

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11th February, 1958.

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

PRESENT

Hon. M.E. COX (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R.G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T.O. BRYAN; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER; His Honour Mr. V.B. VAUGHAN, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mrs. E.E. BOURNE; Mr. C.B. SEARLES; Mr. L. ST. A. THORNE; Mr. H.A. DOWDING, M.B.E.;

Prayers were read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that Mr. SPEAKER will be absent until later in this Sitting.

I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last Meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report from the Accountant General for the month ended 30th November, 1957

PAPERS LAID

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Report of the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department for the year 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$41,273 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-48, No. 67 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also Resolution to place the sum of \$1,531 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No. 69 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No. 68, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of certain areas of land for the purpose of providing a quarry site in connection with the construction of a Deep Water Harbour.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next Meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to give notice of my intention to move the passing of the following Addresses to His Excellency the Governor.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly wish to draw to Your Excellency's attention the inadequacy of the pension at present paid by Government to Old People and the hardships they suffer from rising food prices.

2.. The House accept the principle that care for the Aged should be among the first charges upon this Island's Revenue and are therefore willing to make generous provision for a substantial increase in Old Age Pensions, if Your Excellency were to submit any proposals for their consideration.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

1.. The House deem it appropriate that the medium of Broadcasting should be placed at the disposal of the several Political Parties and Candidates for the duration of the Current Federal Election Campaign.

2.. The House desire to remind Your Excellency that it is the privilege of Government to use a daily-hour period in the time schedules of Barbados Rediffusion Limited.

3.. The House would further remind Your Excellency that the various weekly Government Broadcasts command a listening range of, roughly, eighty thousand persons, a number equal to four-fifths of the Island's registered voters.

4.. Accordingly, the House request that Your Excellency be graciously pleased to instruct Barbados Radio Limited to place equal facilities at the disposal of all the Parties and candidates who may wish to use that medium for the information and enlightenment of the electorate in Federal matters.

Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have done in the past, I do again. I shall advise the Governor to take no notice whatever of that Address. It is not an Address of the sort that with our Constitutional Development should be addressed to His Excellency, and if the hon. member wants an answer, I can give him now. This Government has no intention of making use of the Radio except for the purpose of informing the people of the meaning of Federation.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Lord Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of St. George to sell certain lands, part of the Glebe, St. George to the Executive Committee to be used as the site for a Post Office.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Sir Grantley Adams, seconded by Hon. M.E. COX, the Bill to continue various expiring laws was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. R.G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M.E. COX, the Bill to authorise the Lord Bishop of Barbados and Rector of St. George to sell certain portions of land part of the Glebe, St. George, to the Executive Committee, was read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. senior member for St. Michael: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants or sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that 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.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957 - 58, No. 65.

Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is for the sum of \$82,840 to supplement the Estimates, 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1957-58 No. 65.

As hon. members will see from the Resolution and the notes to it, there is a proposal to increase the allowance to Peasant Agricultural Instructors in charge of District Agricultural Stations by \$1,440. There is also a sum of \$80,000 required to meet refunds which might have to be made in respect of Income Tax during the remainder of the present financial year. There are also supplementaries to two items under Head XXXII - Highways and Transport. In the first case, there is an increase by \$400 for Stationery and, in the second case, the sum of \$1,000 is to supplement Incidentals. I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$82,840 do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, when you look at Head XXX - Inland Revenue, Item 19, Refunds of Income Tax and Death Duties, I think hon. members of this Committee

are entitled to know what is the present position with regard to the income tax deductions. This is February, 1958, and those of us whose income was deducted from the 1st April, 1957 would really like to know something about it. What is the Government's position? What is the Inland Revenue because of these deductions under the P.A.Y.E. system for the last eight months of last year as compared with the income that would have been collected on the basis of ordinary Income Tax returns? Those of us who do not owe the Inland Revenue Department any money would like to know how this bears relation to the original position.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I have been making enquiry from the Hon. Minister in charge relative to the first item of this Resolution, under Head XXI, in connection with the allowance made to Peasant Agricultural Instructors. I do not know when the Allowance was increased - it has gone from my mind entirely - therefore I would like to know something more with respect to this matter. How comes it that we have to pay these Peasant Agricultural Instructors an increase in allowance? Have we been committed to this increase already? I think that may have been consequent upon something done about a year ago, but I just cannot remember anything about it.

Pertinent to what my hon. colleague said, I do not think that the Government would be in a position at this time of the year to answer his question because we have to get in our returns up to the end of February this year, and many of us would not know yet whether we have paid in too much or just enough; therefore, I would not expect an answer to that until sometime after February. (Mr. WALCOTT: You do not know what you paid already?) I know that, but I do not think the Government would be in a position to answer what my hon. colleague is asking, because the Commissioner for Inland Revenue would have to make the deductions at this time of the year. Because of that, I am not interested in that at the moment. Let me say that I am interested to find out the Government's position, but the mere fact that a member may not owe or any member of the public may not owe, does not mean that I do not have any interest in that.

The interest is only on the part of such people who are in the position which the hon. member has instanced. I hope I have not misquoted my colleague when he was on his feet; I think he may have heard me say that other people who were not in arrears may be interested in the matter. As far as these peasant Agricultural Instructors are concerned, I should like to know how this increased allowance came about. I do not remember if it is something consequential.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am asking the hon. member to repeat what he said at first. On this side of the House, we heard only the first portion of the hon. member's speech, and I am asking him to repeat what he said at first.

Mr. HUSBANDS: As far as this increased allowance to be paid to the Peasant Agricultural Instructors is concerned, I would like to know how this increased allowance came about. That is the first point. I do not remember at the moment how it came about, and therefore, I cannot be expected to vote money when an increase in the allowance is to be made good and do not know why it is being made good.

Mr. WALCOTT: My colleague seeks to answer my question, but unfortunately, he is not in a position to answer it I asked about the amount of money which has been deducted. That is nothing which the Government cannot answer. I asked how it compares with the previous year. Moreover, if my colleague knows what he is talking about, he should know that in preparing the Estimates for next year, that is the sort of information on which they will have to work. You want to know how much your Income Tax deductions have yielded. It is, therefore, not a question which the Government cannot answer, unless the hon. member is a member of the Government and has, vouchsafed to him, information which we do not have.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I never attempted to answer anything; I said I was of the opinion that the Government could not give the information at this stage as to what

the position was with regard to Income Tax. The returns are to be sent in before the 28th February -- I think I am right -- and we do not know if we have paid too much or if we have paid just enough. I do not have to be a member of the Government to know that; any member of the community would know it. I do not know why my colleague has said that the Government could answer that question.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is that the anomalies Committee made certain recommendations and this is one of them which we have accepted. They have increased the maximum to the Chief Agricultural Extension Officer, the Officers of the Central Livestock Station and others and we have accepted the recommendations.

As regards the second point, what the hon. member has asked is not relevant. I have no intention, even if I had the information, of giving it. You cannot possibly tell with the P.A.Y.E. system, whether your deductions are too much or too little. We have followed the Canadian P.A.Y.E. system, if it can be said that we have followed one system more than the other. There are some instances in which you credit Income Tax for the following year. Except a man has a regular salary and happens not to take on any Income Tax or does not have another child going to school, you cannot be accurate as regards deductions. You deduct what you have to deduct as the result of the returns. It may turn out that at the end of twelve months you have deducted too little or too much, but that is not relevant at this stage. Even if we had the amount to compare with what we collected this year or last year, what would it matter?

Mr. WALCOTT: I accept the fact that the information is not there, but the hon. member who has just sat down must bear in mind that when questions are asked in here, they are not asked about his personal affairs. When the Hon. Premier said that even if he had the information, he would not give it, he can go on repeating that sort of thing. People outside of this Chamber know and read these things. You are asking for money from the Treasury to make up for these deductions and how in the name of patience can you say that what I ask is irrelevant to what you are requiring? This is what the Note says: "As the provision under this vote has been fully committed to pay refunds of Income Tax and Death Duties, supplementary provision of \$80,000 is required to meet any further refunds which might have to be made during the remainder of the current financial year."

How can any man come in here and tell us that the question which I asked as to how much money you have received last year on the basis of the deduction of people's income is irrelevant? How does it become irrelevant? If he thinks that he is talking to people who are fools, or who are his servants, then he could use that remark; that is the sort of thing which he can keep for my colleague, but not for me. I will be on my feet every time, and he will have to remain here with his sick self until morning, if he is coming here with these uncouth answers. He will find me on my feet each time if he is going to answer in that way. I have come in here out of the desire of the people of St. Peter who have sent me here, not on his desire; and when I ask a question, I ask it on behalf of the Income Tax payers. I am asking something in the interest of the public; therefore, it is not a question of the Hon. Premier saying that even if he had the information he would not give it, because the question is irrelevant.

If he says he does not have the information, then he cannot give it; but he should not say that even if he had it he would not give it because it is irrelevant. I am not asking him any favours, and I want to make it quite clear that when questions are asked in Parliament, we are not asking favours. This is the way he spends public money, and that is why I am always talking about dictatorship. He thinks this colony is something he has bought at an auction sale and can dispose of it as he likes. This would not happen in the Upper Chamber, nor would the Secretary of State do it to our colony; but he comes here with this uncouth behaviour telling people that even if he had the information, he would not answer. If he has reached that stage, let him go out of Parliament; but he cannot come here and tell us that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1957 - 58, No. 67.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$10,500. The Addendum makes it quite clear what it is all about. There is going to be a Festival of Arts, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services has already given some indication of what we are supposed to do. The Addendum is extremely full and there is nothing I can say that would give hon. members any more information than is obtained in the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has a flavour of Federation in it. Earlier we heard a statement made by the Premier that no time would be used on Rediffusion. If we are spending all this money for the pageant in which we are going to take part, then I would like to know how anyone can reasonably say that you cannot allow people to know by radio what Federation is all about. We are spending this \$10,000; Nomination Day is going to be 28th February, and up to now we do not know what we have to do if we are interested. We do not know who are the Officers or where you have to get your papers, and it is only about seventeen days from today, because the affairs of this island have been placed into the hands of a dictator, who is like Jimenez, and who is now deciding how you should vote; that is, if you want to vote "yes", you go to the "yes" box, and if you want to vote "no", you go to the "no" box.

