

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th February, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Dr. H.G.H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (Speaker); Mr. J.E.T. BRANCKER, (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. M.E. COX (Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour); Mr. F.L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R.G. MAPP (Minister of Communications, Works and Housing); His Honour Mr. V.B. VAUGHAN (Deputy Speaker); Mr. C.B. SEARLES; Hon. D.D. GARNER, (Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries); and Mr T.W. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 4th February, 1958 have been circulated and unless any hon. member objects, they will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare these Minutes confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1958.

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

Report of the Housing Authority for the period 1st April, 1956 - 31st March, 1957.

Report on the audit of the accounts of the Housing Authority for the period 1st April, 1956 - 31st March, 1957.

Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 31st December, 1957.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. M.E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:-
Resolution to place the sum of \$226,680 at the dis-

posal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No. 70 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$3,430 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making a loan free of interest to the Governing Body of the Lodge School for the purchase of a motor vehicle and the payment of the insurance and licence

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1958."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1958."

Hon. M.E. COX:

Resolution to place the sum of \$192,000 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. 71 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M.E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Premier:-
Bill to amend the Larceny Act, 1868.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M.E. COX: I should also like 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.

QUESTIONS

Mr. F.L. WALCOTT:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Government prepared to take steps to make May Day, 1st May, a public holiday as requested by the Barbados Workers' Union?

Mr. WALCOTT:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Government prepared to pay unestablished workers in the Public Service for public holidays?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. M.E. COX, seconded by Hon. D.D. GARNER, the Bill to amend the Larceny Act, 1868,

was read a first time.

On motion of Hon.R.G.MAPP, seconded by Hon D. D.GARNER, the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

LEAVE TO PRESENT PETITION

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to present a petition from the Lord Bishop of the Island of Barbados and the Rector of the parish of St. George in connection with the sale of Glebe Land.

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

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg notice to lay a Petition of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of the Island of Barbados and the Rector of the parish of St. George praying the House to pass a Bill to authorise them to sell part of Glebe Land for the erection of a Post Office. The petition is respectfully worded, and I ask that it be taken as read.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE LOUIS TYLER TALMA

Hon.M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to move the passing of an Address to the hon. senior member for Christ Church. This Address reads as follows:-

Resolved that this House place on record their sympathy with the hon. senior member for Christ Church and his relatives on the loss sustained by the passing of the late Mr. Louis Tyler Talma. And that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the widow and other family of the deceased.

I shall not say much, but I think I can say that when we received the news of the passing of the gentleman that we were all shocked.

I should like to say that I have known him for a long time and he was one of the most pleasant officers I have ever met. I am sure that we all share our sympathy with his relatives. This Resolution is a Resolution to express our deep sympathy at the passing of the gentleman, the late Mr. Louis Talma.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. At least there is one thing which seems to bring hon. members of this Chamber together - members from opposite sides-when we join together in commiserating with a colleague of ours on the loss of some near relative of his. It is unfortunate that these occasions are becoming so frequent when we have to offer our sympathy to a member and colleague who has sustained a great bereavement. I join with the Government's Spokesman in offering sympathy to the widow and the near relatives of the deceased. As we all know, that family is a truly West Indian one; they were born in Grenada but consequently migrated to this Island where they have lived, and several of them have acquitted themselves with distinction here. Of these, not the least is the late Mr. Louis Talma, whose funeral was largely attended on Friday afternoon of last week. The Hon. Leader of the House and myself met there, and of course, my colleague on my immediate right (Mr Tudor) and there, was one occasion when we found that we were in complete agreement in expressing our sympathy at the loss which the Agricultural Department had sustained and thereby the Island as a whole by the death at the comparatively early age of 53 years, of the late Mr. Louis Talma.

While we will be sending our formal expression of sympathy with the widow of the deceased, we would also like our colleague in this House to know that we are all in sympathy with him on the occasion of his be-

reavement. That is the more so, because he is still not sufficiently well enough to resume his active life with us in Parliament on account of the shock at the unexpected, untimely and irreparable loss which he along with the rest of his family has sustained. Everyone who is here in this House this afternoon shares the regret of the hon senior member for Christ Church at this heavy loss which has been sustained by this family; and we believe that he, in having our sympathy, will be relieved of some of the grief which otherwise he would be bearing without the help and sympathy of his colleagues.

The question that this Resolution do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, hon. members standing in their places for a minute at the request of His Honour the Speaker.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

Mr.WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to say that there is an error in this third Resolution which should be corrected. I would have drawn the matter to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House, but I preferred not to do so. On the Order Paper there is a Resolution for \$2,800, but in truth and in fact, the Resolution is for \$2,850. That is something which should be regularised. If you look at the Resolution, you will see that it is for the sum of \$2,850 whereas the sum of \$2,800 appears in the one which is on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon Leader of the House will take care of that.

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

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

Mr. Dowding came into the Committee and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58 No. 67

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution for \$41,273. I propose to deal with this Resolution as set out under the various Heads

HEAD X - FIRE BRIGADE

Head X - Fire Brigade - was called.

Hon. M.E.COX: The note to Item 12, "Cleaning, Water and Light," explains that with the increased cost of electricity, it has become necessary for us to ask for a supplementary amount to carry us over to the end of the Financial Year. As hon. members know, quite recently the decision of the Court was that the Barbados Light and Power Company could increase its rates by 12 1/2%. That being so, we have no alternative, but to ask for this additional amount to meet commitments to the end of the Financial Year.

I beg to move that Head X - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, while I sympathise with the position as outlined by the Hon. Leader of the House who has just sat down, I disagree violently with him when he says that the Government has no alterna-

tive, but to pay for the increased cost of electricity. It is scarcely six months since in this Chamber - it was sometime during the last session - a fairly lengthy exchange of opinion took place across the floor of this Chamber as to what should or should not be done by the Government of this island with regard to electricity in the light of the award given by the Chief Justice in the dispute between the Public Utilities Board and the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited.

While at that time during the discussion it was not pertinent to the issue then for any definite statements of Government policy to be issued, there was a warning and a suggestion given from this side of the House that the people of this island ought not to be subjected to so unfair an imposition as having to pay in their personal capacity as individual subscribers a greater cost for the service, and also having to pay in their collective capacity as a community for the increased charges which have to be undertaken in the matter of street lighting. I remember some hon. member who warned Government that it was their duty, if they were satisfied the community is being made to pay through the nose for a service which could not possibly cost it so much, to introduce the necessary Legislation to make the position right. All of us, at any rate on this side of the House, felt that something had gone radically wrong when the Public Utilities Board lost that particular argument; but every sensible person was prepared to abide by the decision of the Court in so far as it was a decision. The matter however should not rest there finally.

