

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 28th August, 1958.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:-

"The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Hon. House of Assembly the Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910, to provide for the drawback of duties on certain goods sold to tourists, which has been passed with amendments which are shewn written on the Bill.

Also, from the Registrar, the following:-

"Sir, I am directed by the Chairman of the Judicial Advisory Council to submit in pursuance with Section 43 (3) of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, the copy of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1958 made under the above-mentioned Act, for the purpose of being laid before the Legislature."

Order No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. Premier to resume debate on the Resolution to approve payment of salary to the present holder of the post of Chemist, Department of Science and Agriculture, in accordance with the salary scale applicable to Scientific Officers of the Research Branch of H. M. Overseas Civil Service as set out in the Schedule hereto.

On the last occasion the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary for me to repeat what I said, and in the interim I was trying to get some relevant information. I will have to draw to Your Honour's attention the unsatisfactory state of affairs relative to this Chamber's documents. I wanted the Godsall Report to see the appropriate reference made to this post, but it is not available in this Chamber. It is a disgraceful state of affairs to take place when documents are supplied to this Chamber and hon. members cannot get them when they want them for debates. If this Chamber is getting the record that members cannot get the Reports, what is the use of printing them? You might as well ask hon. members to travel about with a library in order to have the appropriate documents to deal with these matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I remember that on many occasions recently, the hon. member made reference to the unsatisfactory state of affairs in this Chamber. I am prepared to say that all documents laid on this Table remain in the Library, but I must point out that there are many occasions when hon. members require documents that have not been laid. My memory of the Godsall Report is that it has been laid, but unfortunately some hon. member had access to the Library and never returned it. That is most unfortunate and that makes it most unsatisfactory. When the Library loses a copy, it is very difficult to regain one; so to tidy up affairs, I will have to caution members to see to it that any document borrowed from the House is returned.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to assure you that I have not been one of those members in that position. Far from that, only last Tuesday I found one of my own copies tucked away safely among the documents of the House, and it is a good thing that I had my initials in it, and I thought I had the perfect right to lay claim to my own document. I am very sorry about that because I wanted to show the reasons for my objection to the amendment to this Resolution.
12.25 p.m.

As I have said before, this Resolution would appear on the face of it to be a very simple matter but it is not as simple as it appears. You are interfering with the structure which was laid down by Godsall. The Chemist of the Agricultural Department was placed in the category of Scale G3 to G1A and you will find a similar scale for other scientific officers. If a change has taken place in the United Kingdom with certain scientific officers, and certain of them here belong to certain organisations, it does not follow that a territorial government would have to change its salary structure in view of that to accommodate the person you are talking about because there are other people equally qualified, sometimes more qualified, and when you make this change, it is bound to create dissatisfaction.

I have laboured in this Chamber for many years and I have pointed out on more than one occasion that when you have a salary structure, it is better to have a revision of that whole structure rather than to take this *ad hoc* method of dealing with it, because when you deal with it in this manner, it is bound to create dissatisfaction in the Service. Why should a man suffer in another department because there is no overseas organisation through which his salary scale can now be changed? And, are we to subscribe to a system that something taking place in the United Kingdom is going to condition the local salary structure?

What I think this Government should do is to do just as Trinidad has done. That country has embarked on a policy of training its local people for these positions and only yesterday, I saw in the newspaper that 32 students have been chosen by that Government for training in scientific professions and it covers a wide field. I know of a Mr. Alleyne who is going to take out studies in soil conservation. You should give your students the opportunity of studying for certain things. It is part of Trinidad's plan not to depend on the open market.

I have long heard the argument that if you do not do what is contained in this Resolution, you are not going to get a person to fill the post. Let me say that you cannot compete with Nigeria or other territories which are richer than yourself, and if you try to pay a salary to certain people like those countries, you must be prepared to face the consequences. This Government should be aware that it has been stated by the teachers themselves - and they form part of your Service - that they have a strong objection to their salary structure. Now, you come along and you are creating an awkward situation not only for yourself but for the public. This is not an agreement between members of the Cabinet and the officer concerned; this is an agreement affecting the whole nation; therefore, when I speak on this matter, I speak not as a representative of a few people but as a representative of the whole Service and not in any capacity like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, who says that he is quite satisfied about it from personal experience of the people in his Department. He has no personal experience in so far as arriving at something for a member of the Service as against other members. If that is the attitude which you are going to adopt, every Minister can come in here and say that he has personal experience for his part of the Service. As I have already said, I have no axe to grind for anybody, nor do I have any reason to prevent the Government from retaining these scientific people; but I have a duty to perform for my constituents. I must let my constituents know that if you undertake such a measure in your structure, it is bound to affect other people who work for you. What I do not like about it either is that you get the Government agreeing to increase one man's emoluments and saying that it is interfering with the structure on the basis that this man is going to leave if we do not do this.

This is an *ad hoc* method which was started many years ago from the time it was raised in the Other Place that some of the masters of the Lodge School were going elsewhere to take up appointments. From that day, they have been interfering with the salary structure in this *ad hoc* manner and there has been no stage at which it has been stopped. You set up a Salary Commission to go into your Service, and six months after you have adopted its report you come with *ad hoc* legislation to change something in it. If you want to divide the Service into distinct branches, do so. If you want a Commission to come and say that the Unestablished Staff should be free and not allied to the other branches of the Service, therefore, your scientific officers should be free, do so; but you are going to find out that sooner or later that the elementary and secondary school teachers and other people in the Service and lastly, but by no means the least, the large number of people who reside in Barbados, would have been called elsewhere to take up a job.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to this Resolution because I am not in favour of passing legislation to suit the whims and fancies of any single person. As I have said on the last occasion, when Sir John Saint was Chemist in the Agricultural Department - that was the first ap-

pointment he held in this country - it was stated that he had done so much scientific work in that field that there was nothing more which needed to be done and at one time, they did not have a Chemist in that department. I cannot dispute the scientific people when they say that they do not need an Agronomist now, but they need a Chemist; I am not dealing with the Civil Establishment Order now, but this gentleman's name, who has been called - I know that his substantive post is that of a Chemist and I have understood that he carries out the duties of Agronomist which is not a senior post. When we were dealing with a similar Resolution sometime ago, it was stated as a fact that this gentleman did not draw the salary of the Chemist only but he also drew part of the salary of the Agronomist. I understand that they have abolished the post of Agronomist and therefore, it is not necessary now to elaborate on that; but it does strike me as somewhat peculiar that you are going to do something now in the Department of Agriculture for this particular officer and there are other officers like him whom you are doing nothing about. I mentioned Mr. Carmichael for an example. It has not been stated that he is a member of this Overseas Research Branch and I do not know if he can become a member of that branch. Probably, he may be a man who does not want to go overseas. One of the things which we should be aiming at in Barbados is to try and recruit as many local people as we can with the requisite qualifications, because when you do that, you are more likely to work within your own economy rather than of an economy obtaining elsewhere. If Barbados has to work on an economy which obtains in the United Kingdom, you can very well see what will be your position. There were many Barbadian Civil Servants of experience before the Godsall Report who were not dissatisfied with the salary they were receiving, 12.35 p.m.