As far as the arrangements for sending these people abroad to the Festival of Arts are concerned, our contribution to the overseas affair is \$15,000. You say you are going to send thirty or forty people to Trinidad and that you will pay their passages - I do not know by what and give them subsistence allowance. What type of subsistence allowance can you pay, and what passages can you get for thirty to forty people for \$15,000? Then you are going to spend \$10,000 on the local Pageant. Why is it so necessary for you to spend as much money on the local Pageant as you are spending in sending thirty or forty people to Trinidad and also giving them a subsistence allowance? Is this not extravagant if you are going to have a pageant in keeping with the economy of the Island and in relation to the whole Federal festivities? Do not tell me that you are going to participate in the festivities in Trinidad which only cost \$15,000 and it requires you \$10,000 for your local Pageant.

I do not begrudge the Designer, whoever he may be, but when you look at these things you have to be frank about them. Now, I have nothing against the "out of pocket expenses and the honorarium to the Chief Designer"; I have no objection to anybody getting money for doing something, but good gracious me! - are you telling me that you are paying him \$720 for doing this when he is one of your Government officers? We have heard, Mr. Chairman, of instances in which a man goes on a Board and becomes a Secretary, and when an honorarium is offered to him, the Chief Secretary does not allow him to draw it, but a note is made on a file, and he will be in for promotion. I have no objection to him getting an honorarium for services which he will render outside his normal duties, because this is a different type of work, but is this the sort of thing for which you will pay £150? Payment for designs which will be used as machine drawings are \$700; I have no knowledge of the construction, decoration etc. of lorries and "floats" for which you are spending \$4,100, but let us be frank about these things. When I was a boy, there used to be something like this in Queen's Park on the 3rd June. There must be a limit somewhere, and if you are going to have people participating in these things, what are you going to ask the people to do? Who are supplying the lorries? My organisation has been approached, but I do not know what they are called upon to do. Are you asking the organisations to pay this Designer so that you can get the designs done as you want them?

I am appreciative of what the Hon. Minister of Social Services would do in things of this nature; I know he has a flair for it, but you have to check him on spending money. You cannot allow him to spend any amount of money on it because he has a flair for it, because you cannot have a pageant all around the island. You should have something symbolic of Federation Day, but if you pay the Chief Designer \$720 for this sort of work, what would you pay a Secretary of a person of that nature who has plenty of important work to do?

If this is going to be the standard you are going to set, well then, we are setting very high standards. You are giving this man an honorarium of \$720. I have no objection to giving a person an honorarium; but why give this man all of that, bearing in mind you are calling upon one of your servants who is already in receipt of a salary from the Crown?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am very appreciative of the efforts being made by the Unit Governments in bringing together persons possessed of certain abilities and in so doing, to bring about this Festival of Arts. I think it is one of the things which we should do in a Federation. As far as Federation is concerned, I think it is something which would stand out as a very great effort. If you read the Addendum carefully, you will see that it deals with a selected choir of about 30 to 40 voices, including soloists, and an exhibition of art as our contribution; and I do appreciate what is being done in this respect. I will be the first to lend my support to even a bigger sum in this respect, because, indeed, art in its various phases cannot be taken from any particular class of society. I do believe that the people responsible for this will have to look to every field to select people to represent us; therefore, I for one feel that this is a very good thing.

To get on to the other part which is a pageant to be staged in Barbados, the Addendum reads as follows:

"Plans are in train for the staging of a procession of decorated floats which would aim at depicting to the public various stages in the development of the federation idea. This presentation is at present planned for Saturday 26th April."

Now, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, almost all hon. members know the ability of the Hon. Minister of Social Services for organising and his flair for this type of thing, but a check on expenditure should be made in a certain direction. As a matter of fact, I call this buying your way into something because if enough interest had been created in federation in this country - and the blame for that must rest solely on the shoulders of the Government - you would not have to do that. As I have heard a few moments ago, nothing will be done to allow propaganda on the Rediffusion Service. If you had created enough interest in federation among the people, I am sure the Government would not have to come here for any \$10,000 to spend in paying a Chief Designer \$720 and what not.

Sir, I have great respect for the ability of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, but I think he has gone a bit too far. This is really catching at straws. If you want something lasting and something to serve as a memorial so as to make people remember what federation means, I do not think this is the correct way because, in my opinion, just a few decorated lorries with floats and having somebody to design them is what I will call buying federation into the minds of the people. If you had created an impression and more interest in federation and that interest could surely have been created by those who are responsible for bringing about federation - you would not have to do this.

I am wondering if the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Government do not think that rather than doing this, they should offer a number of scholarships, whatever number they like. If the people want this pageant - I mean the stores in Bridgetown and other various organisations - let them get together and advertise; there is no place in the Government for doing this at this stage. If the Government wanted to do this, the time when it should have done it was when federation was first being mooted about. That was the time to do this. You are actually throwing this money by doing this at this time. What I think for myself would be the better thing

to do, if the Government were really interested in doing something to go down to posterity, would be to offer a number of scholarships of whatever kind and number they seem fit. One of the best things for them to do was for them to offer a prize for the best essay written on Federation coming into being as from 1947. Surely, if you spend this money on federation scholarships it would be much better. You have a tremendous lot of talent lying dormant in this island. Let me say that I am thinking more of a scholarship in music or scholarships in such fields of endeavour; I am not thinking of a scholarship to a secondary school. You have youngsters who are not able to get into a secondary school but they have a gift for designing. If you have people who want help to get into a bigger school in drafting or plan reading, that is a way where you can help by giving a scholarship. I am not talking of academic scholarships. There are a number of people who are the sons of artisans who would be glad of an opportunity such as that, but which opportunity is not offered in this country. Now, you are paying somebody to design a few floats. That is absolute stupidity, absolute nonsense, and absolute waste of money.

As far as I am concerned, I am not like hon. members over here. I shall vote the money which is required for the Festival of Arts, but not for what you are doing here at this stage; all you are doing is to buy your way into the minds and hearts of the people. As I have said this should have been done in 1947.

What is happening is that there is very little interest in this island as regards federation. Then Government is closing Rediffusion to candidates for election and saying that the Ministers are the only persons competent to get on Rediffusion. Let them do so. That does not matter to most of us over here. I do not care. On my part, the Ministers can use Rediffusion and I will use the loud speaker.

Sir, I personally think that this \$10,000 for a pageant is an absolute and wanton waste of money. If the hon. senior member for St. Peter is correct in what he said that it is a Government servant to whom you are giving \$720 as an honorarium for designing, I would like to ask if that is so because the person is a friend of the Minister. Sir, I do not know what they are doing; I do not know how many members of the Opposition know about it, but I know that they are spending \$1,000 on this and of that amount, they are giving \$720 as an honorarium to the chief designer. I say again that you can spend this money on offering scholarships in plan reading. You can send some of your youths who are eligible to do these things to some of those institutes in Boston.

I am not talking about academic scholarships to Combermere or Harrison College, but surely you could look around this Island and find enough people who could benefit from this \$10,000 rather than give somebody \$720 for the out-of-pocket expenses and honorarium to the Chief Designer. Note 6 to this Item "Barbados Pageant" says this: "Plans are in train for the staging of a procession of decorated" - Mr. Chairman, I am reading it just as it is here - "or floats which would aim at depicting to the public various stages in the development of the federation idea. This presentation is at present planned for Saturday 26th April."

Why did they not use the word "muffins" instead of "floats"? (Laughter). This is all nonsense. Now that Federation is a reality, you are saying that you are creating an impression by doing what? The note says that these plans are in train for the staging of a procession which would aim at depicting to the public various stages in the development of the Federation idea, and that the presentation is at present planned for Saturday 26th April. I was talking with a pressman in the House on a day or two before the arrival of Lord Hailes when somebody told a member of the Government Party that Sir Conrad Reeves must feel very proud about Federation, and the hon. member said that Sir Conrad Reeves had played a great part in bringing about Federation. There is no wonder that you are now trying to bring about something to depict to members of the Government Party, the development of Federation. If you ask me to call the name of the Party man, I will call it.

Mr. Chairman, I was not surprised at that. What

are we depicting the development of Federation for? (Asides) As a matter of fact, if the name were to be called, I would whistle, but no doubt, it was one of them. I am quite sure that deep down in their heart of hearts hon. members will agree with me. I am not asking that this \$10,000 be spent on Harrison College or on any University; I am thinking that instead of this money going to a Chief Designer, there are sons of artisans on whom it might be spent. I have seen a young man who can design well, but he has never even got a bursary from the Government. You are now asking for this \$10,000 for doing what? You can ask the plantation owners to provide lorries and donkey carts, but do not ask us to vote this \$10,000 in respect of depicting Federation. I will vote for the other part of the Resolution, but as to this \$10,000, it is just nonsense and it is just playing to the gallery. If you want to do something to impress Federation upon people, do not come in here and tell us that you want to get a lot of lorries and paint them up and put them in procession. I do not take second place to any of them on that side on this question of organising anything, but this is all nonsense. Why do they not have a marathon or a swimming race around the Island too? At the appropriate stage, I am going to move the deletion of this \$10,000, because I repeat, this is all nonsense.