It is the duty of the Government of the country, if it feels that consumers are being harshly treated by being asked to pay extravagantly for a public utility, to change the Law to make it impossible for that particular imposition to be laid on them. The decision has turned out exactly as we had warned, that in addition to private consumers suffering the hardship, Government itself, acting on behalf of the whole community, now finds itself admitting that because of the increased prices imposed by a decision of the Barbados Light and Power Company, it has to pay more for its street lighting.

This is the important point, Mr. Chairman; street lighting in this island is barely a scratch on the surface of its possibilities, and any reasonable person can look forward to the time when every inch of territory in this island will be lit by electricity. In the parishes outside of St Michael, where as yet there is no street lighting, there is great expectation that one day there will be. Now, that is a large outlay which Government will have to face and to meet. Are you going to tell this Committee this afternoon that it does not worry Government that in an expenditure as necessary as that, which it must undertake on behalf of the community, it is prepared to pay more than it ought to? If this experience is not sufficient to warn Government that the Public Utilities Act has got either to be repealed or amended to give direction and power to the Board to deal with matters, I do not know of any circumstances which will provide a warning. While we do not object to this particular expenditure, we think that it should serve as an indication to Government that that law needs amending, as no utility in this island ought to hold the community up to ransom. That is a thing that has got to be stopped, because a two-fold injury is being worked on the individual in this island; if he wishes the service in his own home or business or wishes to continue it, he has got to pay more for it than what it is really worth; and yet in his capacity as a taxpayer when you have the rest of the community to provide street lighting for larger and larger districts of this island, he has still got to pay more. He is therefore meeting a double levy when he should not be even meeting a single one, and if this is not an unfair imposition to him both as an individual and as a member of the community, I do not know what is.

So I would like to warn Government that the position is very unsatisfactory and the sooner legislation is made to amend or repeal the Public Utilities Act, the better.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to what the hon senior member for St Lucy said; but there is one difference in my submission and it is this: We will find that this question of lighting appears about three times in this Resolution - Cleaning, Water and Light at Fire Brigade Department, Upkeep of Traffic lights; and Electricity at Post Office. This electricity is the only means of real industrial power which we have in this country, but what is evident to every one is that the present Government cannot do anything about this matter in a positive way, because some years ago they prophesied that if they came into power, they would nationalise electricity; but you will find that ten years after that, what they have nationalised is buses. They tried to nationalise the buses

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is going to become very intolerable to find that when a member makes an analogy, you seem not to understand that it is the right of a member

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying from the point and for his information, I will read the Rule on supplementary and excess grants:

"Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which those grants are sought, and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the Committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates."

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, what Rule Book are you reading from?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From May's Parliamentary Procedure.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: You cannot question the Chairman!

Mr. DOWDING: I am speaking on a point of order, and I asked the Chairman what Rule Book he was reading from and he replied from May's Parliamentary Procedure. Thank you!

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, it is not easy for us to get this Government now to take a positive step about this question, and you will very well realise that I have for practical purposes to ignore the reference you have made about the point because it has nothing whatsoever to do with what I am talking about. It has no relevance in this House anyhow. What the hon. member was saying is that the Government must amend the law, but I am saying that in a matter like this, it is not a matter of amending the law; it is a matter of your policy towards these things. The question here is not a matter of law, but that in Barbados the question of industrial power and light, which is quite similar to water, is a public utility and should be in the hands of the public. Unfortunately we cannot take that step with this Government in power, because ten years ago the Government in power prophesied that it would take over the Electric Company if they got a majority to do it; ten years have passed, they have a majority and no such thing has been done. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the best thing would be to take over the Electric Company, but I cannot ask them to take it over after they have made a complete mess of the first item they had to deal with, and that is, the buses. If you understand the analogy, that is the point I was making. I could not have agreed although I am a believer in public ownership. I could not at this stage ask them to do it because if they did, instead of the price being what it is, you will have to pay ten times as much to put electricity in your homes.

We have to say, let us stew in our own juice, which is something we do not like; but because we realise there

is no financial imagination on the part of the Government in these matters, we have to be content with what we have. Sir, for that reason I regret this because the Electric Company is not a star in this island in so far as lights are concerned, the service which it gives, and even the wages which it pays to its workers. It is a company to which any Government with any imagination would say: 'let us take it over' - particular in view of the talks about industrialisation. Next door to us, we have the Trinidad Electric Commission which is not privately owned but which is vested in a commission and because of that is a public authority; and even in small places like Antigua you get electricity being owned by the Government. As a matter of fact that is the case in most countries of the world. However, we do know that to get Government to take over things like this, we would have to see a change in Government. We do know that there is too much reticence in Government and we can see that a great deal of our financial position would be depleted by this unimaginative attitude by the present Government in these very serious financial matters.

Why should this Committee be called upon to undertake this burden? When you look around the City, you see you have a dark City. The little bit of lighting which you are getting by the Electric Company, as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said, you have to pay through your nose for it. Personally, I am not happy about it but we cannot do anything about it because the Government in power has no intention to take over this company; and if it has any intention to do so, I would vote "aye" but with a heavy heart, because I know I would be voting for a political ideology, while from the point of view of practical financial matters it would be something which would be worthwhile. Sir, later on I am going to show you the lack of imagination of the present Government

Hon. M.E. COX: Sir, I shall reply to some of the remarks made, especially by the hon. member who spoke last. As regards the point made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that Government should amend the Public Utilities Act, I should like to tell this Committee, and especially the hon. member, that it is the Government's intention to amend that Act so that a company would not be able to refer matters of fact to the Supreme Court as was the case when the Government brought in the Bill some years ago.

Sir, I am not for one moment laying any blame on the Other Place but originally when that Bill was before the House, it did have in a clause where companies could only appeal to the High Courts on matters of law and not on fact. After the House passed it in that manner, the Other Place amended it and for the sake of getting something passed, the House agreed to the amendment.

We have given instructions to have the amended draft prepared, but I would like to say that the Crown Law Office has been overworked in recent years and, perhaps, understaffed and there is quite a number of important items which are pressing bits of legislation which we would like before the House that have caused us not long ago to set up a committee to recommend priority in dealing with them in that office. That has been done and the amended bit of legislation for this purpose would be coming before this House soon.

I think the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would appreciate that even if this Bill was passed, since the 12 1/2 % increase was allowed by the Chief Judge to this Company, the Act could not render void the paying of this increase. Sir, I want to assure the hon. member that we are just as much concerned as he, if not more, about the increased cost of electricity and other items.