There are many Barbadian Officers - I say this having had experience in speaking to members of the Civil Service - there are Civil Servants in Barbados, who, before the Godsall Report was made, were not dissatisfied with the salaries which they were receiving at the time. Those who were receiving salaries like \$500, \$580 and \$600 a month were not dissatisfied with their salaries. If you are satisfied with what you are getting and others are not satisfied with what they are getting, and by reason of their dissatisfaction more money comes to you, you will not be so valiant as to give it back to the Treasury. I have spoken to members of the Civil Service who said that they were not dissatisfied with their salaries and that a few more years could have elapsed before the review took place. I am referring to certain brackets. You bring people out here and give them what can be regarded as reasonably good salaries for any person to live on; but you get this pressure all the time that you cannot attract these people, because the money which you are paying them is not enough.

I do not compare the salary of a man who is a cantonnier with that of a man who is a Chemist, but if you have people in a community and you are paying them salaries on which they can live comfortably, I think that those who are at the bottom are also entitled to salaries on which they can live comfortably. It is not a question of your paying both of these people the same salaries. It is true that when the Hon. Minister was speaking in India, he was far away; but if you read the speech which he made to the Parliamentary Association as to the conditions in these parts, you will say he must see that the disparity which exists today between the top and the bottom on the basis of wages, is nothing about which we can feel satisfied.

A man in Barbados who is working in a lower paid job is working on the basis of a pure subsistence level. There are those who are paid wages that must be on subsistence level and they are pushed against a mediaeval, inferiority complex as if there is some divine dispensation that they must live in that state. These wages which you pay to people do not determine the standard of life in any place at all. When you have a situation like this where you have these attempts to permit salaries for those at the top and whenever there is the slightest opportunity, you say: "We are pressed to do these things," that is not good enough for a community as small as ours and as poor as ours is.

I do not find in the lower brackets that pressure to meet the demands as we are getting from the top. It is these things which have caused this perpetual discontent in the Civil Service which we have. Year in and year out, there is this pressure in the Civil Service for redress, and when you see these things which are made public, people cannot but feel that such things are done for people, because they are nice people. I am sorry that I cannot read the relevant portion of Mr. Godsall's Report for scientific officers and why he made that scale, but the present scale is \$4,560 x 192 - 5,520; 5,760 x 240 - 6,240; 6,720 x 480 - 7,200. Do not let us fool ourselves that this officer for whom we are making this provision is a new recruit. He has had his first degree; I speak subject to correction but I think that the public of Barbados paid money in order to allow this gentleman to go out and have a post-graduate training so as to give him the experience for coming here. I am sure that that was not five years ago. Now, we find that we have to change that. The Godsall's Report is less than two years ago. Before the House died, the Godsall Report came down for ratification. You say that something is taking place in the United Kingdom so as to cause us to change this scheme; well, I ask: What is taking place in the United Kingdom so that you have to change the scales in the lower brackets? - Nothing. In the Post Office in the United Kingdom, a man could get promotion as Clerk, but you do not adopt these things. I am not asking you to be revolutionary, but I am saying that I cannot see the justification for being forced to do this thing in the salary structure; it interferes with the salary structure because, in this case, it has something to do with the Overseas Branch. We have to take things in our own context and make our own decisions.

I do think that the Government should embark not only on a training scheme on which something is taken up and studied, but they should train people for these jobs where we find that there is a scarcity in our territory for these posts, so that our people will return to us. You take a man out of employment and give him the sort of training where he can come back to us. You send a man to the United Kingdom to be trained; he comes back here and he is appointed to go to the Federation; that does not help us, with all due respect to the Federal Government. It is true that you do not want to stultify a man's promotion, but if you are training a man for certain duties, it means that he is lost to us if he goes elsewhere. This training programme is to be treated differently from the ordinary scholarship programme. I am never of the opinion that you should have any strings attached to the boundaries of any young man's or young woman's ability.

12.45 p.m.

If they won open scholarships in their own territory, they should be free to take subjects of their own choice and work in their profession any part of the world; but when you train people for a specific job, you should embark on a policy of giving occupational scholarships. A Harrison College scholarship is not an occupational scholarship, because if a boy won a scholarship he could study something in which he does not earn money; he could decide to study the behaviour of human-beings. You should attach strings to an occupational or vocational scholarship, because you want people to come back and work for you, and it would avoid these things, because they are not good for a small community such as ours. There are certain people, who when you take them into your Civil Service will cause you to depart from your normal Civil Service structure. Very rarely will you find local people causing such a situation. Therefore if you are going to be caused this inconvenience, you have to get down to a definite policy. It is going to cost Government thousands of dollars to correct this error. It started with the teachers at Lodge School where you had to pay them the salary they wanted in order not to lose their services. On principle I am not satisfied with what I have been told and therefore I cannot support this.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I agree in many respects with certain remarks made by the hon. member who has just sat down. Like myself he has had some experience in the administration of the Agricultural Department, and I fully appreciate many of the points he made.

While agreeing with him in many respects, I to some extent welcome this change of policy; it is a new policy

which this Government is bringing down and I see no reason to oppose it. I want to make my position perfectly clear. The policy of the Government in the past has been mainly based on the remarks of the speaker who has just sat down, at least in most respects, but this policy, though dangerous, would redound to the benefit of this island, and I refer to the case of skilled and technical men. There must be a settled policy as far as specially trained and technical men are concerned, as you cannot have the same policy for the rank and file of the service and for technical men whose services are hard to secure, because if you adopt that policy, the island will lose them. When I say that, I refer to the service of Sir John Saint; if this island had lost the services of Sir John Saint twenty years ago, it means that the sugar crop of Barbados could have been 200,000 tons as it was last year. I am not saying that he alone is responsible, but he was the Chemist at the time, and we can see from his work that he is qualified for that work. The island needs a man of the calibre of Mr. Bolton, though he may be young. You are not giving him an increase immediately, and not until 1965 will he receive an increase in salary. This is only to grant him security of tenure and give him greater inducement to remain. As he grows older he will get more money, because he knows he will remain as Scientific Officer on the salary scale \$4,560 x 240 - \$6,000; then he becomes Senior Scientific Officer on the scale \$6,240 x 240 - \$7,440, and after a number of years he will move to Principal Scientific Officer on the scale \$7,560 x 240 - \$8,900. He might take fifteen years to get there. This is an enlightened policy which you should adopt; I am not saying that you should adopt it for Mr. Bolton only; it should be a settled policy for technical and scientific experts, whether they be at the Hospital or at the Department of Science and Agriculture. This is not for teachers because very rarely do you find teachers so specially skilled except in Mathematics or Science. If this policy were adopted, it would have been possible to retain the services of Mr. Rose and other scientific experts in the Department of Agriculture whose services this colony lost as a result of not having a proper policy to induce them to remain here.