As a matter of fact, this Government is getting besides itself; they are now coming for this \$10,000 when some of it has already been spent. This is not the right thing to do; you have power, but you know what is said about having power. Do you think it is right to spend this money and now come here and ask for it? What would the Premier say if Mr. Keith Walcott was running the Government and the Government had spent this money and then came down here for it? You cannot spend money like this; you should spend money on something which would be of lasting memory, but not on this stupid thing. When they were talking about giving school children buns and sweet water, I said, that something better should be done for these children. This is reckless expenditure Mr. Chairman; because somebody wants to give his friend \$720, you spend a lot of this money before you come in here for it! There are a lot of people who have ability and you could allow scholarships in commemoration of Federation. I think you should go about the Island and tell the people what Federation is; it is not surprising that a member of that party told somebody that Sir Conrad Reeves was smiling, because he had played a great part in Federation. Their knowledge of Federation is limited to what they hear at their Council on Monday nights.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I doubt very much whether any grandmother would not complain about the amount of money which is spent on balloons and crackers at Christmas time, money which should be spent in buying something else for use in the house, because when they have finished with the balloons and crackers the money has gone. Some husbands will tell their wives that with all this waste they should have bought shoes for them instead of all these fansangles which they have put up in the house.

As regards the West Indies Festival of Arts, I believe that this idea arose in Jamaica that we should celebrate Federation not only by speeches, but by showing what the West Indies are capable of in the way of music. The Jamaicans got together with the Trinidadians and we were informed, being in Trinidad at the same time, that since Trinidad and Jamaica are at a further stage in matters of this sort than the rest of the West Indies, it was felt that they should get together and ask the rest of us to join in. Naturally, Barbados came in. I am told that at the time of the Coronation - I was not here - "loats" were used and they were extremely well spoken of; Now this Committee, comprised of people who are very interested in matters of sort, people like Mr. Frank Collymore and others, made this recommendation. There have been frequent meetings of this Committee and this is what they have turned out. Why should we sit in judgement on them and as a Court of Appeal say you must not have Steel Band, Choir or a Float? Isn't it nonsense? It is normal to have that type of thing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why confuse the two? I do not

think one member of the Opposition would have the guts to say anything against the Festival of Arts. Let us get down to the Pageant.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have also mentioned that. Pageants are customary performances on occasions of celebration in most countries on earth for time immemorial. You have Carnival where persons dress up and show off-like the Odd Fellows and Mechanics, to which I believe the hon. senior member for the City belongs. There is an undying feeling in old men to be childish sometimes and dress up and show off. What is wrong with the Pageant? What is wrong with Christmas? Life is normally so drab that it is a good thing to have a few occasions on which you can make-believe and have things like processions. I do not think this needs the slightest defence, but I wanted to pay the hon. senior member for the City a compliment by not sitting quietly, because he might have misunderstood my silence for contempt, which I will show in silence to other people sitting over that side. The only point which he has really made, to which I do not know the answer, is to what extent merchants have been approached. For all I know, some of them are subscribing; the programmes may have advertisements for which the merchants are paying, but I have no information on that. I know merely that all the West Indian Governments are being asked by the Committees getting together these things - and I include both the Festival of Arts and the Pageant - to contribute to it.

We had Coronation celebrations and as far as I can remember, the Coronation celebrations were paid for by the Government, but I am very glad to think that the hon. senior member for the City, who himself is an adviser to the merchants, has expressed these sentiments, because I have no doubt that if Government approached the hon. senior member for the City and asked him to use his influence with his friends down Broad Street, money will be forthcoming; (Mr. MOTTLEY: But they are not your enemies, you know.) But I will pass on the suggestion. I am glad to think that after a number of years even the merchants in Bridgetown are beginning to have commonsense, and to see that the best Government that could possibly run this island is in power. It almost makes me inclined to make up my mind to leave the island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Let me hear that again.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Hon. members can read anything they like into that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am straying from the subject of the Festival of Arts and I repeat that the hon. senior member for the City made one point which I shall pass on to the Committee. The Trinidad Government is seeing after everything and we have got to pay our share. We are going to put it in the Estimates; therefore if we vote this money now and we collect money between now and March from the merchants, we do not have to pay the Trinidad Government all of this; we would pay what we collected plus the balance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is a fair answer to my question. We are not asking anything about the merchants contributing to the Festival of Arts. As far as the Festival of Arts is concerned, we are 100% behind it and will vote this money, but we think that the amount you are asking is very small. What I am really dealing with, however, is the local Pageant. Government should work up this Federation and ask merchants, planters and organisations to contribute rather than spend this \$10,000, which could be used in a different direction.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I know the hon. member is only opposing what we are doing locally, and as far as that is concerned, my argument still stands, that if people want to subscribe, they can do so. (A VOICE: Have they been asked?) I do not know, but I will pass on the suggestion to the Committee. I have been informed that they have been asked, but they would not take part, which to me is not surprising. The average merchant, in spite of the compliment which I paid merchants a few minutes ago, wants to see what he is getting for his money; but I have just been informed that they have been asked to send "floats" and they said "no". I will still pass on the hon. member's hint to see whether they may

have a change of heart.

Now the hon. member has suggested that the Government is making a show although it should have been preaching Federation and the rest of it for a long time. The answer to that is simple. The people who are making a noise now saying that the public of Barbados does not know enough about Federation, are the people who are fearful about the prospects of going around this island to persuade people to vote for them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am among those who feel there is not enough information, and for your benefit I will say I have no fear if I had to go around this island.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY Adams: The hon. senior member for the City knows that I am not referring to him. He knows that the Party to which he belongs is so scared about the necessity of having to go around the island to inform people about Federation and beg for votes, that they want the Government to give them an easy way of canvassing.

We are not Sunday School children. The Labour Party is well known in this Island and that Party can wait almost until the last moment to ask for votes. (Mr. WALCOTT: Frank Walcott, too.) Therefore, when we hear this cry about Government is not going around preaching Federation, I say this: most of those who make that accusation are those who should themselves in years past have been making themselves known to the public so that they would be in a position, when the time comes for asking for federal votes, to get federal votes. I do not know if what I just said has anything to do with the set up over there but I said this in answer to the hon. senior member for the City when he said that this is an attempt to sell federation to the people. This is just the same thing as another country on earth which will have a celebration on an occasion of this sort.

Mr. WALCOTT: Can you imagine any person saying that the merchants in Broad Street or Barbados are glad to see that Government in power! After this speech which the Premier has made on this matter, I say that all of them should be put in the Lunatic Asylum. After hearing what the Hon. Premier has said just now, it is clear that he does not know anything about what he is introducing. He is introducing a Resolution and does not realise that the Resolution which he is introducing is divided into two parts. One part is necessary because you have an obligation to join in a federal pageant.

If you read the Addendum to the Resolution, this is what it says:-

It is proposed that a Festival of arts with items of Drama, Music and Dance and Exhibitions of Art, Sculpture and Handicraft contributed by the Units of the Federation should be held in Trinidad from 23rd to 30th April, 1958. A Central Organising Committee for the Festival has been set up in Trinidad and each of the other federating territories, together with British Guiana and British Honduras, have been invited to organise a local committee to arrange the contribution from the individual island.

2.. The financing of this Festival is based on the following proposals:-

(a) the establishment of a Central Festival Fund for the promotion and presentation of the Festival in Port-of-Spain, and for the subsistence of visiting teams from territories outside of Trinidad and Tobago;

(b) the payment by each participating territory of the cost of preparing items displayed in connection with the Festival and of the transportation of its team to and from the Festival.

This will take place in Trinidad. Now, this is what it says as regards the Barbados Pageant:-

Plans are in train for the staging of a procession of decorated or "floats" which would aim at depicting to the public various stages in the development of the federation idea. This presentation is at present planned for Saturday 26th April.

The local Committee to whom arrangements for this Pageant have been entrusted have secured the services of a Chief Designer and it is proposed that work on the construction of the "floats" should start as soon as the necessary funds are available.

That has nothing to do with the Festival of Arts which is taking place in Trinidad. The idiotic statement which you have heard today by the Hon. Premier - and he can only be a Premier of idiots - is that you are dealing with a Festival of Arts.

I must repeat that this situation between the hon. senior member for the City and the Hon. Premier is a Budd Abbott and Lou Costello affair and I have to challenge it at this stage. The Hon. Premier looked at the hon. senior member for the City and he then came back to give out one of those nonsensical statements of his. After half-an-hour's talking he then realised that the pageant in Barbados is a different thing from the Festival of Arts which we were talking about, and this is what he said then: "if it is so my argument still stands." Only an idiot will say that. What argument do you have that still stands? We said that the local Festival based on these views as expressed in this Addendum is expensive, and not only that; you are paying \$720 as an honorarium to a Chief Designer who is a man in the service of the Crown. As the hon. senior member for the City said, what you are paying to this chief Designer is as much as can send some more people to the Festival of Arts in Trinidad to represent Barbados. What do you hear in answer to the question of the floats? He says that they do not want to do anything in order to make it easy for somebody to let the electorate know he is coming forward for the Federal Election. I want to say that I am one of those people who are interested in the Federal Elections. I wonder if the Hon. Premier knows that I do not have to get on Rediffusion to let the people know who is Frank Walcott. As a matter of fact, he told somebody that I am one of the persons whom he cannot prevent getting in the Federal Parliament. Let him get up and deny it and I would call the person's name.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You can call two hundred names; I have not told anybody anything of the sort.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes; you told Dr. La. Corbiniere that. Tell him I say so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am going to draw to your attention again when you are speaking and you hear the sound of the gavel, you are to stop speaking and listen to what the Chairman has to say and do not carry your voice so loud as to drown the sound of the gavel. I drew your attention to the Rule already.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know you will draw my attention to the Rule. Why did you not draw the Hon. Premier's attention to the Rule? He gets up without rising at any point of order and you say nothing about it, but you knock the gavel for me to sit down, because this is his House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I never knocked the gavel for you to sit. If an hon. member is speaking and another one gets up and the member who was speaking sits down he gives way. You gave way.