As regards the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, it is true that this party to which he once belonged (up to February 1954, if I remember correctly, and he also was a member of the Executive Committee until the introduction of Ministerial Government when he was no longer a member) had as its policy the nationalisation of public utilities and I am sure that

the hon. member was one of the persons who shouted loudly for nationalisation at that time and supported the Government on that. Perhaps, if the Hon. Premier at that time were not so heavily influenced by what the hon. member said on an occasion, we would have nationalised the Electric Company by now. That is not a joke; that is a fact. At one time I thought he had the Hon. Premier around his finger. The Premier used to listen to him left and right; he dominated the scene. Perhaps, what really caused the Hon. Premier to get cold footed about nationalisation was when the present Minister of Social Services who was then a member of this Party raised a debate on the nationalisation of Rediffusion, the hon. senior member for St. Peter jumped to his feet - he was a member of this Government at the time, a member of the Executive Committee and a member of the Party - and said: "what! all this nonsense that these people are talking about is only running capitalists from this country and preventing them from investing in this country." Sir, he was loud in his praise of nationalisation but on this occasion he was loud in condemning us in our policy of nationalisation and he was telling the world that we were preventing capitalists from coming here and investing money because of all this talk of nationalisation. As I have said, at that time he was a member of the Executive Committee holding the portfolio, I think, of trade. Matters concerning trade were right up his sleeve and he loudly condemned the idea of having nationalisation. But, today, he jumps up and tells you that this Government has no policy and this Government was to nationalise this place of business - the Electric Company - ten years ago, but now today instead of doing that, we come with this increase. Well Sir, this is a changing world.

This is a changing world, and that is why perhaps people have little or no regard for politicians. Some people refer to politicians as chameleon, lizards which change their colour as they go on different leaves and branches; they just change to suit the times. I am not in a thing, I will stick to it and wait the opportunity when I can put it into force. If the hon. member were honest - I should say if he were sincere in his utterances about the nationalisation of the Electric Company. I am sure - again I repeat - that with the influence which he bore or brought to bear on the question of nationalisation, by now, instead of the buses being nationalised, we would have nationalised the Electric Company. I am not prepared to say what is the Government's intention at the present time, but I am convinced as anyone else that if there is one thing in this country which should be owned by the Government, it is electricity, more particularly since almost every gallon of water which we lift from the earth is going to be lifted by electricity.

As the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said, no company should be able to hold up the public at ransom in cases such as this and in cases of other important items.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have given you the right, Mr. Chairman, not to knock your gavel at any stage of the hon. member's speech, and you have allowed him a wide expanse. I am claiming the same thing now. The Hon. member said that if I were sincere -- he was going to say if I were honest and he realised that he would be using an unparliamentary phrase and he substituted a parliamentary phrase which would connote the same meaning. An insincere person is as dishonest as any dishonest person. (Hon. M.E. COX: No, No,) Do not let the hon. member get worried now; I am repeating the words which he had used. He said: "If the hon. member were sincere," which means that I am not a sincere man.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of Order, I will substitute the word "lukewarm" and say that if he were not lukewarm on the matter of nationalisation - without linking the word "sincerity" with the word "honesty", because they are two different words with two different meanings.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not responsible for the words

which the hon. member has used; I am dealing with the utterances which have come from him. His utterances were: "if the hon. member were sincere" (Hon. M.E. COX: In nationalisation) Do you mean to tell me that he only meant in nationalisation? The hon. member went further and talked about some lizards changing their colour and about people changing, whereas he always remained one way. Therefore, in using the word "sincere" he was not using it only in respect of nationalisation. He wants it to go down in the records that I am such an insincere man that I change my policy whenever it suits me to do so. However, Mr. Chairman, I will deal with him gently.

In so far as the debate to which the hon. member made reference is concerned, there was the question of there being no Government policy. That is where I would say that he is not sincere and honest in saying that the Government had a policy in connection with the nationalisation of Rediffusion Service. When the then hon. junior member for St. George, who is now the Minister of Social Services, moved the passing of an Address for the nationalisation of Rediffusion, I said then, and I say it now, that if the Government came down with a policy to nationalise Rediffusion, I would be opposed to it, because I asked why should you nationalise something like Rediffusion which people can install in their homes, and not look for something for which people cannot pay? I said that you could better nationalise every drug store or everything that is sold. It was that aspect of nationalisation to which I referred, together with the one which the Hon. Premier used about light, because the hon. member does not even remember what he is talking about. It is a fact that the Premier said that he was going to nationalise the Electric Company, but did nothing about it; the Electric Company refused to go in for getting any money for expansion and therefore we are paying the price for that. They did not expand, because they did not know when this matter of nationalisation would have come about.

I believe in nationalisation now, so that when the hon. senior member said that it was my influence which prevented the Government from nationalising Electricity -

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order. I did not say that. I said if he had used his influence --

Mr. WALCOTT: What did the hon. member say not ten minutes ago? He said that at that time, I had so much influence with the Premier that I ran the country; it was such a source of jealousy to some hon. members that I had this influence with the Premier that it looked as if I was removing somebody from being near the Throne. (Laughter) Therefore, it is a good thing that I am no longer there, because my life will remain with me a little longer. (Laughter); Nobody will shoot me in believing that I will be the next Premier. What the hon. member is saying is that I ran this country for the five years when I was in the Executive Committee, because the Premier leaned so heavily on me and he was heavily influenced by me. I will say nothing more, because I will divulge Executive secrets. If I said in what way I ran the country and where I have disagreed. If the hon. member is paying me a compliment to say that I exercised influence on the Executive Committee, and I exercised it because the Premier leaned heavily on me -

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order. I never mentioned anything about the Executive Committee or about his exercising any influence in the Executive Committee. The hon. member's memory seems to be getting very bad.

Mr. WALCOTT: What has happened to the hon. member? The whole question was that of nationalisation. The only thing which the hon. member knows about me, is that the Premier would lean on me in Executive Committee. He went so far as to say that I had the portfolio for Trade and Industry. What I am pointing out to the hon. member is that, in so far as the question of elec-

tricity is concerned, we all felt that electricity should have been nationalised. I would challenge him to say that any debate came up among the Party on the question of the nationalisation of the electricity or of the Electric Company, and I said not to nationalise it. I challenge him to say that during the time that I was a member of the Executive Committee or a member of the Party, the question of nationalising the Electric Company came up and I opposed it.

Today he is saying that they would have nationalised electricity if I had been in favour of it.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order, I never said that. I would never be so reckless as to make a statement like that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if you had to make a precis of his speech, or if there was a dictaphone and it was recorded, you would have seen that the burden of his speech today was that I am telling them to nationalise when I was one who was opposed to nationalisation. That is what he said, and then he quoted an instance about Rediffusion. He thinks that I am afraid to say that even now in 1958 I believe in nationalisation, though you should not nationalise for the sake of nationalisation. Why don't you nationalise the lawyers? In England you nationalise doctors, but it does not mean that you should do it in Barbados because it is done in England, because you have not reached that stage in Barbados where the law is required. I do not follow willy-nilly anything that is done. I am still a believer in nationalisation, but because of the way they handled the bus situation, if I voted for nationalisation of the Electric Company, I would be doing it from heart.