I can speak at greater length, but I regard this as an enlightened policy and one which should be settled in the case of specially qualified officers. When I say that, I would regard certain of these points as being prerequisites to an appointment of this nature. The Minister did not make quite clear to this House certain factors which I thought he could have stressed to a greater extent; he should have stated certain prerequisites to which this officer conforms as far as qualifications go. I did not hear the Minister say that this gentleman is specially qualified for this particular job, but I presume that he is, judging from the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The Minister could have stated what qualifications he has and what special work he has done to equip him for this particular post; that it is difficult to secure officers of this special scientific knowledge, and that his services are specially needed in the island at this time of the conservation programme and so on.

12.55 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that I regard this policy as a good, enlightened policy which would have to be adopted in the future in the case of some special, highly technical man. Whether this Chemist is a highly technical man, I cannot say, but I presume if he is appointed according to the Addendum - The Secretary of State for the Colonies proposes to appoint the present holder of the post of Chemist as a member of the Research Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service - that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has not been misled, but he is satisfied that this officer is specially qualified and has the other requirements to put him in that Research Branch of the Overseas Civil Service. I cannot question that and I doubt whether any hon. member here can question it. We have to accept that as true and right and on the level.

But I am saying, if this is so, it is probably a new means of inducing certain scientific officers to remain in certain colonial territories in order to complete the work which they were sent out to do. Whether he works in Barbados, Honolulu or Trinidad, he will be in that grade because that is the grade in which officers of the Research Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service are placed. That is the grade applicable to scientific

officers; therefore, whether he works here, in Honolulu or Trinidad, that would be the salary he would get; therefore, that would be a means of inducing certain people of a certain calibre to remain here and work and from which the island as a whole would benefit. When we have a properly skilled soil Chemist, the whole Island benefits. We have been able to increase our productivity of sugar from 150,000 tons to 203,000 tons. That has benefitted the island as a whole, whether you be the agricultural worker or the manager of a plantation. The country benefits as far as the revenue is concerned; so you can see that the island as a whole stands to benefit. If we cannot induce a man of a certain calibre to remain here, well, we are nowhere. You cannot regard specially trained and equipped technical men as you would regard the rank and file of Government Civil Servants because the others are not trained specially. You cannot make a vote-catching speech in here all the time. If this Government has embarked on a wise and more enlightened policy, let them stick to that policy. I will say, do not earmark only Mr. Bolton, let them earmark Mr. Carmichael too. Do not let them single out one man. Let them find out who are the others that you have so qualified.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member who has just spoken. He has given the facts just as they should be given and he has shown that he knows something about the matter. The hon. senior member for St. Peter displayed a lack of knowledge of the subject and if one had listened to him not knowing the facts, one would have thought that he was an authority on the matter.

I think it is time that hon. members get information sometimes and look at things in their true perspective and do not always rant and rail, especially when they do not know the facts. I thought the hon. senior member for St. Peter would have made a better job of it; he certainly made a mess of it. He showed no understanding of the matter before him and it seems to me that his is only an obsession as regards certain remarks he made.

As regards the question posed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, I do think that it is a necessary step in accordance with the qualifications of Mr. Bolton because I think everybody knows that he is well qualified and that he is a B.Sc., (Second Class Honours) Leeds University;

On the 23rd November 1954, he was first appointed to the present post. What are the facts? The hon. senior member for St. Peter got mixed up with the real facts of the case. Mr. Bolton was on leave and is still on leave when he was made a member of Her Majesty's Overseas Research Branch. That alone shows his qualifications and capabilities. He was admitted to that research group; hence the position is this. Do you want Mr. Bolton back in Barbados or do you want him to go elsewhere? Will you conform to the requirements which are necessary to get a man of the Research Branch in Barbados or do you want them to carry his services elsewhere? Sir, he is not just a chemist in the like of Mr. Carmichael. Mr. Bolton is in the Research Branch and the other gentleman is in the forensic branch. One is an agricultural chemist and the other fellow deals in things of a forensic nature.
1.05 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of explanation. If the hon. member is making a comparison (*ASIDES*) ...

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

Mr. WALCOTT: When you are addressing the Chair, so many of them ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must be addressing the Chair always. Never ever must he be addressing another hon. member. That is a most important rule and one which must be followed by hon. members at all times. An hon. member is never addressing his colleagues.

Mr. WALCOTT: But I have the right to rise on a point of explanation; and when I rise, the Hon. Minister of Trade is going to tell you that I do not have the right

to do that. Must my right to rise on a point of explanation come from the Hon. Minister of Trade? I cannot subscribe to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is more interested in something which I have not heard than in making his point of explanation; and he is trying to make me become interested in something which I have not heard and to which I am not paying any attention. Let the hon. member go through with his point of explanation; let him not bring any asides to my notice. If the hon. member is interested in them, we will never have any order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: If the hon. member is speaking on a point of explanation I am not supposed to give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: At my discretion I will let the hon. member explain.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have not compared nor said that these two persons are Chemists and that they are one and the same thing; I said that they were two scientific Officers and I spoke of their qualifications. I have not compared one with the other as if they are in the same branch; they are two scientific officers, one is an M.Sc. and the other has Second Class Honours, as the hon. member has said.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am not wasting any time with the hon. member. I want to say that I am not here to defend any person; I have a job to do for this community and I am going to do it, irrespective of class, colour, creed or anything like that. There is no use injecting that element into the matter. I do not think that the hon. member who has just spoken -- I will finish at that; he will understand what I mean.

The trouble is that the Barbados Government has not a word to say as to what the Secretary of State for the Colonies has done in Mr. Bolton's case. Mr. Bolton has been admitted into this Research group; he is entitled to certain emoluments because of his membership there, and we are asked to reply to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Whether Mr. Bolton goes to Timbuctoo, Honolulu or anywhere else, if they want his services, they will have to pay for them. We have been asked if we want back the services of Mr. Bolton, and this Government and I say: "Yes, we want his services for the benefit of the community as a whole." He cannot get any real increase until 1965 and then it will take him another 10 to 15 years before he reaches his maximum. Some of us perhaps will be dead by that time; if we are not dead physically, we will be dead mentally. Some of us are riding for a fall - (Mr. WALCOTT: You had one already) I have been good enough to rise again.

Mr. Speaker, a Chemist is not a person who just walks along the street and you can pick him up; a Chemist's job is a specialised one, and when one is so good as to be able to obtain membership of this Research Branch, you will realise that there are emoluments which you have to pay. You cannot count these Specialist people as being in the rank and file of the Civil Service, and the advantage to be gained in having a good chemist in the island outweighs any cheap jibe. (Mr. WALCOTT: The Estimates have it). We employed him in our Estimates, but he has now gone up higher. This is not because we have asked for it; this gentleman has the necessary qualifications to become a member of the Research Group. If Mr. Carmichael claims similar treatment, then let him make application to go into the Research Group too; if he does that and we want his services, we will have to do the same thing as in Mr. Bolton's case. We do not send out people to this Research Branch; they qualify for it and if we want them back, then their services will have to be obtained.