Mr. WALCOTT: You knocked the gavel for me to give way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You were speaking and you were going too far. I wanted to draw to your attention that you were straying and I wanted to stop it and that is the reason why I knocked the gavel. I never knocked the gavel for you to sit. But what has happened is that some hon. members when the Chairman knocks the gavel, try to talk as loudly as possible, so as to make one think that they have not heard the gavel. When they have already heard the gavel; but they are just trying to keep up that amount of volume so as to drown the Chairman and the gavel. I am saying that it is contrary to the Rules of this Committee and I will not be warning any hon. member about it again.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want any warning; I am no child; I am old enough, I have long passed the adoles-

cent stage. You sat in the Chair as Chairman and allowed the Hon. Premier to stray so far that when he realised he was straying too far, he said: "I am going too far;" let me get back to the Resolution." What I said was in reply to what he said. You permitted him to say that in so far as Government giving any person permission to canvass on the radio that they know they cannot get in and because they know they cannot get in, they want the Government to make it easy for them to get in. I got up and replied to them that I am not one of them who needs any Government to make it easy for me. I called a name so as to let him know. I am not afraid of him and if he thinks I am afraid of him, he can put it to the test. You can have the Federal elections tomorrow. When they raise the question of having the matter put over the radio, I will say that the Premier went on the radio in 1946 and quarrelled with Sir Hilary Blood and said that he was no Socialist. That is not the first time that he went on the radio. This is the first time you will have an election on a multilateral basis and a request is made for the candidates to speak on the election. That has happened in England; Sir Winston Churchill did it and the election which was won by Mr. Attlee was won on that basis. If they felt that they had a good chance in the running, they would use the radio, because it would be to their advantage. This is only the signs of the times. What suits them now is the use of the "floats", somebody to go around depicting the progress of Federation.

They should take the people back to 1925 to the attitude of the leaders at the turn of this century, the leaders who really fought for the emancipation of the people. The one man who is living today and who would have prevented that emancipation would be the Premier, and you should have somebody to depict that. He should remember that he is one of the classic examples of those who tried to stop the early leaders of this emancipation which we are now enjoying. Whenever you talk about going to the people, he has to go to the people who look like us. Now, in the evening of his days, he is talking about the merchants in town. The merchants in town will treat you just like how the dictators will treat you. That is what I have to say when you make this statement about treating people with contempt. Let him put any of his cronies on the platform and see if they can stop me. I have an invitation to go to East Africa, to Uganda, where the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would like to go. I am not going there, because I want to stand here and wrestle it out with them. Sometimes I wonder if I am doing the right thing to leave this House of Assembly because when these Bills come down here the public will not get the forceful and vigorous attack on these nonsensical things.

We are not challenging the matter of the Barbados pageant as such, but if they want to get a Pageant and go about the country, do you think we should subscribe to that? Because the Government brings down this matter must we agree with it? As to the "Out of pocket expenses and honorarium to the Chief Designer", I should like to ask when is the last time you gave a man £150 for doing work like this? I believe I know the gentleman who is supposed to be the Chief Designer. So far as my knowledge of the person goes, he is a very nice young man and this is nothing against him; but if he were my brother, I would say that the paying out this kind of money just shows you how things are. If I did not have discussions with the Ministers this week on another matter, and because negotiations are going on in respect of it, I would not use that as a comparison. If you are giving this \$720 to a Designer, what is he getting off at? When the hon. senior member for the City made mention of the merchants in town - well, we have Carnivals and we see them all around; but this Pageant which the Government is carrying on, is more than a Pageant; it is propaganda. You do not want to use the radio, because other people will use it too; but you are the Government and you are taking this money from the whole community and you are using it in the direction of political propaganda. That is how you use the radio now; they put people who go to their political meetings to be their Directors of the Government time on radio programmes. Therefore, you have the same sort of organisation in which you can get Government Programmes sponsored by the political party, and

they can get what they want put over.

Mr. Chairman, in so far as we are making provision for a Pageant - I am sorry the Hon. Minister of Social Services is not here in his seat, because as to this idea of a "float", I know whence that idea came. This is the idea of the Hon. Minister of Social Services. If something was being run about which the community had enthusiasm, the Government's position would be one in which we would have facilities; they would be allowed to use the Garrison, but in this matter, when you are the main participant, it shows that the community is not with you in carrying out anything like this. You have the Pageant, which the Chamber of Commerce is carrying out, and when you come to countries which are Roman Catholic countries, they do not ask the Government to do anything.

Countries that are predominantly Roman Catholic and go in for Carnival before the Lenten Season carry them out, and it is done on such a mass scale that Government does not have to enter these things. But what any reasonable man would object to is that you are spending \$15,000 on the West Indian Festival of Arts, and \$10,000 on the local Pageant.

If you ask for a break down of these figures, you will see how much is being given to these Choirs. We have boys and girls who can sing, and if you go into the cost of sending these people to Trinidad, with the Chief Designer getting \$720, you will see how much they are getting. You are sending them to live in low standards, and I bet you that the expenses which you are paying cannot afford these thirty or forty people to live in the Queen's Park Hotel and give them a subsistence allowance equivalent to \$12 a day. I am sure that if these people who are going to sing to put Barbados on a Federal plane asked for a break-down, you would have to note more money. I have heard a friend of mine say that because Toscanini was a good conductor and you asked him to conduct a Steel-Band, he must do that for nothing, because it is a freeness for those who are going to the Festival of Arts. We have in our midst people who used to sing, although when taking high notes they used to point at the roof. But, Mr. Chairman, to be quite serious, if you can pay the Chief Designer \$720 for the part which he is taking in the Festival, I bet you cannot divulge the other figures.

The cost of return passages to Trinidad for the Choir and the cost for preparing and transporting the Art Exhibition to Trinidad and other incidental expenses, has been estimated at \$3,000. Now the cost of sending forty people to Trinidad at the rate \$80 is \$3,200. How are you going to send them? Are you sending them by the Lady Joy, The Marion Belle Wolfe, The William Johnson or the Investigator?

Last week the Minister of Agriculture brought a Resolution in here to provide funds for the Conference which the Credit Union people attend in Trinidad.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I am only drawing a comparison of costs. That is not out of order and I have the right to compare money already spent for transport services. Try and understand what I am saying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is criticising a Resolution already passed in this Chamber.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you understand a criticism? A criticism would be, if I said you should not pass the money. I am saying that the amount of money passed last week was to reimburse the Credit Union for expenses in Trinidad of \$80.10 for travel, \$40 for incidental expenses and other hotel expenses, and if you took the cost of sending that one person to Trinidad, you will see that it was over \$200 for three days, because the Conference only lasted three days. This Festival of Arts will be from the 23rd to the 30th April, which means that the Choir must be there a day before and come back a day after; that is nine days, so with that amount of money you can clearly see how much the members of the Choir will be allowed. I have asked some of the people who tell me that they are doing what is being done and how they are going. Must I come now and give these people

who are going to the Festival of Arts something, and yet we find the Chief Designer is being rewarded in this way. The majority of people who are going to this Festival of Arts in Trinidad are poor people, and should not be called upon to pay anything. If Government can be as generous as to spend \$10,000 on the local Pageant, why is it that sending forty people to Trinidad to the Festival of Arts could be as cheap as \$3,000?

I know that God does not send His blessing to the people you would like, and unfortunately the people who love singing are the people whom you would not invite into your drawing-room. God has blessed them with good voices, and when you look at certain people you are sorry that such a voice has been pitched in that frame; but it is there already. You are not giving them the facilities which you would give to other people, but you are asking them to be content with this amount of money.

I am a Democrat, and I feel I cannot support this Resolution for the local Pageant with the information before me, and irrespective of who votes for it, I can exercise my right in here without having to look at any person to see whether he is vexed or pleased. I cannot vote for this because you cannot show how the money is broken down, and as long as the Premier has anything to do with these things, you will get these nonsensical replies. He knows nothing of Festivals. He mentioned Jamaica and Trinidad but that idea could not have come from him. He does not even know what is a "Singing." Do you think he could arrange a Festival? It is true that even the "float" does not come from him. His organising brain is like that of an ant, only waiting to be crushed. His organising brain is only there for destruction. I have given him the answer to what he wants. Any time he comes here and talks about treating us with contempt, I will tell you that the people in St. Peter treated him with contempt and ran him out. He will have an opportunity when I come to St. Joseph to run me out too.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, in response to the criticism on this side of the House with regard to the expenditure of \$10,000 for the Barbados Pageant, the Committee was told that many grandmothers dressed their rooms with balloons at Christmas time. We are not here to concern ourselves with what grandmothers do, although we must be concerned with any grandmother type of thinking in the House. After all, grandmothers are supposed to have passed the age of thinking rationally, and certainly, Sir, the House of Assembly is not an institution or haven for the feeble-minded; but listening to the speech in defence of this Resolution, one seriously has to ask the question whether or not the House of Assembly is not an institute for the feeble-minded, because seldom have we ever heard such a rambling, irrational discourse as we have heard this afternoon. The speaker did not know what he was talking about, and utterly confused the Festival of Arts with the local Pageant; and certainly, Sir, he made no responsible defence of the position criticised by the Opposition.