I must close by telling the hon. member this: the hon. member likes to follow the Premier in his antics in answering questions by trying to go into Executive Committee. I will tell him that one of these days I am going to risk the Official Secrets Act on the basis of going to gaol for divulging what I knew at Executive Committee when you come with this sort of thing. When you talk about things in Executive Committee, there are too many

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order, I never mentioned anything about Executive Committee in my speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you are a Parliamentarian, and you know that nobody other than the Executive Committee can nationalise the Electric Company. Who else besides the Executive Committee can nationalise in this island? What he was talking about was not whether or not you should nationalise, but whether he should amend the law.

Hon. M.E. COX: I never said that. I said if he had used his influence with the Premier at the time, we would have nationalised.

Mr. WALCOTT: You can only use your influence on him in Government to get something done. We all sit on Government. Imagine the four of us - His Honour the Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House, the Premier and myself sitting at Executive Committee at the time. Ask the hon. member now to say if at any time the four of us discussed the question of nationalising the Electric Company. He talks about influence, but if the Premier were here I would say this: If you were correct in what you were saying, you would know that the Premier got on platforms and said some things which the rest of us heard for the first time, but because we did not want to embarrass him on something which we knew nothing about before, we had to commit ourselves to something which we had not previously discussed.

I am warning the hon. member that in a debate he should never try to use what the public cannot know about, and by innuendo try to make people believe that we said something before and want to say something

different now. He says that I have changed, but he will have an opportunity to go through the island and tell people that I have changed; I have changed in the sense that I am no longer a member of that Party, and have no intention of returning either. You have to look for others who want to join in.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, an interesting interlude has just taken place, but interesting as it has been for me to hear it, yet it has obscured one of the points I had hoped the Minister would answer. I just want to say this: The quarrel on this side of the House with Government is a simple one, and I do not think it is completely concerned with nationalisation or non-nationalisation; it is something simpler in essence.

Mr. Chairman, you will remember that last year when the Public Utilities Board and the Barbados Light and Power Company had the controversy which finally had to be settled by the Chief Judge, the most amazing thing which emerged out of the whole proceedings was that whereas the Barbados Light and Power Company had had full opportunity to argue its case before the Chief Judge, the Public Utilities Board which was the second Party to the dispute, was not allowed to do so, and the ruling given was that in as much as the appeal was over the head, so to speak, of the Public Utilities Board, it would not be proper for the Public Utilities Board to be a participant in a case in which it was interested and it was an appeal from itself.

That, Mr. Chairman, might well have been a good ruling so far as the law goes, but it was a bad ruling so far as the community's interests go; if the Public Utilities Board which exercises the authority in managing, so far as it can, the public utility when it has a dispute with an individual utility cannot argue its case before the Chief Judge as the other party to the dispute can, the community must obviously suffer because the Public Utilities Board is the agent of the community acting in that capacity against the individual utility. So where the law wants amending apart from any other consideration is just here; that something has got to be done to make it possible that in all disputes between the Public Utilities Board and a particular utility, the Public Utilities Board must be able to present its case before the highest Court of the land in the same manner and to the same extent as the utility with which it has a dispute. That is the direction in which the law needs amending for now; the wider issue of Government policy towards the Light and Power Company can rest on the side for the moment, because it is not exactly at the moment. What is important is that when once the Public Utilities Board has said that it will not approve of such and such an increase, that should be final; but in case the dispute is referred to a Judge, let the Public Utilities Board be in a position to argue its case before the Judge as the private utility can.

I should just like the Hon. Minister and Government to understand the main grievance is not now the question of public ownership of a particular utility; the immediate grievance is that the Public Utilities Board is at a disadvantage on legal disputes because it cannot argue its case to the same extent as a private utility, and that is the direction in which we should all like to see the Law amended.

The question that Head X - Fire Brigade, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XV - POLICE

Head XV - Police was called.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, as you would see, Head XV - consists of a number of items and I take it that hon. members have already gone through them. If there is anything which hon. members would like to know I would be very pleased to give them.

I beg to move that Head XV stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, there are various items under this Head of which I would like some information. In connection with Item 38, Incidentals, I would like some information as to the amount which is expended on the checking and repairs of stop watches. I would like a breakdown in respect of Incidentals because this item is dealing with various things. I would like to know what it costs for repairing stop watches and how many stop watches have been repaired and checked. I would also like to know whether he can give the number of occasions which each stop watch has been repaired during the present financial year. As you know, Sir, on the findings of these stop watches alone, people are convicted and occasionally substantially fined for speeding when the speedometer of their car or lorry is showing another rate of speed. As you know, Sir, two policemen go into the witness stand and say that their stop watches showed such and such a speed and people are convicted on that. I remember at one time these policemen came into court on several occasions saying that the persons they were charging were doing 37 1/2 miles per hour but today we find a greater deviation in the rate of speed according to their sworn testimony in respect of these breaches of the law. It is very important that these stop watches should not only be checked and repaired but checked and repaired by someone who is certified to be competent. I am not in a position to say whether the gentleman who repairs these watches is certified. We do know that he is a watch repairer of long standing, and I have no doubt that he is conscientious and does his best. When we know that any motorist can be convicted on the evidence of these stop watches against the evidence of the speedometer on his car, and especially when the gentleman who is alleged to check and repair these stop watches does not even come into court for one to ask his experience and his qualifications and whether he checked the two stop watches, it is very important that we have some information about checking and repairs of these stop watches and what are the qualifications of the person who repairs and checks them - and I mean apart from the fact that we know that this gentleman is amiable, experienced, and quite an affable person. Sir, you know you are not allowed to practice as a doctor, a dentist, a veterinary surgeon or even a solicitor without producing some qualification. What is requested by the police in respect of the gentleman to whom they entrust the repairing of these stop watches and on the strength of whose work, we have numerous people convicted from time to time?

Let us turn to Item 48, Motor Transport, if I may deal with all of these items and then let the Hon. Minister give me an answer, the Note says that there has been greater activity than was expected on the part of the Mobile Section of the Police Force. This has been caused chiefly by the increase in the number of accidents and crime.