We have already started to train people, but on the other hand, what guarantee have we got that when we send out people to be trained, we will get back their services? (Mr. WALCOTT: What guarantee have you got that you will retain this man's services?) Because of that, we are not saying that we are not going to spend money and allow people to be qualified. Until such time, we have to carry on. The hon. member ought to see this: We have a vast amount of work to do where the Scotland District is con-

cerned, and no cheap politics, cheap talk or know-all politician can do the work which is to be done up there. Some people are not capable of assisting in the work which is to be done, but then they will cast unfair criticism on other people's work. It is all right to talk to gullible people, but what we are considering now is the life-blood of the people; this is specialised work. This man has been given a part of his training as having been paid for by the Barbados Government. We want a proper Chemist and this man is good in the eyes of these people who know -- not in the eyes of those people who just talk. To say that the proposal here will upset the equilibrium of the Civil Service is a joke. We have the facts to prove that very often this post becomes vacant and it takes two or three years to get a Chemist here.

I repeat that you cannot walk the streets and pick up a proper Chemist, and now that we have one who is willing to return to Barbados, we are glad to have him return here. I am not disclosing any secret when I say that it was stated to us most emphatically that if we want the services of this man we must reply quickly or he goes to Nigeria. This man has been offered something, which is far better, in Nigeria, but I want to get on with my job. I hold no brief for anybody; we want to do something in the agricultural sphere and we must have a Chemist and a good one too. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that if Dr. Saint had been lost to us, no one knows what would have happened to the sugar production of this island.

1.15 p.m.

Sir John Saint has done yeoman service here; this man is much younger than Sir John Saint, but who can tell what he will contribute?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to draw the attention of hon. members of the House to Rule 29, pp. 6, which reads as follows:-

"While a member is speaking, all other members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions." It is a Rule which I should like hon. members to remind themselves of.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say anything more because I believe this House is convinced that we require the services of such a man. If it were not so, I would be the last man to bring this Resolution here. There are many points which hon. members made on which I really intended speaking at length, because I do not want it to be felt by members of the people of Barbados that we have not got the goods to reply. But some people want to get their names splattered all over the newspaper, "In the House" and all that. For the last five years the people of Barbados gave this Party something to work on, and that is to constitute the Government of this island; therefore we have not got to look for placards; we are not know-alls on every subject, so when the hon. member makes all these irresponsible statements to get publicity in the Press, we have not got to do that. Some people think that we do not talk enough and press our cases; we are doing things in a business-like and dignified manner.

I feel, Sir, that by the passing of this Resolution the people of this island will have a lot to be thankful for. I cannot say how long this officer will stay with us, but I hope that as he prefers to come back here he will stay for a considerable time. I must submit that if we were to lose the services of this particular officer at this time in our development, it would be a serious loss to Barbados taking into consideration the development scheme which we now have in the Scotland area and other schemes which the hon. member would be pleased to hear about when they come to light. I feel, Sir, that we have done ourselves and the people of Barbados a good thing when we decided to get the services of this officer although small incremental increases will have to be made for his services.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No.2 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, 1952, to make certain amendments to the Housing Act, 1955, and to provide for other incidental matters.

THE HOUSING (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1958

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as members will see from the Objects and Reasons, this Bill seeks to repeal the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, 1952 and transfer the functions of that body to the Housing Authority. It also seeks to amend the Housing Act, 1955 so as to widen the range of purposes for which the Housing Authority can make advances by way of loan and to give the Housing Authority the power to borrow money. The Housing Authority will in future administer these loans to Public Officers and Civil Servants.

The amount set aside in the Five Year Plan voted by this House for Public Officers' Housing has been inadequate to cope with the demand upon it. The outstanding applications at the Board amount to over \$2 million and we have already paid out the \$1/2 million allocated in the Five Year Plan. When I saw the position soon after I took up this Ministry, I knew we had to do something quickly in order to satisfy the public officers, because it was leading to a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. Some people who are not satisfied charged the Board with discrimination; there is a long queue and therefore we have to take steps to correct the situation.

As was told the House in the Budget Speech of the then Premier, Sir Grantley Adams, the Banks were approached and are willing to lend us that amount to satisfy these loans, but since the Housing Loans Board is not a body corporate, we will have to amend the Act if we want to take advantage of that offer.

In 1955 when the then Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, now Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, introduced this Public Housing Bill, he indicated that it would be better to bring the separate Authorities under one Authority, and that is the Housing Authority. We feel it is far better to have one body to deal with all loans. We feel fortified in this especially with the experience we have seen elsewhere. I notice that Trinidad is following us in that respect, because they had all these Authorities to deal with separate loans, but they are now bringing them under one Authority such as we are doing in Barbados.

I know that some members of the Opposition hinted that they were not in favour of bringing this Housing Loans Body under the control of the Housing Authority, but other places who have tried to operate the separate Authorities are now wedded to the idea of having one Authority, and I think members will agree with the principle of this Bill.

1.25 p.m.

I will ask the House to note that under Section 10 of the present Housing Loan Act, the Housing Authority can delegate any of its functions in connection with this fund to a Committee authorised under Section 10. It reads as follows:-

"The Authority may appoint a committee for any of the purposes of the Authority which in its opinion would be better regulated or managed by means of a Committee and may delegate any of its powers to a Committee with or without restrictions or conditions as it thinks fit."

Therefore, the House can see that the Housing Authority can in this respect appoint people who have experience of these loans and who know how to administer these loans and it can appoint representatives of the Civil Servants themselves to this Committee; so I think the Public Officers can rest assured that their interest will be looked after and with no delay by the Authority. In fact, we intend to have a member of the Civil Service Association on the Committee just as is done at present with the present body which administers this fund. We intend to have this Committee which would be set up by

this Authority. We think it would be a means of expediting these loans.

I would like to tell the House this so as to give an indication of the serious position regarding delays and inefficiency to cope with the demands of Public Officers. There were 1,126 applications received up to the end of July and we have only granted 290 loans. That means over 1,000 applicants have not been granted loans because there are no funds. All the funds have been used up.

This Bill is very pressing. There has been some delay. I had hoped to have it down here before but because of the pressure of the work in the Legal Department it has not got here before. I therefore hope the House will give it the urgent attention which it deserves.

The House will note that in this Bill provision is made for an increase in the interest rate charged. At present it is three percent and Government bears a subsidy of more than two and a half percent because the interest on current loans for this purpose is five percent, and then there is interest on the Sinking Fund; therefore we are bearing something like two and a half percent. The new loan is being raised at six percent and it will involve a subsidy of some \$27,000 a year at four and a half percent although we are raising the interest rate to four and a half percent.

The House will see from the Annual Estimates under Housing that the sum of \$20,000 has been provided for this. That is part of the interest to be raised by the Housing Authority on this loan but the whole subsidy will be \$27,000.