This is the height of extravagant expenditure. We are spending \$10,000 on this proposal local pageant. One of the feeble statements by the defender of the Resolution was his reference to the merchants of Bridgetown in connection with this matter. He said he did not know if they would be asked to contribute towards this pageant but if they had not been asked yet to contribute, the door was still open. Would you really imagine, Sir, that any merchant in Bridgetown would donate one single cent for this purpose after we pass this money today? What nonsense is that? Merely because somebody connected with this pageant - the Chief Designer or somebody else - had thought fit to suggest that some pictures of a Minister or some Ministers should be on some of these floats, you get this Resolution. If they wanted \$50,000, they would have brought it down because of the idea of their having their photographs or their pictures depicted on these floats and at the public's expense, of course.

Sir, this part of the Resolution has been justifiably condemned, and its inclusion here is the quintessence of stupidity. Fancy, we are called on to spend \$10,000 to decorate a few lorries with floats and to pay the Chief Designer \$720 for out-of-pocket expenses and an honorarium. In these matters, my contention always has been that the country gets a Government it deserves. If it de-

serves a stupid Government, it will get one; if it deserves an extravagant Government, it will get one; and if Barbados has elected a Government, the chief spokesman of which is stupid enough as to say that although the merchants in the Island have not been asked to contribute to the pageant, they can still contribute after Government votes this money, then I say that the people more than deserve what they get. This Government can get this money because they will get it passed on a majority vote; but let them throw away this money; let them waste a lot more. I am sure it will take actions like this to awaken the people out of their stupidity. It is only by continual waste of the public funds and the doing of these nonsensical things by the Ministers that the public's interest will be awakened. Therefore, if I do not believe in wasting my time all the time, let them do as many nonsensical things as they are doing and the public will one day find them out.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to waste any time; I rise to move a reduction of the amount of this Resolution by \$10,000. While I am on my feet, I just want to say that when I was speaking just now, I mentioned that if it were your desire to celebrate this occasion and to create an impression in this way, this was one of the things which you could have asked not only the merchants of Bridgetown, but planters and people of that sort, to join in. I saw the Hon. Premier enquiring from one of his Ministers whether the merchants were asked and he then said that they were asked but they refused. I rise to disagree with that statement. Merchants are my friends and I take no umbrage on that. There are times when a lot of people are glad to meet people who have merchants as their friends.

In moving the deletion of this Resolution by \$10,000, I would just like to say for the benefit of hon. members that the furthest I think Government ought to have gone in a matter like this should be after organising and bringing together all sorts of organisations from the landship movement right up the line, they should offer prizes as an incentive. It would be just like Carnival, where you just offer prizes; it is not Government's business to enter into this pageant. It smells; and I do not think any other hon. member outside of the Government Party, knows anything about it. I may go as far as to say that even the Hon. Premier himself seems to know very little about it.

I repeat, I strongly support the amount for the Festival of Arts. It is a very good idea of bringing all the people together with their various abilities. We will strongly support that, but this idea of saying that merchants do not take part in this local pageant is something I do not know anything about, and I would like hon. members to know that these floats are costing us a tremendous amount of money. I cannot see how it can be said that the merchants were not willing to take part. I speak with some authority. On an occasion on which I asked the people carrying on business to give prizes, they responded quite generously and I doubt, if the Hon. Premier and the Government had asked the merchants to subscribe, that they would not have done so. I doubt the information he has is correct. Discussing it with the hon. junior member for Christ Church on my left, he said that he knows nothing about it. I have been watching the advertisements in the local newspapers in connection with the matter and I have not seen anything relating to merchants being asked. I regret I cannot vote for this part of the Resolution as I think that the Government without any organising ability should only have offered prizes as an incentive to, say, the best decorated lorry. One would have thought that that would have been the incentive which the Government would have offered. I cannot subscribe to Government spending money in this direction; I believe that there are private organisations and thousands of people who can create and make a situation such as this what it is. Just as people make kings, just as people make men, just as people make Governments. Let the people come in with something and you offer an incentive; but do not come and say that you are getting lorries from the Highways and Transport Department and you are paying a man \$720 to be a Chief Designer. You are paying your way! I beg to move that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$10,000; that is to say, that the \$500 which is required for the Festival of Arts and the other amount

which you propose to put in the Estimates is what we are prepared to vote for.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$10,000. There is a deduction for the Festival of Arts in Trinidad, and we are prepared to vote for that; but as far as spending \$10,000 for this Barbados Pageant - and more than that, this Government has taken too much upon itself. This Government has absolutely no right in spending one red cent before coming to this House and getting its approval of this expenditure. If that is not in the Premier's knowledge, then let him get up and say so; they have spent the majority of this money without coming to this House and asking for one cent.

I beg to move that the amount of this Resolution be reduced by \$10,000.

Mr. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if there is one advantage which the West Indies Festival of Arts would have, it would surely be to give a prize to whoever could set to music the speech of the Hon. Premier and have it sung by the jackasses that could be found in all the territories. (Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I led by you.) led by himself as Choir Leader. I have not heard of so much wicked, deceiving nonsense in all my life. To think that the person who introduced this Resolution is the same person who is being claimed by people who are as purblind as himself to lead the Federation and to place the destiny of three million people in his hands - the same person has had the effrontery to name one of the persons who is supposed to make this recommendation, namely, Mr. Frank Collymore, a very distinguished Barbadian who has retired as Deputy Headmaster of Combermere School; but he withheld from the Committee the fact that the Government had refused to pay Mr. Frank Collymore his salary for the month of January.

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

Mr. TUDOR: The Hon. Premier mentioned it.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. I said that when I was in Trinidad, I was approached by Jamaicans and Trinidadians who were getting up these things, and a Committee was appointed, a Committee of people interested in these things, like Mr. Frank Collymore and others. I do not know anything about paying Mr. Frank Collymore. The Government does not pay him anything in any month.

Mr. TUDOR: It was quite irrelevant for the Hon. Premier to introduce the subject of federal broadcasts in this debate, but although it was irrelevant, it serves a useful purpose. He appeared to tie the question of enlightening the electorate of Barbados on Federation to the question before us now, the question of expressing our appreciation of Federation by joining in a festival, when it had nothing to do with it. However, there is never a bad thing which happens, because all that he has said on that matter is that he has served notice on the people of Barbados that the only use for them when they are in the most ignorant condition and the least they know of the matter, the better it is for him to destroy; and the Labour Party can wait until the last minute to go and ask them for votes. He wants them to vote blindly and forget all the broken promises. That is why it is still possible for him in many instances to rely on displaced coopers, the yard fowls among them, and although promise after promise has been broken, they cannot find time or purpose to throw him out of public life once and for all.

As has been repeatedly said on this side of the House, the West Indian Festival of Arts is regarded by members of the Opposition as a desirable thing, and we have said in no uncertain terms that we think that Barbados should take part in it. It is with the intention possibly to get the Committee to forget certain discreditable aspects of Government policy that the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution tied that question with something else

in the Resolution. The sending of a choir and an exhibition of art if possible to Trinidad, the participation of Barbadian artists in what is going on in a West Indian venture is a good thing and it ought to be supported. It has not yet been noticed by members of this Committee that even if the Government spends a larger amount in its contribution to the West Indian Festival of Arts - than it contemplates spending, a refund is going to be given from the proceeds of the festival in Trinidad, so that the people of Barbados will be getting back something for their outlay. That is very welcome indeed.

The second welcome thing is that the Government of Trinidad quite wisely has called upon the Government of Barbados to put up all the money necessary, and that Government is prepared to advance all the sums of money necessary to defray the expenses of the festival and collect money from the other Governments afterwards. There is nothing wrong with that and all Barbadians will feel proud that Barbadian artists like Miss Nell Hall and others are taking part in this West Indies Festival of Arts. But when you come to the Barbados Pageant, that is a different matter. It is fitting that the people who are about to shout that such a move on the part of their opponents is unfair and biased are the first to do things that are unfair and biased. There is an amount of \$10,000 for the Pageant and the amount of \$720 is for the Chief Designer of the Pageant. This sum of \$10,000 represents the amount which would be spent if we did not insist on an alteration in the law -- the exact amount of money would be spent if a person or party decided to spend ten cents per head for every voter in this election campaign to boost the Government Party with the Premier portrayed in the procession without a head, without a back, empty and untenanted.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, I do not mind how abusive the hon. senior member or St. Lucy becomes; he cannot help it; he was born like that and will die like that. (Mr. TUDOR: I will die a Christian though.) When he dies, my name will be the last thing on his lips. This Festival is taking place after the Elections and during the time that the Parliament is meeting. By what stretch of the imagination can anybody use it as propaganda for the Elections? This is taking place in April. (Hon. R.G. MAPP: All of you said it would be used as propaganda.) It has been said three or four times, and possibly because it might be said again, I rise to my feet. Over and over again it has been said that this Government is using it for election purposes, but this is taking place in April after the Elections.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I heard the member over there say ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I heard the Hon. Minister of Communications say that all of us said that I did not say that at any time, but even if I had said it, I make no apology. I am not like the Minister of Communications I could never be like you who are only over there because you could not sell out the Premier at Mr. Lewis' house. You thought Barrow would have won the Elections, and you were at Mr. Lewis' house trying to sell out the Premier.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that it would be propaganda, but somebody had to tell him that it is after elections. I knew that before I said what I did, but somebody else told him so.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one reply of all the ones I can make to the Hon. Premier. He said that in his opinion when I die his name will be the last thing on my lips. Let me just tell him this: I am no blasphemer and my last breath would be occupied in calling the name of God by whom all things were made, and I know that I will have a happy and pleasant death when it comes, because my bed will not be surrounded by black candles and I will not be calling names like "O' neal" and "Wickham" and all the people whom he has helped to kill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair. The hon. senior member for the City is breaking the Rules of the Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, Sir. He is an obeh man.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, nobody said or talked as if he was giving the impression that he did not know that all this was taking place on April 26th. All the members of the Committee on this side of the House read the text of this Resolution long before the Hon. Premier did, but what we do say is this: if in the course of the Election campaign the Government has money at its disposal to spend and can start spending the money in the course of the campaign before the day is reached for which the expenditure is required, that Government and its agents are engaging in political campaigning with the use of money as much as any other candidate who happens to do it, and it is therefore unfair for the Government to use this means to bribe and incite the attention of the electorate so that they can have an advantage over their opponents.