Now, Sir, nothing is more likely to cause a greater increase in the number of accidents than the present Police method of tracking down people who are speeding in motor vehicles. I do not know if you are aware of the procedure which police motor cyclists use in doing this. What happens is that a motor cyclist would come into court and say that he was driving his motor cycle behind the defendant who, he was suspicious, was exceeding the speed limit, for, say, one-eighth or one-quarter of a mile maintaining an even speed and in maintaining this even speed on a measured distance behind the defendant, his speedometer was showing 45, 50, and even in some cases 60 miles per hour. Now, this is where his speedometer is always correct. If it is the speedometer of your car, that speedometer is always wrong; you have to take what the stop watches say. He goes on to say that having continued on that measured distance at that speed he decided to pass out the defendant and, as you know, he would have to pass out that motor vehicle at a greater speed than what the defendant was doing. He goes on to say that having got in front of the vehicle, he then signalled the driver to stop.

Of course, the Ministers are more or less con-

tioned to Ministerial business, Government House and places like that, and when they arrive home late at night they would not realise what is taking place on the roads. Sir, you will realise what a danger it is having these police motor cyclists going at greater speeds than these motor lorries. You can realise the greater potentiality of danger and increase in the number of accidents through this method of policemen trying to track down speedsters. Do you realise how many more accidents can be caused by police motor cyclist? This goes on in the Island daily, and for this there is no legal sanction whatsoever.

Now, these police motor cyclists go to the parish of St. George on Constant Road to try out the speedometers of their motor cycles. They have no means of testing them mechanically: so they take their motor cycles to Constant Road and two policemen with stop watches stay over a measured distance while these motor cyclists traverse this measured distance at speeds, sometimes of forty, fifty and sixty miles per hour. Now, this happens on Constant Road which is an important highway. It leads to District "C", St. Philip, and various popular places in this Island. These police motor cyclists traverse this measured distance two or three times in order to test the speedometer of their motor cycles by the two stop watches which are checked and repaired by a certain venerable jeweller of this Island. What are the two hon. members of St. George doing in trying to stop this sort of thing taking place on a road in the parish which they represent?

I cannot see that when they are just simply testing out something which they doubt, they should not have a mechanical contrivance to test it. They should have some other system of testing speed, not to put a motor cycle at 40 to 60 miles an hour in order to satisfy your self that the speedometer is working correctly. If that is allowed to go on along that highway, do not be surprised if you have a greater number of accidents, than are anticipated by the note to this Item 48.

While we are at this stage, it would be a good idea for the Government to give a hint to the Commissioner of Police about the speed at which these Police vans are being driven, because the drivers of these vans feel that they are immune from prosecution for committing any breach of the traffic laws of this Island, particularly the laws relating to speed. They feel that they will never be prosecuted for exceeding the speed limit. I know that a certain corporal who is no longer in the Police Force, prosecuted a certain private, who also is no longer in the Force, and the latter was convicted and fined; however, in the Assistant Court of Appeal, the decision of the Police Magistrate was reversed, because there was a technical flaw in the conviction.

The third point is in connection with Item 71, "Upkeep of Traffic Lights." The Note to this Item says this: "The cost of supply of current to traffic lights was underestimated. The cost has been further increased since July by the additional 12 1/2 % per cent charged by the Barbados Light and Power Company."

I would like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House two questions; the first is, who is the person required to give this estimate? and, secondly, who was the person responsible for this underestimate? It has been stated that the further increase is only due to the additional 12 1/2% charged by the Barbados Light and Power Company. It would be interesting to learn what was the original estimate for the upkeep of these lights, and who made that estimate.

In respect of Item 77, "Motor Launches," I observe that this is what is stated in the Note: "During installation of the engines it was discovered that much of the woodwork of the launches was rotten." I am wondering if there is no routine inspection of these launches. Would the Hon. Leader of the House, on behalf of the Minister for Police, give us the information, if he can, as to whether these launches are periodically inspected, as any private owner would do in respect of his own launch, or any firm would do in respect of their own property. According to the Note, it was not discovered until the question of providing new diesel engines and the engines were actually

being installed - it was not until then that anybody had the slightest idea that a lot of the woodwork of the launches was rotten. That, Mr. Chairman, does not suggest that the property of the taxpayers is being looked after as we would expect it would be looked after. I should like to know if there is any regular inspection, not only of these launches, but of the other property belonging to the taxpayers who are heavily taxed to run the Government of this Island. I think we should have our minds set at rest, as to whether there is any inspection, not only of these launches, but of other property in connection with the Police Department; otherwise, they might be coming to us at some future date in respect of who knows what. It is only for the first time that they discovered that much of the material of the launches was rotten when they were installing the engines.

Mr. WALCOTT: On this question of the motor launches, what I would like to know, is if there is any intention on the part of the Government to have more marine control. It has been brought to my attention that there is not enough marine control in the harbour, and some of the people, who have to work out there, say that they experience urchins jumping aboard their craft at night; therefore, it seems to me that there is not sufficient marine control in the harbour. I believe that since that unfortunate incident took place in the harbour, and which is now engaging the attention of the Court, I had drawn to the attention of the Government that something should be done about this matter.

As regards Item 82, "Motor Vehicles," the Note is very peculiar to me. This is what it says: "22,100 was provided in Estimates 1956-67 for the purchase of the following: One (1) Bus for the Police Band, one (1) Hillman van, one (1) Humber car and two (2) motor cycles."

I am not questioning the accuracy of the Note, but it may be that this Head might have been passed at a very early hour in the morning. What I would like to know from the Hon. Minister is this: why do they have the use of this Humber car for the Police Department? Do you have a State Car for the Police Department too? We know that the Head of the Administration has a Humber car, but why, in addition to the cars and the motor cycles and the travelling allowance, there must still be the use of this Humber car for the Police? For what purpose is it being used?

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, as regards the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition relative to the number of stop-watches being repaired and so on, I was trying to get that information, but it was not forthcoming, and I should like to promise him that as soon as I get the information, I will pass it on to him. That reply holds good for the other Item in respect of Motor Transport. As far as the Traffic Lights are concerned, I am not quite sure as to who really made the estimate, but if I remember correctly, the Engineer of the Government Department in collaboration with the Commissioner of Police, used to deal with these matters. As I say, I am not quite sure about that, and therefore, I would not like to make a dogmatic statement. The amount estimated for the upkeep of these lights, was \$500, and we need another \$200 to carry us through to the end of the Financial Year.

As far as the inspection of the motor launches is concerned, these launches are inspected and serviced by the Department of Highways and Transport. I think that that was an order given in 1954, soon after Ministerial Government started. As a matter of fact, in respect of Government vehicles, an order was given that they should be repaired by the Department of Highways and Transport.

The launches are inspected and also serviced by the Transport Department.