I do not think, Sir, that I need say much more on this Bill. I have given the facts to hon. members and if they require more information, I can give them later on. We are at present drafting the Rules pertaining to this Bill and under which these loans will be administered. They will be submitted to the Authority and will be laid on the Table of this House after this Bill has been passed.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill set out that the purpose of these amendments is primarily to permit the Public Officers who already have the authority to borrow money to be incorporated in the Housing Authority.

The Hon. Minister who introduced the Bill said that Trinidad is following us in this respect but Trinidad cannot be following us because we have not done anything like what Trinidad has done. Whether they are fooling you or not, what is not clear to me is your changing the authority from the Public Service body and putting it into the Housing Authority. It does not mean that you are going to build more houses. What the Hon. Minister says - and this is the financial part of the matter - is that the bankers will allow the Housing Authority to borrow money but the Public Officers' body cannot borrow. I do not know very much about banking, but these Ministers have the idea that if a Bank Manager tells them that something has to be done, all that they have to do is to come to the Legislature with it and members in here have no right to say anything on the matter. God forbid the day that I would not be able to say anything on anything which comes to this Chamber. As long as it is something which has been brought here to get the approval of this Chamber, whether or not it be an opinion given by an expert, so long as I have an opinion to express, I will express it; otherwise, it means that University graduates will be running Legislatures.

The Hon. Minister has not said that the Housing Authority can get money easier than the Public Officers' body. As I understand it, both of these authorities can borrow money.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not say that one body would find it easier or more difficult. I said that the Public Officers have no authority under the Act to borrow money.

Mr. WALCOTT: I accept that. Because the Public Officers cannot borrow money, you are shifting it to the Housing Authority which can borrow money. Let us examine this. If the Housing Authority can borrow money, against what is it going to borrow money? Is the Government giving the guarantee or the Housing Authority? The Housing Authority is a body established by Government; therefore, in the net result the Government is the guarantor. 1.35 p.m.

If that is so, it is a question of changing from one coffer to the other. If the Government is to carry out the loans which they have to make, then it will take a long time to carry out those loans. What I am saying is this; the Government seem to have found themselves in the position that they want an amount of money adequately to meet the Housing Authority loans, which will be one section, and they will give the Housing Authority the right to borrow money; but they forget that the Housing Authority is already committed to borrowing money for other people. If you say that you have not got enough money for housing public servants, do you believe that the Housing Authority will get money from the banks? If the Government is not putting its money into the banks, do you think that the banks will give the Housing Authority money, if they find that the Government has not gone up to the amount of money for Housing loans? The other people will suffer if we pay money over to the Housing Authority. The Housing Authority can ask for loans for other people. When we make this change, well, as far as I am concerned, it does not matter where you place this authority. If you are telling Civil Servants that you will put money into the hands of the Housing Authority, I am asking: what is the extent to which the Housing Authority will get loans in Barbados?

The Housing Authority also controls the Labour Welfare Fund, but the Agricultural workers are only going to get loans in so far as the money is coming from the Labour Welfare Fund. The Labour Welfare Authority, as it is at present constituted, provides funds for workers so that they can get loans, but the Housing Authority is the Authority which has to deal with them. Apart from that, you have what is known as a general fund for people who are other than agricultural workers. What is worrying me is this; if you give the Housing Authority the right to borrow money for public servants, to what extent is it going to work against general loans for the public as a whole? It is no point telling a mason or a carpenter that he can borrow money from the Housing Authority. The Civil Servants are now about 5,000 persons in number as compared with other people running into the vicinity of about 60,000. I do not like to make people believe that they can get money when they cannot get it. It is not a matter of shifting from one authority to another; it is purely a matter of administration. If it is much easier to administer these loans in this way, then you do it; but now the Housing Authority cannot get enough money to lend to people to whom they have the authority to lend. There is not enough money which the Housing Authority has the authority to lend at present.

I have not got any Newspaper, nor do I go into a Newspaper Office to write anything. I am the last person whom you could accuse of talking for any Press. I am talking for the House and the public to know this; the Labour Welfare Fund is controlled by the Housing Authority. It is a known fact that people say that they cannot get any money from this Department. When you go over to the Housing Authority, you are only changing over from one place to the other. You are going to get people feeling that the Housing Authority is getting money to lend to Civil Servants. I would like to say that where a man can put a mortgage on his house, you should help the other fellow who cannot get any help; and the man who can get a mortgage on his house is compared with another fellow who has not got any help. Those who represent rural constituencies will find that their constituents will be coming to them and telling them that they cannot get any loans from the Housing Authority, whereas the Housing Authority is making loans to people who are in better circumstances than those in which other people are. I am not one of those people who believe that you should have eight or nine authorities to do the same thing, but I am satisfied in my mind that there would be no danger what-

soever in having Civil Servants in one category by themselves in this respect: they have conditions of employment within the Civil Service which are different from the conditions of employment of anybody else.

I would like to see people treated in such a way that there will not be any competition. If the Housing Authority seeks a loan from a Bank, would it be a matter of telling the Bank that you are borrowing this money to make a loan to a Civil Servant or would it be a matter that the Housing Authority is borrowing under the Act, whether it was a loan for a Civil Servant or for anybody else? The most important thing is that the Housing Authority cannot really institute the borrowing of money unless the Government approves of it, because it has to carry out the policy of the Government. If you know that you cannot guarantee any more than a certain amount it does not matter whether you borrow it from outside, or whether you have put it into the Treasury. The net result is that if the money is not repaid by the persons who borrow it or if anything takes place, it is the Government which has to go to the Bank. You cannot go to the Housing Authority and say that it has to pay the money; you have to know to what limit or extent you propose to go with these Housing loans.

1.45 p.m.

To what limit are you going to have these Housing Loans? You cannot put the baby in the lap of the Housing Authority because they cannot create policy in the financial sense. In other words, how much money are they going to borrow and in whose names? Can anyone ask for a loan of so many million dollars against the Government of this country without the Government having any knowledge of it? The Minister will have to tell us what is the policy of the Housing Loans and how far he intends to go for the Civil Servants for general loans, because it is a fact that the fringe has only been barely touched. I hope that the Labour Welfare Funds will not be mutilated.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Housing Authority should be asked to borrow money for its general schemes and that you should not take up the Labour Welfare money and use it in this respect. I represent a rural constituency, and agricultural workers come to me and I have to go to the Department and make some requests for loans. They do not always want to build a house, but they ask for the loan on the basis that they have put something into the Fund. If you cannot provide for those people who want to borrow it, you should not put the funds into the general Housing Schemes, because Government owes it to the population anyhow, and your general housing policy should come out of the Treasury. What you have in the Five Year Plan cannot reach the requirements. What, then, is your changed policy? Is the Minister suggesting that the Housing Authority will have the right to borrow money, irrespective of amount, without Government's knowledge? You cannot do it that way; you have to see that they borrow money within the scope of the Act. I sympathise with the Public Service, but I think the Minister made a statement just now in which he said that people come to him, and it is very embarrassing that they cannot get these loans. Government should be prepared to make another statement letting the public know how much money they can make available. You cannot work on the hypothesis that every member of the Civil Service wants a loan, because some of them have houses already, and some are in income groups that would not permit them to have a loan; so, Mr. Speaker, though the loan is available, some people are not in the position to get a loan, and therefore we should know what are the basic requirements.