The Premier has a short memory; if he did not have a short memory, he would recall that processions which have as one of their Chief features the carrying around of his portrait do not end very well. They start, but never finish. Secondly, I do not know which member of this Committee on this side of the House would be inclined to take seriously his opinion that we are opposed to the pageant and to everything else, because we fear the consequence of the election campaign. He could scarcely mean that if addressed to me, because we ran him out of St. Lucy in 1954, we ran him out of St. Peter in 1956, and if the rest of the island takes courage from these two examples, there would not be one dry spot in this island where he can rest his feet.

So, Mr. Chairman, our attitude in this matter is a simple one. We cannot agree that the expenditure of over \$10,000 for the Pageant is a justifiable one. More so since it has been charged against the Government and it has not been denied that they have spent a large part of the money already. Do you realise, Mr. Chairman, that this is perhaps the most serious accusation that could be made against Government, and that they have been deceiving the House of Assembly and its Committee by coming into Committee to ask for money, some of which they have already spent? Where has the authority of the House of Assembly and its Committee of Supply gone that things like this can happen, that the Minister and his subordinates can pursue a course of action which involves the spending of public funds in a large measure without recourse to the source which supplies the money? When things like this happen, Mr. Chairman, the people may not of course take warning from them, but they serve to illustrate how great is the injury which has been done to political institutions in this island, when public money can be expended long before public sanction has been given to the expenditure. It is a foregone conclusion that there are never enough of us on this side of the House to save the people of Barbados expenses which we consider to be wanton, and which we also consider not justified in this instance. I, for one, am not disturbed by the members on the other side, provided that it goes down in the records, as it must, that there were a few courageous members of the Assembly on this side of the House in Committee, who protested against this outrage in public expenditure.

Two kinds of justifications will be made. It may be said that we are encouraging local talent, local art, local decorators and all that. That may be true; but it would be a sad day indeed when you have to spend \$10,000 in order to encourage three or four people to do something.

When the hon. senior member for the City was speaking, he made a very good point when he said that the whole purpose of celebrating Federation particularly in a year like this should be to emphasise for all times the contribution which individual West Indians can make to the Glory and the development of their country. He suggested that this occasion should be marked by the granting of scholarships in art, painting, music, archi-

ture and in several fields so that persons who have the gift for expressing themselves in any of these aspects might benefit from the interest which their fellow countrymen have in their work, and might be rewarded by the Government of their country with a scholarship to further their status. That is how we should celebrate national dates. A float and a pageant are alright in their place, but I do not think you need take seriously the Hon. Premier's remarks that the merchants of Bridgetown are only too glad to see him in power. Many a true word is spoken as a joke and that particular joke is one which people of this Island paid very dearly for. Only they are glad to see him in power because they knew that when they canvass for him and his Party they would have the soap they wish to put on the market at the price they wanted, and the coconut oil they wish to sell to the people to prepare their meals. The merchants would be an ungrateful pack of people if they are making so extensive a profit at the expense of the people not to thank him for being in power and not to spend all their money and lend all their influence to keep him there. The significance is as true as any - and I mean in what we have said, and not what he has said.

Mr. Chairman, for us to resist the spending of \$10,000 on matters like this is not to obstruct for the sake of being able to obstruct. It is not because hon. members of the Opposition want to prevent the Government from getting its business done. The people have elected us here, Mr. Chairman, and although hon. members of the Government may not think it is true or, if they think it they might not have paid attention to it, but it is a fact that members of the Opposition represent constituencies which are more critical than members of the Government, and therefore the members of the Opposition bear in that respect a heavier responsibility to their constituents. There is not a member sitting on this side of the House who, if he opposes anything by the Government, is not met by members from his constituency and asked "Why did you vote against them; let us hear your reason." All of us over here know that if we are not convincing now in our explanations and our replies, only they on that side can win. But it happens that the converse is also true because we represent the most critical of the electors; therefore, we do not stand in fear of our seats as they fear because we take it upon ourselves to question and instruct those who vote for us and there is a perfect understanding between us and the people we represent. We do not have to fear; we only tell them the facts. Speaking for myself, when I tell them they will understand the reason for the stand we will take in this matter. It is not that we do not wish Barbadians to express their joy. We are voting for the \$500 and whatever else is needed to send individuals from this island to Trinidad to represent us in the national Festival of Arts. That is the extent of our contribution - an extent which we feel can profitably be made - but we cannot give our support to this other measure because we feel the Government of this colony is using the Barbados Pageant as a subtle means of electioneering and playing up its own propaganda publicly in defiance to the conduct of good political behaviour, and for the Opposition to subscribe to that sort of Behaviour would be to prove that it would be unworthy of the public confidence.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this matter but only a word in the course of interruption of the Hon. and Learned Premier has caused me to come to my feet. He pointed out in reply to certain hon. members on this side that the date on which it is proposed to have this pageant would be after the Federal Election and, therefore, it would have no possible result on the Federal Election.

I rise to point out that in paragraph six of the Addendum to this Resolution, there is a very significant phrase because, it will be noticed that the Hon. and Learned Premier used a similar phrase last December. In this paragraph it is stated: plans are in train for the staging of a procession of decorated floats which would aim at depicting to the public various stages in the development of the Federation idea." This procession is at present planned for Saturday, 26th April. "Is at present planned" are the operative words. It is at present

planned for Saturday 26th April. That means that today, the 11th February, it is at present planned or Saturday 26th April. But when we pass this money today, tomorrow it may be planned for another day. The question is: how soon may the present plans be changed if the money is passed in view of getting it in time for the elections and fixing it for a date convenient for propaganda for the Government party at the expense of the taxpayers, and for Government to state its views at the elections? We heard the Hon. Premier said last December that "it is not his present intention." Now, we have it here in this Addendum that "this presentation is at present planned for Saturday 26th April." If we pass this money today, what control have we over the spending of it before the Elections and from the propaganda which they hope this pageant would be able to portray in support of the Government's Party?

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

AYES: Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. D.D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP; Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. SEARLES, HOLDER and THORNE - 8.

NOES: Messrs. GODDARD, MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD, TUDOR, and BRANCKER - 5.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the CHAIRMAN declaring "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, no declaration has been made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I declared that the "Ayes" have it; the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying that I did not hear your declaration. I am sorry if you made the declaration and we did not hear it. None of us over here heard it. We said "No" loudly; it does not matter, however, because the other side would win. I apologise, Mr. Chairman, if you made your declaration and I did not hear it; all I am saying, is that I did not hear the declaration.

Mr. TUDOR: We called for a division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are even late now for a division.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I am speaking. You do not rule in here: I am saying that in future - you should let your declaration be audible. I say that with the greatest respect to you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the hon. member or most of those hon. members on that side, I will say that they were not paying any attention to what was going on, because just now when I declared that the "Noes" have it, they still called for a division. I had declared in their favour and they still called for a division; that only shows that they were not paying any attention to what was going on.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolutions passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that the majority of hon. members would like to attend a social function tonight and if that is so, it is fitting that we should adjourn at this time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: At one time, we wanted to attend a social function and the members of the Government would not agree to an adjournment.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have never tied any member to his seat. In any case, we should adjourn for tea now.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this motion, I should like to say that in the course of the debate which has just passed, I made mention of the name of Mr. Frank Collymore, who was formerly the Deputy Headmaster of Combermere School and who is now acting as a master on the staff of that School; the Premier in reply to me said that he did not know or he had not been told of Mr. Collymore's case and now I shall take this opportunity to tell the House the facts of that case. Some years ago when a decision was about to be taken about the revision of salaries of secondary school teachers, it was pointed out at the time that they were cases in which teachers at secondary schools, though not qualified in the strict sense, had put in sufficient service to merit their being remunerated and special legislation was passed to enable Mr. Collymore and others to benefit as if they had the highest academic qualifications. Mr. Collymore carried on his work as Deputy Headmaster as well as drawing the salary of the post which he held. He retired last month and the Governing Body thought it proper, in the interest of the school, that Mr. Collymore should return to the staff as an acting master.

Mr. Collymore complied with the request of the Governing Body and to his surprise and the surprise of all of us who know about it, although we have not heard it from him, at the end of the month when salaries were being computed, Mr. Collymore was not paid any salary for acting as a master for the month of January, and it was pointed out to him that the Governing Body could not make up its mind how he should be paid, and because the Governing Body could not make up its mind as to how he should be paid, Mr. Collymore served for twenty-five days as an acting member of the Staff of Combermere without remuneration. Unless the situation is clarified shortly in the course of this month, Mr. Collymore runs the risk of doing the same for this month until the situation is made clear.