As far as the question raised by the hon. member about marine control is concerned, I cannot say that anything has been done to tighten up control there, but I will make enquiries, and inform the hon. member as

soon as I get the information. I do agree with him because on one or two occasions I happened to have gone out on a launch, and there were a lot of boys jumping on these launches and going for a ride out to the ship, wetting the passengers and behaving very disorderly indeed. I am glad that he raised the question because I think something should be done to control these chaps who perhaps might be doing these things for fun, but which might be detrimental to passengers.

I cannot answer the hon. member's questions as to why the Police Department wanted a Humber instead of a Vauxhall. I should like to remind him that we agreed to this in the 1957 Estimates.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are two items under this Head which arrest my attention very forcibly. There are two small items but they illustrate the tendency on the part of Government to get too farcical. The items are No. 49 and No. 68. Item 49 deals with the maintenance of prisoners in Lock-up and the note says: "There has been an increase in the cost of biscuits. A greater quantity of biscuits has also been required." I may, of course, be alone in looking at these things this way, but it seems to me that we are always on the border-line of farce when a matter like this has to engage the attention of this Committee. Surely it ought to be possible in the Estimates every year to gauge this kind of thing and to take into account the possible increase if there is any - I am sorry to hear that there is - in the amount of food and nourishment provided for prisoners in Lock-up; but to tell us that you want more biscuits is not the sort of thing that should be engaging the attention of this Committee.

Much worse even is the explanation to Note 68, "Removal of Dead Bodies - the cost of removal of dead bodies has been increased by \$2 per body. There has also been an increase in the number of dead bodies." Evidently, the drafter of this heard of Billy Graham and the \$2 men. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat shocked to discover that there are some people in this island who are so ungrateful that they prefer to die rather than live under the blessings of the regime in power, but even they must exercise their choice. But seriously, it seems to me here again that this is a matter that could well be budgeted for and you should not have to come to the House and its Committee of Supply for \$800 for this kind of thing. I would like the Minister to say, while we are at it, what has caused the increase in the number of dead bodies. He may not have the statistics at his disposal, but he may have been briefed by the person responsible for this particular thing. Why is there such an increase in the number of dead bodies necessitating this vote of \$800 now that the current Financial Year is drawing to its close? It does seem to me that these items are rather too small to occupy the attention of this Committee and that adjustments could be made in the Estimates to cover them without it being necessary to have recourse to the House for matters like these.

Hon. M.E. COX: The note explains, Sir, that the contract was awarded after the Estimates were passed; therefore it was not anticipated at the time that there would be an increase by \$2 or anything. I daresay that the Asian Flu must have taken quite a few people very well.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Leader of the House in answering the question about the car said that he did not know why the Police Department bought a Humber instead of a Vauxhall. I criticised this at the time and have not yet got a proper answer from the Government. Every Police Inspector and every Police Superintendent is allowed a loan to purchase a car and is paid travelling allowance, and you have a run of cars in the Police Department. Now you have vans, Land Rovers and motorcycles in the Police Department; are we not entitled to ask for a sensible explanation on buying a Humber car and putting it up in the Central Station? If you are giving travelling allowance to every officer, why buy another car and put it down? If somebody is coming here, do you

want to have a State car for the police too? Be honest. This is allowing something reckless. You bought a bus to carry policemen; naturally that is nothing to object to, because when the Police Department used a truck and the rain fell, the police had to take shelter. Can't you tell us why you bought this car? I suppose you might tell me why I bought one. When you came with this in the Estimates, I criticised it, but now you have bought it you should tell us the reason. I understand the Inspector General of Police of the West Indies, is making a tour here; I do not grudge any officer having a car, but couldn't you use one of the other police cars? This Legislature will not object to your having a car, but since you have a van, a bus, Land Rovers, and each Inspector and Superintendent of Police has a car, why buy another car to put in a glass-case? You cannot pay the Commissioner travelling allowance, and then allow him to use that car. Just because you can put \$4,000 in the Estimates to buy a car, are you going to put it there to rot out? When these things are asked for, Government should ask the Head of the Department for a reason, and you will be able to say why you want it. If somebody asked why you wanted a bus, you could say you had to transport the Police Band all over the island; and if you were asked why you wanted money for the line of cars, you could say that the Superintendents and Inspectors must travel.

But then, for all that ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. member is breaking the rules of this Committee.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I have not raised my voice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Government Minister responsible for this matter should investigate it. I am sure that the Hon. Leader of this House is bound to say that this is something which he cannot immediately answer. I repeat that this car is bought purely for the conveyance of a Commissioner of Police on a visit to the island. If you buy something just to take somebody out when he comes here, then for God's sake tell us how necessary is that? I am sure not one of them over there can answer me and tell us why they bought this car.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, after hearing what the hon. senior member for the City has said, I think the Hon. Leader of this House should undertake to have an investigation into the matter to find out if it is true; because if we agreed to buy a car (and I know that they bought a Humber motor car which is not a cheap motor car) we should know why you bought this car and why it is not being used and is jacked up. Tell us what has gone wrong with it. When it is jacked up, it shows that you do not use it. As a matter of fact, I understand that you used it on an occasion to track down some gentleman who was here

Hon. M.E. COX: I would promise the Hon. member to get the information but I would like to say that I know that I know that a car is being used by the Police Superintendents to travel around in. They have to use cars in addition to pick ups but if you say that this car is not being used, that is a different question. If it is not undergoing repairs and is only being jacked up, that is a different question. However, I will have that matter investigated.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to repeat exactly what I said just now. You have provided allowances for everybody. You have provided all these things. What about this particular car? What we really want to know is how many times a week do you use that car. You buy a car to use it. I do not know that some people buy cars and if the train sets up they put the car down and walk

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is quite possible

that the Hon. Minister does not really know anything about this particular car and he may not even have seen it. As a matter of fact, when this matter was first mentioned to the Hon. Premier some months ago, he denied having any knowledge about its existence. That car was used by the Commissioner of Police and some of his immediate subordinates when Mr. L.F. Burnham, now a member of the British Guiana Legislative Council, was on a visit to the Island and it was thought by the authorities that he had to be watched because he was an alleged Communist or had communistic leanings. I remember a memorable occasion when Mr. Burnham was travelling with some friends of mine, our car broke down and the Police Commissioner obliged us by giving us a lift in his car and so we did not arrive at our destination late at all. I have not seen this car on the road since. I was told that it has not been used for a considerable time. I do not know that it was used on that particular occasion.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. member would appreciate that no Government would purchase a car for that reason. I am not saying that the car was purchased to be a supplement to the Commissioner's car but I know that a car is being used by the police in their work. Part of the use of this car is for the purpose of tracking crimes and it was bought for that purpose. However, I will promise the hon. member that I will investigate the matter. I repeat, it is not purely an officers' car; it is not there to be used wholly and solely by the Commissioner of Police; It is to be used for general purposes and tracking crimes.