The Minister did not say what could be estimated as the figure; but if you have a revolving fund, then your general housing policy can be streamlined. I say that because if the Housing Authority is not going to set up a Committee, the hon. member should repeal the Act because it says "the Authority shall consist of not more than seven persons to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive of whom one shall be appointed Chairman, and such persons shall hold office for a period of five years." If you are going to extend the Authority now, you must give room for more membership. I do not know how many members there will be on the Board now, and I do not think it would be right to set up a sub-Committee to deal with Public Service Housing, and therefore you will have to put at least another member on the Board. On a Board of that nature, there is

only one trade unionist among its seven members, and I want to say to the Minister that that is not adequate representation when you take the number of workers involved; there should be greater representation by the people who represent the workers.

The Labour Welfare Fund is one of the biggest Funds, and the fact that \$2 million of it has been shunted into the Hospital means that housing has been depleted by that amount, and I think that a statement of policy should be made. I am not so happy, Mr. Speaker, that the financial policy is going to be much better for housing as housing - that is to say, Civil Servants housing, general housing and Labour Welfare Housing - because you are putting them under one Authority and giving it authority to borrow money. All I can say from this, Mr. Speaker, is that the Civil Servants will have the opportunity of better loans being granted to them than they can now get under the present system. What we should like to know from the Government is to what extent will they permit the Housing Authority to borrow money and to what extent would Government guarantee it, because in the final analysis, Government should give it. If there are now seven members on the Board, it means that the number will have to be increased, because the Act says that the Authority should consist of not more than seven members, and if you are going to add more people you will have to amend the Act so that you can have eight or nine members. I should like to know, therefore, what is the policy of the Board as far as finance is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in favour with the principle of this Bill, especially when one considers the frustration and disappointment which is being experienced by hundreds of Civil Servants who have applied for loans and whose applications have not yet been considered. When I say that, I refer mainly to the Public Officers in the lower bracket who, too, are included in this Public Officers Housing Scheme. The Minister has told us that there are about 1,000 applications which have not been considered; that is not good enough. It is through that state of affairs, as I understand it, that this Bill is being brought down whereby the administration of the Public Officers loans and the general housing loans will be consolidated into one Department.

1.55 p.m.

This is a good thing and there is no point in having one set of people administering Public Officers Housing Loans and another Authority, which is really the better Authority, doing a similar thing to another set of people. This is a change which would have to take place sooner or later. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, it is not a question of incorporating two bodies; it is a question of financing the Public Officers housing scheme. In attempting to finance the scheme, the new authority - the Housing Authority - will have the power under Clause 2 (1) and (2) from time to time with the approval of the Legislature to borrow money upon such terms as may be approved by the Legislature or for any purpose of the Authority. That can only be done provided the Government guarantees the repayment of these loans.

The whole question really hinges on the financing of this scheme. I will throw this out to the Hon. Minister. I wonder if he has considered the question as to whether or not the time has come for attaching some of the Stabilization Fund for this purpose. Speaking from memory, about eleven million dollars are lying idle under the Stabilization Fund. The question is whether some of that money can be borrowed for this purpose and instead of the Stabilization Fund deriving interest at the rate of 1% or 1 1/2%, whether Government can borrow two million dollars from that Fund at 4%. It would be more beneficial and the money will be quite secure because the Government has guaranteed the payment of these loans. There is no point in allowing the Stabilization Fund to be built up from year to year and having eleven million dollars lying idle while hundreds of Civil Servants and hundreds of other people are applying for money for this purpose and cannot get it.

It is alright to say that the Stabilization Fund is there for a rainy day but since we have been putting it up, a hurricane has struck the island and very little of it was

needed. You will need it probably after this generation has died out; therefore, why leave eleven million dollars lying idle and getting interest at the rate of only 1% or 1 1/2% and you are saying that you have no money to give out these loans? Why cannot you attach the Stabilisation Fund?

If you want to do something, take this matter up with the Colonial Office and see if this money cannot be loaned out for housing purposes. I see no point in allowing this money to remain lying idle. I do know that a lot of owners of sugar factories and plantations feel that this money should be set aside for a rainy day and should not be touched, but I am saying that a rainy day has already come and they had no reason to touch it; therefore, I can see no harm in your going through the regular channels and advancing a loan from this Fund to the Housing Authority to set up a fund for this purpose. The money will still belong to the Stabilisation Fund and instead of 1% or 1 1/2% accruing to this Fund, the Government will be paying 4%. The Fund will benefit and the workers of this country, including the Civil Servants, will benefit.

Sir, I can make out a better case than that. I just mentioned that by the way. As I have said, I know that as soon as you talk of touching the Stabilisation Fund the sugar Factory owners and plantation owners will want to take off your head; but you can do that, or you can reduce the rate of levy towards the Stabilisation Fund and put the balance towards the Housing Fund. Instead of your levy of \$4.80 on a ton of sugar for this purpose, you can reduce it to, say, \$2.00 a ton and release some more towards building up the Labour Welfare Fund. No matter what you call it, whether it be Labour Welfare Fund, Rehabilitation Fund or Price Stabilisation Fund, it is one of those funds which have accrued by the sweat and tears of the agricultural workers. The fact remains that money is built up and is lying idle for years and it is money which the factory owners and plantations do not need. It is money which is put there just for a rainy day. As far as the Rehabilitation Fund is set aside, as your Honour knows, that money is spent from year to year in the rehabilitation of factories.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is going a bit too far now.

Mr. TALMA: I am stressing that the Government should consider using part of the Stabilisation Fund for making these loans and do not make it appear as if no money is here which can be used for this purpose. There is a lot of money here and that is the reason why we did not get more help from the British Government when "Janet" struck. We can find the money. There are many reserve funds lying idle which can be tapped to finance housing schemes. The Civil Servants represent the backbone of workers of this country and they are people who for the greater part work and pay rent all the days of their lives. We have not yet really attempted to solve the problem for them. The amount of \$500,000 which was earmarked for them was just a drop in the ocean. That sum was utilised in helping a few cases and those cases were the people at the top - those who administer this loan. What about the other thousand who have put their applications with no result?

Sir, I am saying that the Government is acting wisely in bringing down a Bill of this sort but they have to get it from wherever they can get it.
2.05 p.m.

