hon. member to understand that the Government's appeal did not cause me to conclude my remarks; I was stopped by Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Leader of the Government has said that the Government has not been informed of anything, but the public has been informed that there is a deadlock between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association. I am suggesting, therefore, that no harm can be done if we said that we would like to appeal to the workers of this country not to do anything that is rash, but to wait a little, because we have confidence that the Barbados Workers' Union will try to solve the situation. We are going to adjourn for six weeks and we will not have any opportunity other than now to speak on this matter. I suggest that we allow it to go out to the public that the Trade Union is trying to do something in this matter. As a representative of the people in this Chamber, I am as interested in this matter as anybody else. When we realise that we are faced with a drought and we are also faced with the burning of canes, I think it is time to make an appeal ----

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to say that very often in making a statement you aggravate either one side or the other. If it is just a question of making an appeal, then that is all right.

Mr. MOTTLEY: My appeal is that it should go out to the public that every possible thing is being done to bring about a settlement in the interest of all concerned. I think that that is how the hon. senior member for St. Philip was approaching the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. senior member for the City has said that he thought my approach to the matter was along that line. I do not know who is right or who is wrong; I am suggesting that a Committee of Enquiry should be appointed to investigate matters in the sugar industry as has been done before. I should like to say that on the last occasion when we had a Committee of Enquiry to go into the sugar industry, it resulted from a suggestion made on the floor of this House, not because the Government thought that it should be done.

Mr. WALCOTT: Before you put the question. Mr. Speaker, I think that I should say something in this matter. I would have raised the matter before this House, especially at this stage. I do not want to say anything about the matter, because it has reached a very serious stage and when matters reach such serious proportions it is not necessary for one to speak too much on them. I am the Secretary of a Trade Union and negotiations are going on in secret - something as to this situation will appear in the Press tomorrow. Negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association have reached the stage when there is a deadlock. The Government is aware of that and administratively, it is a matter which would come before a Government Department. Negotiations were conducted under the Chairmanship of the Labour Commissioner, and the Executive Council of the Workers' Union must meet. This is a serious matter, therefore I do not think that on the floor of the House much should be said about it because, in this case, a lot is said which people do not like to say. I have had a lot of difficulty which I have not created, but which has been created for me.

I would say that this is a very serious matter and we are hoping that it can be settled without endangering the economy of the Island any further, because the economy of the Island has already been endangered by what is taking place. An amicable solution still appears to be remote. I do not think that what the hon. member is saying is appropriate at this stage; when we spoke of the situation in 1945, there was no Trade Union representing the interest involved. You do not have to ask for an industrial enquiry on the floor of the House if the industrial machinery is there; the Trade Union would take objection to the Government instituting an enquiry over its head. We are not being run

by the Government so that they can start an enquiry, and it is not for anybody in here to institute an enquiry for the Trade Union. The Labour Commissioner will inform the Government as to what steps should be taken in the matter. I hope that everybody with goodwill in this Island on an occasion like this will use his resources so that we might be able to bring about a settlement in this matter. 2.20 a.m.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to say any more because I will have to say a lot more in the next couple of days.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I was hoping that Your Honour would allow me to say that in view of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, this situation has been engaging the attention of my Ministry from the time the strike started in anticipation of a deadlock. I did not want to say anything tonight, but my Ministry has already tried to engage the services of somebody to act on behalf of the Government and to see whether this situation can be solved. The suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Philip is belated, so to speak, because Government has already taken action along that line and tentative arrangements have been made.

I should like to say very seriously that some of us as members of this House do not realise the responsibility which is placed on our shoulders, and it has been reported to the Ministry that certain supposedly responsible members of this House, after the Union had kept meetings and had got the people in a frame of mind of cutting the canes, went around in the districts and tried to prevent these people from working by telling them that if they work now that the crop is nearly over, they would not get the money: so they should stick out and get it. That, Sir, is a sense of irresponsibility and only designed to cause trouble in this island, because if all the canes are burnt there is no mistake about it that the people are going to suffer.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I think that is such a serious allegation that the hon. member should state the particular members.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not mean the hon. member who has just asked the question nor the hon. senior member for St. Peter; but, Sir, I must say that it is a most irresponsible action and means nothing good for those hard-working people in the Sugar Industry, and may only help to fatten the irresponsible members of this House who do it. They are doing it to improve their position at the expense of the workers who are not as knowledgeable of these items. That is what is causing a lot of trouble.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to enquire from the Minister whether he is aware, because he does not seem to be, that this strike started spontaneously because the workers thought they had a grievance.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member has only interrupted me, that is all. Again I say that hon. members should take their duties seriously and realise that they are representatives of the people and lead them aright and not into the dangers which they were led some years ago. I will say no more on that tonight.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, a serious allegation was made against members in here which I asked to have explained and Your Honour should protect us.

What I rise about in fact is to show that I am not irresponsible. A little time ago we took three weeks' holiday, and now we are proposing to take six weeks' holiday when a national disaster is hanging over our heads. The hon. member just now talked about his Ministry; but earlier, he said that we are all now ordinary members in here.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not understand, and I regret to tell him that now. I said that the Ministry has already taken action. If he admits that the Ministry died last night at 12 o'clock, surely he would not wait until now to do it. Nobody wants to be unkind to him, but certainly by now he should learn something.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I am going to develop my argument. The hon. member said that he is an ordinary member. With a national disaster pending

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to that. I did not say that, and I challenge the hon. member to say when on my feet on the floor of the House I said that.

Mr. DOWDING: He did not say it on his feet; he said it sitting down. and for us to adjourn this House tonight for six weeks is an act of irresponsibility. I do not agree with it with the circumstances such as they are, and all this confusion could have been saved if it were not for political manoeuvring by the Government at the present moment. They are manoeuvring and waiting for certain people to come back to the island.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is a strong statement, but I must excuse him because he does not know what he is saying. Imagine the member getting up and saying that this is political manoeuvring by Government. This is a matter, Sir, between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Workers' Union.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of explanation, I was referring to the adjournment. No one can tell me that this Government has not got plenty of work to do, and it is no

use your objecting because I am a sincere member of this House; and if you are going to take six weeks now, it is nothing more than manoeuvring somewhere. I am not talking about the deadlock between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Union. I would say what I have to say whether or not a deadlock existed. We are taking six weeks now when a little while ago we had three weeks, and there is only one reason for it and it is not to get on with the people's work but to make bye-elections to suit themselves. It cannot take six weeks to get this done and I am objecting strongly and leaving this House because they are taking six weeks now after having had three weeks earlier.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Does the hon. member want this House to meet without two constituencies fully represented? Does he realise how serious it is? The hon. member over there should shut up.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is the Hon. Minister saying that it has not happened before? It has happened several times before. We cannot equal your irresponsibility, and I must say further that you did not elect me.

The question that the House do not adjourn until Tuesday 27th May at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

2.30 a.m.