The question that Head XV, Police, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXVII - CHARGES OF DEBT

Head XXVII, Charges of Debt, was called.

Hon. M.E.COX: I beg to move that Head XXVII, stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not have very much to say on this Head because, curiously enough, this is one instance in which the Addendum not only is self-explanatory but is fully self-explanatory. What bothers me is this: I would have thought that Government would have by now issued in more detail, information as to the whole state of these loans which have been raised in the last year or two. I have raised the matter in Committee and in the House before while the Hon. Premier was present on the point that Government has failed to inform the House as to the success of these loans as have been issued. Occasionally we read that such a particular loan has been over subscribed or has been subscribed but in the case of the 1957 Loan, it was carefully withheld from this House and from the public at large that the loan was not subscribed because individuals had not bought the debentures. On the contrary, had Government waited for that, Government would not have got the money it wanted, so Government borrowed the money from the funds of the Savings Bank.

Now, this is something which involves large issues of policy. There may be nothing legally wrong if an opinion is sought on borrowing money from the Government Savings Bank; but some people might feel that these funds are Trust Funds, and that you ought to amend the Savings Bank Act before you borrow the money. But there is something which is even more important than that. The ordinary man or woman who puts his \$5, \$10, \$15, \$50 or \$100, as the case may be, into the Savings Bank, cannot expect to get more than 3% on it. When you borrow money, when you issue debentures, you are paying as high as 5 1/4%, but the 5 1/4% which you pay the Government Savings Bank, by some curious misfortune, is not going to the small man, and it is hard for him to have his money used without his consent, how-

ever good the purpose may be, when he is not going to reap the benefits. How much better it would be to tell the public at large who have put the money in the Savings Bank that they themselves could purchase debentures and get the higher rate of interest. When the Manager of the Savings Bank has to buy Government stock, he will not pass the 5 1/4% to the public; he will pass on only 3%. That is a point which the Government should take up, because it involves one or two serious issues.

The first point is the use of the funds of the Savings Bank, without amending the Act, because the Executive Committee of this Island is exercising the authority through the Accountant General, the Financial Secretary and people like that who are the Trustees of the Government Savings Bank. I would like to hear arguments on that; I do not know whether it is the best thing that the Trustees of the Savings Bank Funds can themselves borrow these funds and lend them to themselves. That is a point which should not be dismissed just like that. I think that there is some merit in it.

The second point is this: If you are going to do that, if you are taking money out of the Government Savings Bank to subscribe to a loan which you yourself are raising, the full benefit ought to be given to the people whose money it is. It is not the best thing - it is not fair to the depositors to be getting 3% when the Bank itself is getting 5% by investing their money with the Government and get 5%. That would certainly bring a safer and quicker income to small depositors.

The question that Head XXVII - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. M.E.COX: I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: As to this Head, Mr Chairman, the item on which I speak quite often in this Chamber is "Entertainment of Visiting Service Personnel." I would like to know from the Hon. Leader of the House, if there is any improvement in the method of providing entertainment for these people. I have heard allegations made by men of Her Majesty's Ships that they have not been provided with the facilities of meeting whom they described as the Creoles the local girls of Barbados - at the entertainments which are provided for them. I have heard complaints made by coloured ladies that they would like the opportunity of providing entertainment for, and of being the hostesses of, members of Her Majesty's Ships and foreign ships as well, and they have no opportunities of so doing, because they are left out. There are just one or two exceptions -- the pale anaemic looking coloured girls and - with those exceptions the coloured ladies are not given the opportunity of being invited to the dances, excursions and so on which are provided out of public funds for entertaining the men of the fleet.

We must face the fact that the vast majority of the people of this Island are coloured and when our people are coloured and when our people are coloured in the majority, the personnel of Her Majesty's Ships must be surprised to find that the number of people who are their hostesses are of a different complexion from the majority of the people of this Island. That is what many of the sailors have told me, that when they are invited to these entertainments, they will find half a dozen coloured girls and 94 coloured whites. If they are providing the entertainment, if the people who are doing it traditionally, are the people with the traditional point of view, well, let them be segregated so that when we see six buses carrying sailors and local ladies, let us see that these ladies are representative of every section, of every colour or race in this Island and of every shade or complexion, not merely those who would like to pass for

whites. That is not fair to the visitors who are curious and who would like to talk to our local people, the Creoles, so as to get to know something of West Indians and particularly Barbadians. Through the efforts of these people who organise these tours, functions and dances, there is a policy which almost amounts to segregation being practised with respect to the arrangements for the entertainment of the visiting personnel from ships of the various fleets.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I really do not have much information so as to reply to the hon. member in that respect, but I think that a lot of this entertainment is as a result of voluntary effort. This money only pays a very small part of this entertainment, and much of it is as a result of local effort. Those of us who travel to other islands see the stupid barriers of class and colour set up but it is a question of conscious effort on anybody's part to perpetuate that state of affairs, there is no one or no Government who is more ready to stamp it out than we on this side of the House are. I assure the hon. member of that fact.

There again, I do not want to throw any blame on anyone, because as I said, some of it is voluntary effort, and the hon. member must know that in some of these occasions where it calls for voluntary effort, there are people who traditionally come forward, and there are others who do not come forward, but I do not think it is anything more than that. There are some people who come forward and entertain sailors and continue to do so from year to year. I know the Y.M.C.A. has always made an effort as an organisation; I see them also sometimes on the Y.M.P.C grounds, and there are other organisations who do things and still continue to play their part. I think that all of us are most concerned about anything which smacks of stupid barriers and which may lend colour to the erroneous ideas which have gained force in other islands that this island is worse than any other place under the sun, and I assure the hon. member that we will continue to do anything we can to improve relationship.