I think the time has come when the Government should acquire various parcels of land in proper and up-to-date districts and develop housing schemes. It is not good enough just to lend Civil Servants money; when the Government acquires parcels of land in various residential areas, that will be a means of assisting Civil Servants. I think that it is one of the conditions of making these loans that the land should be owned in the first place; a Civil Servant must buy the land before he starts to build on it. I am suggesting, therefore, that the Government should acquire plots of land in these various districts, lease them at a peppercorn rent and facilitate the scheme instead of having these exorbitant prices being paid by

Civil Servants for parcels of land or for houseplots in the various areas. This is a good Bill and I do hope that money will be found for the financing of these schemes.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the short time that I have been a member of this Chamber, I have been trying to get myself acquainted with the various Departments of Government in order to see if I could understand some of the difficulties under which they may be labouring. For the past few weeks, I have been paying some attention to the working of the Housing Authority, and I think that every politician who has constituents will know that at some time or other, they will come to him and ask him something about these housing loans. Therefore, I would like to say that this matter has certainly excited my attention and I believe that it is a matter of quite a big magnitude. With reference to this matter, I would like to know if there is any criticism as to the principle of this particular piece of legislation here today. I am referring, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I may say -

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have been following the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I must say that on this particular occasion, I found it very difficult to understand the points of his argument. I was not sure if the hon. member was disagreeing with this piece of legislation, or if he was saying that the authorities were more than one or that the administration would not be as efficient as it should be, if you bring everything under one Authority. I can easily imagine that if the Government felt that it would be more efficient to have the Housing Authority, as it is now constituted under the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act, also becoming a corporate body, it is quite easy for the Government to make two corporate bodies, if they want to do so. I consider that the reason for this fusion of the two bodies would be for the purpose of carrying out administrative arrangements. That is not casting any aspersion on the administration of either of the two bodies. I think that they are working quite well but under two bodies you will not get greater efficiency.

I would like to say that I do not agree with, and I deplore the remarks of the senior member for Christ Church, when he said that the only people who have got those loans are those who had easy access to the present officers. I think that these officers are doing the job as well as they can in the circumstances, and I do not think that they are practising any discrimination.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I did not say that people had access to these officers; I did mention the word "access", but I did not say that they had access to these officers.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Well, Sir, apparently, they did not have any access to the officers; but they just had access. Getting down to the point, I think it should be stressed - and I believe that this is a challenge to the politicians: some of the difficulties experienced by the present Housing Board at the moment have been engendered by certain mischievous and malicious politicians who have been telling people not to repay any money to the Housing Authority, because it is the Government's money and it has not got to be paid back. (Mr. WALCOTT: What is a politician?) One of them whom I have in mind is a Conservative politician who has not got back in the House, and another one is one whom I shall not attempt to mention at the moment. (Mr. WALCOTT: You must say whom you mean.) He is not in the House at the moment, if it worries the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

If it happens that a certain fund is set up for the assistance of people, whether it be sugar workers, general workers or Civil Servants, and there is a purpose attached to that fund, there are certain references which are given to the Board which has to administer the fund, and you would expect that it would be administered according to the references which have been given to the Board. If it is a question of getting money to repair or

renovate your house, you get a loan on the principle that there is going to be the repayment of that loan. The interest which the Housing Authority sets for the repayment of loans is lower than what people would get at the Bank. The interest is at the rate of 3% and I understand that it will now be 4 1/2%, but still it is better than what you can get elsewhere. I should like to say that the Authorities are extremely lenient, and I would say dangerously lenient, with some of the people who are just refusing to repay their loans. We are hoping that this fund will be a revolving fund. Let hon. members and other people who are interested in the welfare of the people tell them that when they borrow money, they have to repay it on the terms on which they should repay it and if they find that it is difficult to repay their loans, let them tell the Housing Authority that they cannot repay them; but let them not borrow and not repay one cent in five years, as I know has happened. If people make an offer to repay the money, let them know that not only will they be helping themselves, but they will also be helping their brothers who have not had any loans as yet. I think that responsible people should take their responsibilities seriously and let their constituents know that when they refuse to repay their loans, as they are doing now, they are destroying the same bridge over which they have passed.

2.15 p.m.

They are breaking the Bank if they do not keep on paying in some slight way to make the Fund revolve. It is an extremely serious matter and I believe that other responsible members of this Chamber will take it seriously. I am getting in contact with those people in my constituency who I believe have been a bit lax and do not understand the purpose of this loan. Even if you increase the efficiency of the Board by merging the two bodies, there still remains the fact that if the people do not understand the principle under which they are being helped, the efficiency can be destroyed, and if the loans are not repaid at intervals, the Bank could be broken and the loans not become revolving, and they would still be destroying the purpose of this Act which is made to help people in general.

I was about to make a point when my colleague was in the Chair, but I think I can do it now; and although it is slightly beyond the principle of the second reading speech, I again make the appeal which I know my colleague has been making for a little additional attention to be given to the housing situation in St. Joseph.

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

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone Clause 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to postpone Clause 2, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for Chattel Houses built from Labour Welfare Funds and now vested in the Executive Committee, to be vested in the Housing Authority.

HOUSING (HURRICANE CHATTEL HOUSES) VESTING ACT, 1958.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to vest the Prefab houses in the Housing Authority. The Housing Authority was administering the collection of rents and instalments and seeing after these houses soon after their completion two years ago, and I think the House will agree that they are the rightful people to continue ad-

ministering and looking after these houses. This Bill is to vest these prefabs in the Authority so as to give them power to look after them.

As members know, most of these prefabs are being sold to the occupiers under hire purchase agreements, and others are being rented to old age pensioners. There are some 717 houses on hire purchase agreement, and 73 are being rented at very cheap rates to old age pensioners who pay 25 cents a week. The average cost of these prefabs is \$1,053; there are three types; 16' by 9', 20' by 9' and 24' by 9' and the subsidy which the occupiers enjoy is over \$400. A 16' by 9' for example costs \$981, and over a period of years, it will cost the owner \$517; a 20' by 9' costs \$1,151 to construct and it will cost the owner \$642; and a 24' by 9' will cost the owner \$700. These subsidies were arrived at after we struck the average cost of repaired houses after "Janet". As you know, Sir, we gave a certain amount free, so that everybody who was affected by the hurricane enjoys a subsidy of one kind or another, but we thought it only fair and equitable that those people who lost their homes during the hurricane should enjoy a similar subsidy. I think the House will agree that these are very reasonable repayments. The House will note that the Bill makes provision after taking certain administrative expenses for repayment of half the funds to the Labour Welfare Fund and the other half to the Housing Authority; so the Housing Authority will get back what they put into these houses.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have no general objection but I want to know how you arrive at 50% and not 60% or 70%. When the hurricane business was done, it was not done by a Resolution in the ordinary way, but you took up Labour Welfare money.

2.25 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of order. I would just like to ask the hon. member this question. I heard him mention something about 50%. What does he mean?

Mr. WALCOTT: The Bill says that 50% of this money shall be paid back to the Labour Welfare Fund; therefore, you must know on what basis you have arrived at that. I asked that question to know how you arrived at that percentage. In a general way, it is normal that the people should get back their money.