Without further comment, let me say this: I hope the Premier will take the facts as given - he can check them if he likes, but he will find them to be true - and give instructions to the Governing Body of Combermere School not to continue this indecent farce and not to show such scant respect for the long years of distinguished service by Mr. Collymore by withholding from him the salary which is rightly his due.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two matters which I have to raise on this Adjournment. One is the Deep Water Harbour and the other is serving of two officers in one post.

An Official Gazette came to me in December stating that the Government of Barbados had appointed a gentleman by the name of Mr. F.J. Odle as Labour Commissioner. In the same Official Gazette it was stated that a gentleman by the name of Mr. A.H. Pickwood is also Labour Commissioner of Barbados and has been seconded to the United Kingdom to carry out some post there. What I should like to know is whether in our establishment we have any funds provided for the payment of two Labour Commissioners. Mr. A.H. Pickwood, was seconded to the United Kingdom, and in the same Gazette it was stated that Mr. F.J. Odle had assumed duties as Labour Commissioner of Barbados. I want to know what authority there is that in Barbados there should be two Labour Commissioners. I have not read anything which states that Mr. Pickwood has relinquished his post, although as Labour Commissioner he is already in the United Kingdom. The post in the United Kingdom is not a post in our establishment, and if tomorrow the Government decides that the work in the United Kingdom should no longer be performed by this officer, what is going to happen? Are we going to be landed with two Labour Commissioners? As it stands, Mr. Pickwood is Labour Commissioner of Barbados and Mr. F.J. Odle is Labour Commissioner of Barbados and yet there is only one post in the establishment of this island. I am worried to know how a state of affairs like that could exist.

The other matter which I would like to raise and which is of public concern, though I do not know how true it is, is that it was stated in the *Trinidad Press* that it was alleged that some of the workers at the Deep Water Harbour made certain statements relative to the quality of the Deep Water Harbour. I saw a letter in the local Press in which the Company, Richard Costain, is objecting that any such statement was made by any of its officers. I should like to know whether Government has made any investigation into this matter to find out if there is any foundation whatsoever in these allegations, because they were made public in that everybody could read them, and it would be a very odd thing for this island if these allegations were ever proved true without any investigation. I feel, Sir, that it is incumbent upon me to raise this matter, because you can understand that it is going to be a matter which will affect my Organisation, the Trade Union. If anything like that goes wrong, we would like to know at an early stage. I was trying to get the Official Gazette to find the exact date of its publication, but I know it was made and I am making that enquiry now.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not propose to detain you at any length, especially as I realise that certain members' bodies are present but their minds are elsewhere. Reference has been made to Mr. Pickwood and his activities in the United Kingdom at the moment. I am in correspondence with not less than two dozen Barbadian workers at present in the United Kingdom, and great dissatisfaction is expressed to me in this correspondence in the fact that Mr. Pickwood is there - not a Barbadian and not even a West Indian - looking after the interests of Barbados, in a job which they feel is eminently suitable for fellow West Indians to perform. They are particularly grieved because Mr. Harold Brewster, a West Indian and a Barbadian is there now and was always doing the lion's share of the work, and because Mr. Pickwood was appointed to work, he is getting, of course, the greater amount of money and doing much less work than Mr. Brewster; and on the standpoint of West Indian nationalism and Barbadian manhood, it has caused consternation and disgust among our fellow countrymen over there, because Mr. Brewster was doing the work well and getting so little for it. They feel it was unnecessary under the circumstances, unless it was impossible to get some other Barbadian or West Indian to do the work, to second Mr. Pickwood over there.

I rise to make that point in view of the fact that his name was raised in this debate, but I intended to make it the substance of a substantive motion at a future time. It would be interesting if members of the Government Party tried to obtain a point of view, and they will find that they would get a confirmation of what I expressed in respect of Mr. Pickwood, a non-West Indian, in charge of Barbadians in the United Kingdom.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to make an amendment to the motion made by the Hon. Premier, and that amendment is that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 18th February, at 3 o'clock p.m.

In doing so, I just want to reply briefly to the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition relative to Mr. Pickwood. For the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, he will remember that sometime in 1955 the post of Liaison Officer was created and the holder of that office was Mr. Pickwood. Mr. Pickwood as well as his Assistant, Mr. Brewster, were paid from the Emigration Vote. Mr. Odle to whom he referred, is Labour Commissioner, because Mr. Pickwood is not coming back; therefore there is nothing wrong in Mr. Odle's doing the job as Labour Commissioner and Mr. Pickwood as Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom. There are two different jobs altogether and, as I said, money has been provided in the Estimates for these posts, one under Emigration, and the other under the Labour Department.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise just to explain to the Hon. Minister that I am not talking about that. What I asked was this: Mr. Pickwood has been gazetted in the Official Gazette as Labour Commissioner and at the same time Mr. Odle has been appointed Labour Commissioner. What I was asking was: how it comes that you have two Labour Commissioners

of Barbados? Mr. Odle has been gazetted as assuming the duties of Labour Commissioner from the same day as Mr. Pickwood, Labour Commissioner, being seconded to the United Kingdom Liaison Service.

Hon. M.E. COX: To all intents and purposes, Mr. Odle is Labour Commissioner of Barbados and Mr. Pickwood is Labour Officer in the United Kingdom. That will be regularised in the very near future and more particularly as soon as we pass the Interpretation Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: You do not see that something is wrong then?

Hon. M.E. COX: There is nothing wrong. The post of Labour Commissioner is vacant because Mr. Pickwood is not coming back to that post and because of that someone has been appointed to that post. There is nothing wrong in doing that. The post of Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom has been filled from the time it was created by Mr. Pickwood.

Now, Sir, as regards complaints which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to, I am not saying that he has not had the reports but I want to say that no reports came to the office of the Ministry. As far as my Ministry is concerned, we get these reports from time to time. We get monthly reports and as far as I can see we get good reports all the time. It would be perhaps of interest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition to know that Mr. Brewster's salary is not as low as he thinks. Mr. Brewster used to get £850 per annum plus an allowance of £250 and travelling. Recently we increased the salary to £1,200; so that is not as small as the hon. member complains. That is the position as it stands, so far as Mr. Brewster is concerned. As soon as the Interpretation Bill is passed, that will clear up all the anomalies of which hon. members complain.

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

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter raised this matter about a letter which appeared in the newspaper concerning the Deep Water Harbour. I thank him for giving the Government an opportunity to say what I am going to say now. I think he is referring to the letter signed "O.H.J." which appeared in the recent issue of the *Trinidad Guardian* and which I also believe appeared in the local daily newspaper.

I may tell the House that we are quite satisfied with the official reply to the letter given by the contractors who are carrying out the work of the Deep Water Harbour. We have made enquiries into the matter and it seems to me from all the facts we have ascertained that this is the work of a malicious person. I put it as mildly as that because hon. members know how it is. There are certain people who are apparently opposed to the Deep Water Harbour constructed where it is, and they will go to any length to damage not only the progress of the work but also the good name of Barbados. They do not mind saying these things in the newspapers, but we mind when these things cause harm to Barbados and they would cause harm if it were not pointed out that they do not have any foundation or fact.

I must thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity to say that we have investigated this matter and there is absolutely no foundation in what has been said, and that we are satisfied with the reply given by Messrs. Costain & Co., Ltd.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I read that letter myself but I really take this opportunity as the result of the reply given by the Hon. Minister to say this. He must be very careful in giving these off-hand replies. He said that they were satisfied with the official reply given by the contractors of the Deep Water Harbour. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture who is on his immediate right will tell him that if you have a contractor doing something and something of which you were suspicious went wrong, the last man to give a reply on that is the contractor.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker I rise on a point of explanation. When he said "suspicious" what does he mean?

Mr. MOTTLEY: He replied to me that they were satisfied; that is to say, he meant that the Government was satisfied that with the official reply on the contrac-

tor the matter is still just a rumour. All I am saying is this: if you have a contractor doing something and there is even a suspicion that something is wrong with the structure of a house or anything else, you cannot say that you are satisfied with the official reply of the contractor. You are doing a tremendous job. I have asked questions on the floor of this House -- I do not remember if I enquired of the Hon. Minister of Communications or of the Premier -- but the questions were not answered. They have brought down legislation to prevent Messrs Costain from paying taxes when they are doing this work. I asked those questions, but now I am here wondering if the Hon. Minister of Communications would give the public this information.

In reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Hon. Minister said that he had considered the matter and he is satisfied that this is something which would damage Barbados, but he is also satisfied with the official reply not from the person who is seeing the contractor. This is a serious reply. You cannot ask the contractor to report on himself; whether this rumour is founded on a fact or otherwise, it is sufficient that it is a rumour which appears in the Press and it is a matter for the Government to investigate. I do appreciate the attempt made to investigate this matter of a report coming from the person who is the contractor. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture could tell the Hon. Minister of Works that he should not get a reply from the contractor.

When the Government amended the Act exempting Messrs. Costain from taxation, I asked for how much was the contract given out, and for how much did the Government agree with the contractors to build the Deep Water Harbour. I know what the reply is going to be; it is going to be that I should look in the *Official Gazette* that I should look at the report and so on. I have asked questions which have not been answered. I asked how much money has the Government agreed on for building the Deep Water Harbour? and the next question was was there a definite agreement for a specific sum of money or was there an agreement with percentage of cost and charges? I say that with any job of this magnitude going over a period of five years it is a very rare thing to enter a specific amount although you may put in the words: "Subject to wages going up." I asked who has been appointed by the Government of Barbados to see that the terms of the contract are carried out? Nobody in the Government has answered me Messrs. Costain are reputable people, but the contractors, like anybody else, are out to make as much money as they can out of any deal. I am not saying anything against the reputation of Messrs. Costain or anybody else. They will carry out the deal, but they will also see that they make as much money as they can.