I would like to say here in passing that the hon. junior member for St. Philip said as regards paying back money to the Labour Welfare Fund that it is money belonging to the Labour Welfare Fund and the people do not pay it back. That has been said for a long time before he came into this House and I have been informed that one of his strongest supporters was an advocate of not paying back money to the Labour Welfare Fund. You know, Sir, that there is a saying: "If the devil brings it, the Lord sent it."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member said inadvertently, the hon. junior member for St. Philip. I do not know if he meant the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would not say that the hon. member is an advocate of that today. I only said that because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that he has made that statement of "no paying back" on the basis that it is to be put in a revolving fund.

When we go into Committee, the Hon. Minister can tell this Committee on what basis is this 50% arrived at as I am very worried about it. I want to know if the Labour Welfare Fund is responsible for administration expenses. A property at Country Road has been bought out of this fund. I am a very serious protector of the Labour Welfare Fund and I want to see that we get the maximum advantage out of that fund.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, half of the money advanced to these people was from the Labour Welfare Fund; therefore, we arrived at 50% on that basis.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.30 p.m., the sitting of this House is suspended until 3. o'clock p.m. 2.30 p.m.

On re-assembling,
HOUSE RESUMES ON BILL TO PROVIDE FOR CHATTEL HOUSES BUILT FROM LABOUR WELFARE FUNDS

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

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

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 9 were called separately and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE TO REVERT TO ITEM NO. 2.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to revert to Item No. 2. The House was in Committee on this Bill on the last occasion.

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

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE ON BILL TO REPEAL THE PUBLIC OFFICERS' HOUSING LOAN ACT, 1952.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

3.10 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay Papers.

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

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am commanded to lay The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I am also asking leave to give notice of a Resolution.

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

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations, 1958."

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order NO. 4 - To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island. I understand that the Resolutions have not yet been printed.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 16 ORDER."

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1958".

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture be allowed to take charge of this Order.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, This Order seeks to rectify certain anomalies at the Markets and to create new posts for the extension of the service. Hon. members will observe that certain changes have been made as regards the post of Attendant and Cleaner. That post carried two titles and now that we have made a forward step - we are attempting to establish markets all over the Island - we are trying to call this particular person by a different name, the name of "Keeper", and he will not be required to do the cleaning. We will have to give other people the work of cleaning. That is one step forward.

Another step which we have taken is in regard to the substitution of the post of Senior Supervisor for that of Meat Inspector. This Officer will be a qualified Meat Inspector who will be required to carry out the duties of Meat Inspection. All these are changes which we are making, and we hope to have the new market open to the general public within another fifteen days. It is true that this market poses a big problem to the Government, but those of us who are really strong enough to teach the people what they should do and not follow what the people want to do - that is the reason why the Government exists - to teach the people what is the right thing to do.

In developing markets all over the Island, we are trying to help the grower and to give the consumer a specified place where he or she might purchase the things which he or she wants to purchase. I do not want to say anything more on this question, because the question of the markets has already been debated and we are now waiting for this bit of legislation so as to have the new market opened. This is one of the things which will pave the way for the proper staffing of the markets as I have said, we hope to open the Fairchild Street market in another fifteen days.

There is also a market at Six Roads, St. Philip, which we hope to open during the next month. We are also making changes at the other markets throughout the Island. At the Cheapside market, we are raising the senior Supervisor and we are giving him the status of Meat Inspector and he goes up to a higher grade - I beg your pardon, Sir, we are changing the Meat Inspector to Senior Supervisor and at the Bay Street Market, which we hope to establish, we will have a Keeper there and also an Assistant Keeper. At Oistins, the Post of Attendant and Cleaner is to be changed to the Post of Keeper and he, too, will be getting a higher salary.

As hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, those are the main changes in the staff employed at these markets. They are as follows:-

(a) The substitution of the post of Senior Supervisor for that of Meat Inspector. This Officer will be a qualified Meat Inspector who will also be required to carry out meat inspection duties; (b) The substitution of the post of Keeper for that of Attendant and Cleaner since experience has indicated that it has not been possible to combine successfully in one post the duties of supervising and cleaning and (c) The replacement of the temporary post of Clerk of the Bridgetown Fish Market by that of Keeper.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the proposals which are set out here. I know that the Staff

which is proposed for the new markets will be supplemented by a number of Unestablished Staff for which provision has already been made and included in the current Estimates. I merely want to have an assurance from the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, and it is this: in all these rural markets - I refer specifically to the Oistin Market - you have had an Attendant and Cleaner and we now propose to make him Keeper at a salary of \$912 - 1,248 which is the regular scheme.
3.20 p.m.

Now this Attendant and Cleaner appears to have dual duties; it is now suggested by the Minister that it was cumbersome to work. I am trying to make what the Minister said clear. You need a Keeper and apart from him you need cleaners who belong to the unestablished staff; in other words, the duties of Cleaner and Keeper cannot be vested in one and the same person; the Keeper will be in charge of the market, but you cannot expect the Keeper to look after the cleaning of the market. I want to be satisfied that what I am saying is correct: so, if I am wrong, the Minister can stop me. I want the assurance that the cleaners of these rural markets will not be overlooked, but would be put on a proper basis. They are referred to quite rightly here as being members of the unestablished staff, and I should like the Minister to explain how many cleaners there are at these rural markets, and in the case of Oistins, how many men and women are appointed there on the unestablished staff as cleaners. Of course, what applies to Oistins would naturally apply in most cases to the other markets, and I should like to know what wages are paid to these cleaners and receive the Minister's assurance that they will be put on a proper footing and receive some sort of consideration as other people in the Government Service in this Island have received, because I happen to know that there is a certain amount of discontent in that people who do the actual work are sometimes overlooked at these markets.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, there is only one cleaner at the Oistins market and there will be one Keeper; there will be one Keeper and one cleaner at the Six Roads market; one Keeper and two Cleaners at the Speightstown market and one Keeper and two Cleaners at the Bay Street market. I think that provision has been made for that in the 1958-59 Estimates and I do not think they carry more than one person. In the past, the Attendant was also Cleaner, but today we are doing away with that as it only only proposed to have one Cleaner.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 13 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with Order No. 13 as the next Order of the day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

AMENDMENTS BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL re BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TOURIST BOARD

Hon. M. E. COX: This amendment is very simple. In Section 17 of the Bill, it is proposed to delete the word "them" and insert the word "it".

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL re BILL TO AMEND THE TRADE ACT, 1910.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask leave to deal with another small amendment from the Other Place to the Trade Act, 1910.

You will remember that the definition of "Tourists" in that Bill excluded Air-line personnel, and it is felt that airline personnel and students when on holiday in the island should not be regarded as airline personnel, but as ordinary visitors to the island; so to make it clear, the amendment put in by the Other Place reads as follows: "or airline or ship personnel unless such personnel are on holiday within the island."

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with an amendment as outlined to the House, and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government's business, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 2nd September, 1958.

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

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

3.30 p.m.