I repeat, that the questions were for how much money did you agree with Messrs. Costain for building the Deep Water Harbour? Is it a specific amount, or is it a percentage plus cost and charges? I do not expect the Hon. Minister to answer me tonight, but I do hope that at some future time, he will answer those questions. I saw it stated in the *Trinidad Guardian* that they will be interested in these questions. The *Guardian* had one pose, the *Advocate* had another, but this is something in which the public will be interested.

It is not very businesslike, when the hon. senior member for St. Peter raises a question as the result of a letter which he sees in the Press, for the Minister to say "I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to reply to you, you have come out in a most unbusinesslike way. If I were spending £2,000 on a house and somebody says that he sees that the foundation is cracking or that this and that is happening, I would not go to the contractor and ask him to report to me as to whether or not he had done the right thing; I would get my report from somebody whom I had in charge of the work. It is not the right thing to say that the official report by the contractor has satisfied the Government that this matter is only a rumour. I am not making any accusation, but I say: "please answer the question which I have asked." You will hear all sorts of things later on. Barbados will have more engineers than Messrs. Costain and probably better; therefore, in order to avoid anything, let them answer the questions which I have asked. In any event, the Government should definitely have somebody looking

after their interest, especially when this work has been given out by contract.

I hope the Hon. Minister has written down the questions which I have asked. I asked how much has the Government agreed to pay the contractors for the erection of the Deep Water Harbour? Have you agreed with them for a definite amount or is it a question of cost and charges plus? If so, is there anybody who is looking to see if the terms of the contract are being carried out?

Hon. R.G. MAPP: I do not think that the hon. member has read the letter as I read it, but what I see in the letter in the *Trinidad Guardian*, is that the person is saying that some tides have washed away the stones at the bottom. I do not know that the foundations have been laid badly. The hon. member should appreciate and he should know that we have resident engineers who look after these things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, it is not good enough for the hon. member to say that we have Resident Engineers. If I ask a question to get information for the public, what harm is there in answering the question I ask? There is no trap in it. All you have to do is to answer the question and let it go into the *Advocate* and "O.H." who writes nonsense will shut up. But if you answer the way you do, saying that you have a reply from the contractors, that is not the type of answer you should give and people will be in doubt.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: The hon. member can get up again if he wants to, but he does not expect me to answer the question now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said I did not want you to answer now.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: He is teaching me my job. May I ask what is wrong with tabling the questions? I will tell him that I will be prepared with the answers anytime asks them in future. He can table these questions in the ordinary way, and I will lay the replies in the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to remind the hon. member that the Hon. Premier gave the assurance that he would answer them, but nothing has happened.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to crave the indulgence of the House to clear up point which I made just now. I referred to the Interpretation Act just now under which the Labour Commissioner is appointed; but it was not the Interpretation Act to which I should have referred, but Sub-clause 2 of Section 5 of the Civil Establishment Act 1949, which is perfectly in order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will take this opportunity to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention the fact that I have now got the *Official Gazette*. The notice appeared in the *Gazette* on the 10th October, 1957, and it reads as follows:-- "F. J. Odle, M.B.E., to be Labour Commissioner, with effect from 4th October, 1957."

In the same *Gazette* we find the following:-- "A. H. Pickwood, Labour Commissioner, to be seconded to the post of Liaison Officer, Barbadian Immigrants' Liaison and Welfare Service in the United Kingdom, with effect from 4th October, 1957."

What I am asking is whether in your Establishment you can have two people holding the same post, when in the Establishment you only have one post. By what the hon. member is saying, we can have the Governor of Barbados seconded as Governor to Cyprus, and still appoint a substantive post of Governor without his having to resign. I want to know how the Secretary of State can appoint Mr. Odle as Labour Commissioner when Barbados only has one post, and the Labour Commissioner for Barbados has been seconded to the United Kingdom. How is it going to work if you have two Labour Commissioners? I want to know how it is that your Establishment gives you the right to have two Labour Commissioners. It is not that you have eight posts.

Hon. M.E. COX: The *Gazette* says the man is seconded.

Mr. WALCOTT: But he is still Labour Commissioner of Barbados. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if Mr. Pickwood's secondment ends, he is not going to be in mid-air because his post is non-pensionable and the Barbados

Government is paying him money. What we have to worry about is that if the Barbados Government abolishes this post in the United Kingdom, we are going to have both Mr. Odle and Mr. Pickwood as Labour Commissioners in the same establishment. What is confusing me is that it seems that you can have two Governors, two Directors of Agriculture and so on when there is only one post in the Establishment, which means that the position needs regularising. It is not an anomaly as the hon. member said, but an irregularity. I know the regular position is to have a Labour Commissioner and an Assistant Labour Commissioner, but I cannot understand how you can appoint Mr. Odle as Labour Commissioner when Mr. Pickwood is still Labour Commissioner of Barbados, and both were appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The hon. member referred to the Civil Establishment Order, but I never knew it was intended through the Civil Establishment Order to have a situation like this. What I understood from the Order was that you could second a serving Officer to a post and appoint some person to act during the period of secondment, so that the Officer would not lose the status and money which he would draw; but when it comes to the Secretary of State making an appointment, you cannot come back and tell Mr. Odle that he is no longer Labour Commissioner of Barbados because the other Labour Commissioner has returned. That is why I feel these Civil Establishment Orders may have a different interpretation than what is given in them. I understand the law is that so long as a man is appointed and has done nothing to prevent him from drawing his pay, he is entitled to draw his emoluments, so that if there is a question of a mistake being made, Mr. Pickwood is still entitled to draw his emoluments. I am wondering why Mr. Pickwood has not resigned from the established post of Labour Commissioner. I want to know whether it is the intention of the Government to have two posts, but it seems irregular to me. The hon. member quoted the Civil Establishment Order, but all I want to know is whether you are having two Labour Commissioners for Barbados.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the permission of the House, I should just like

Mr. WALCOTT: You do not have to do that.

Hon. M.E.COX: I do not do things like that; I stick to all the Rules in here, and anybody who knows me that. I am asking permission to speak. I cannot speak forty times on the adjournment.

I really do not know what the hon. member is trying to get at.

Mr. WALCOTT: How do you mean you don't know?

Hon. M.E. COX: I thought when he asked just now about the particular Act under which Mr. Odle was appointed and which gave authority for the secondment of the substantive Officer to enter the post, that he would have looked up the Law and see what it is.

This is what is said: "Where the holder of an office (Hereinafter referred to as the substantive holder) is withdrawn from his office for the purpose of being seconded in accordance with the provisions of the last preceding subsection, it shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint a person to such office as if it were vacant; and such person shall be deemed to be the holder of such office and shall receive the emoluments attached thereto during such time as the substantive holder thereof is seconded as aforesaid."

Mr. WALCOTT: What I gather from my interpretation of that is that the substantive holder will be able to come back and hold the post of Labour Commissioner.

Hon. M. E. Cox: I have already told the House that Mr. Pickwood is not coming back.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter has been holding my interest too for a reasonable length

of time and the Hon. Minister has just read a law which makes it become more interesting. From the wording of the Act it appears to me that Mr. Odle is not the substantive holder.

I would like to read it myself so as to see if I have got the right impression. As I have said, I have got the impression that Mr. Odle is not the Labour Commissioner of Barbados again not by the wording of the Act.

Hon. M.E.COX: He definitely is

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will read Section 5:-

"If an officer is seconded to service under another Government or under an authority, body or agency approved by the Governor for the purpose of this section (which Government, authority, body or agency is hereinafter referred to as an approved employer), such officer shall, during the period of his secondment, cease to receive the emoluments attached to his office but shall nevertheless, if the approved employer agrees to pay the Government of the Island a contribution in respect of his pension during the period of his secondment at the rates prescribed by the Governor, be deemed to continue to hold such office for the purposes of the Pension Act 1947."

As far as this sub-section is concerned, Mr. Pickwood is quite well covered under the Pension Act.

I will read Sub-section 2:-

"Where the holder of an office (hereinafter referred to as the substantive holder) is withdrawn from his office for the purpose of being seconded in accordance with the provisions of the last preceding subsection, it shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint a person to such office as if it were vacant; and such person shall be deemed to be the holder of such office and shall receive the emoluments attached thereto during such time as the substantive holder thereof is seconded as aforesaid."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw to the attention of the House that there is no quorum present.

The Bell was rung.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. HUSBANDS: As I was saying, Sir, under Sub-Section 2 of Section 5, Mr. Odle is deemed under the law to be the holder of the post. He has nothing to fear by the way of losing any emoluments, but the substantive holder of the post is Mr. Pickwood who is now seconded as Liaison Officer in London. I do think it is a knotty business.

Hon. M.E.COX: How can it be knotty?

Mr. HUSBANDS: If somebody is deemed to be the holder of a post and somebody else is the substantive holder but is on secondment, what might be the position if the secondment ceases?

think we cannot read and understand? Mr. Odle is now deemed to be the holder of the post. As I was saying, he has nothing to fear as far as losing emoluments is concerned, but the present holder, Mr. Pickwood, is covered under the Pension Act. In case the secondment of the substantive holder ceases -

Hon. M.E.COX: What are you getting at?

Mr. HUSBANDS: This is what we are getting at: in case the substantive holder were to have that secondment terminated, what would be the position and what would be the position of Mr. Odle? Claims may be made by both parties. I would not be in any hot water.

Hon. M.E.COX: Do you think that we know not what we are doing?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I hope you know. I am very glad the Hon. Minister has cited the Act. I had my fears and think the House is well served by having my colleague to bring up this matter.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 18th February at 3.00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.