Mr. BRANCKER: In respect of the money which we are being asked to vote, we have already voted \$800 and this amount of \$250 will make a total of \$1,050, and I am recommending that a close watch be kept on the spending of that money to ensure that there is no segregation in respect of local invitees to the functions at which people are entertained from these ships. Obviously, what the hon. member has just spoken of is voluntary effort, because the money comes out of various people's pockets; they are entertained at homes. But when the public purse is being asked to provide something like \$1,050, the principle involved is important, and the Government must ensure that none of the segregationists have any part in the arrangements of these functions or sending out of invitations to the local people in entertaining the personnel of these ships.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I think I should say something on this, because I do not think that these funds only go to the Naval Welfare League as has been suggested. The Naval Welfare League comprises a body of ladies who have carried on this organisation for years. I do know that much of the money spent is through their own effort, because not only do they get up small entertainments to augment their funds, but they get donations from persons who are interested in the welfare of the Navy. I know that they are taken on picnics to the Crane. I have seen several mixed coloured ladies in these groups and not merely white persons. I do not know to what extent the complaint of the hon. member for St. Lucy is true, because I have heard the matter raised over and over again for the last ten years; I do not think it is any worse today than then, and there is nothing to complain about. I do know that all of these funds are not spent by this organisation; there is the Y.M.C.A. which organises football or cricket matches and it calls for money, and I presume some of the money goes into that channel. This is a very worthwhile cause, and I

think they are to be commended for it. I do not wish to say any more than that I do not know of any segregation that exists.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Just let me say that so far as the programme which is being arranged and for which this money is asked is concerned, I have here a list of some of the things that are to take place which includes sight - seeing tours, dances, cricket matches, soccer matches, water polo games together with a few more events, and that the sum needed for transportation, considering the number of ships coming and the number of men that will be on them, is small, and therefore this supplementary vote is being asked for. I agree with the hon. member that there are these voluntary groups and Associations which provide entertainment for these people, and I think they are making a commendable effort.

The question that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$41,273 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question being put and resolved in the affirmative without division, the chairman reported progress and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

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

On reassembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Hon. M.E. COX: I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that there is no quorum.

The bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 2

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture as the next Order of the Day.

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

THE FISHING INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day now

stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill are set out very clearly in the Preamble of the Bill but I should like to tell hon. members of this House that for sometime now we have found it most difficult to get some of these fishermen to renew their insurance premiums when they become due. I think this Hon. House is well aware that we lend fishermen quite an amount of money to convert their boats into powered boats and things of that sort, and we as a Government have to see to it that our money is protected by way of insurance. I may say that it is not every fisherman who is punctual where payment of premiums is concerned and we have found out cases where premiums on fishing boats are not paid and as a result our money is at stake; therefore, we have come down with this Bill to pay their insurance premiums when they fail to pay them for any reason whatsoever so as to safeguard our money; and secondly, we have stipulated that that money must be repaid within a 90 days period; otherwise the boat in question will be seized.

I do not think that is creating any hardship; I think it is helping them to facilitate matters; but we must make it quite clear that we are not adding that money to the loan which we previously gave them; we are doing it as a means of overcoming any difficulties they might have experienced and it is not a long time loan. It is only for 90 days.

Sir, I think it is a very good step and a wise way to keep Government investments enhanced. We have had many chats with fishermen and they too think it is a good thing. They are those who pay their premiums promptly and there are also those who allow them to lapse. We cannot afford to allow these premiums to lapse because during the time the premiums lapse something may happen to the boat and our money may go down the drain. I think it is a very good thing and I think hon. members will agree with me. I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in principle one must agree with this amendment. I only want to repeat what I said on another occasion. I just want to throw out to the Government that they came here for the payment of a Marine Mechanic to be attached to the Fisheries Department and it was discussed in this House whether that officer would be the person responsible for the repairing of fishing boats or whether he would just be giving advice to fishermen on the care of their engines. At the time, the Minister in charge said that he was there only for the purpose of giving advice and as to the question of repairs that officer would not be able to do that.

I want the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to give careful consideration to what I am going to suggest to him. I do appreciate the efforts made on behalf of the Government to lend money to fishermen and to have their boats power driven. But a careful study must be made of these motors. I am throwing this out because I have given some thought to it. I have discussed within the last few weeks with fishermen on the St. James Coast this matter and they have told me that the cost of repairing these engines is very great. One of them showed me a bill which was in the vicinity of \$400. Sir a man must be extremely well off at the end of a season to be able to pay \$385 or nearly \$400 to repair his engine. What I am suggesting to Government is that if you do not do something in this respect, you will find yourself within a period of 10 years holding a security on just a bunch of scrap iron. This is not in opposition to your lending them this money. What I am trying to point out is that you should give consideration to the setting up at central points in this Island a repair shop for these fishermen and provide some means of getting these en-

gines out of their boats so as to reduce the cost of the repairs. I am not criticising the Barbados Foundry for the price they charge these fishermen but something will have to be done if you are to encourage this fleet. As I have said, if you continue to lend them money and hold no collateral security - because all the security you are having is the boat - you will find yourself in the course of time holding a security on a bunch of scrap iron.

I want you to give careful consideration in the life of these engines and I am sure the Hon. Minister will take into consideration what I am saying. I agree that you are going to lend them more and more money but as you lend them more and more, the question which you have to ask yourself is: how will I get it back? The average income for a year of a fisherman investing in a boat worth £600 is about \$400. Even if it is \$300, that is very good; but when at the end of the year he has to pay between \$300 and \$400 for repairs, that is not good enough and I counsel Government to do something to relieve that situation because, as I have said, all you will have as your security is a bunch of scrap iron. In other words in ten years' time he will not be able to pay you off if he has to go on with the payment of these repairs.

I am going to suggest that the Government make some provision for one or two central repair shops at one or two points in the Island where the Marine Mechanic can go and advise fishermen and where they can have their engines taken out at points and brought there so as to relieve the situation.

In passing, I want to say that I understand that you are going to have regulations as regards your general marketing of wares shortly but, be that as it may, I want to make this suggestion in respect of the market at Eagle Hall. I have already drawn this to the Hon. Minister. It has been brought about as a result of the insanitary conditions in which fish mongers offer fish for sale at that corner.

Provision was made in that Market for the sale of fish and meat. I know that the Commissioners of Health for the parish of St. Michael have made it clear that although they were working on the general hours of closing the Bridgetown Market, a portion of the Market was kept open because nobody could control the time when boats would come in with fish whether it is 8, 9 or 10 o'clock at night -- and railed off for the purpose of marketing fish, and watchmen and others were told that, after a certain time, there was no necessity to charge people who came in to sell fish. I do not know if those conditions still exist, but from what I have observed, the position has gone back to what it was before; it is just as bad or even worse. The fish are thrown on the ground just as they were thrown on the ground in former days; they are thrown in the gutter and the market is right opposite!

I have raised the question with the Hon. Minister and I am happy to say that he took steps immediately; but the question is being raised that the Police have no authority in this matter. If you offer some place for people to sell their fish under conditions conducive to proper sanitation, and they still put the fish in the street, then I say that it is the duty of the Government to protect people by calling upon them to carry their fish into the Market. It is not good enough for people to put fish in the gutter; you provide a Market for people and I say that it is time for the Superintendent of the Market to get into his car at night and see for himself what I am talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member should pursue that point any further. I think that he has already elaborated on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not going any further with that, but I think I should ask the Hon. Minister to impress upon the Superintendent of the Market that things should be done as they were done when the Market was first opened. Within recent months conditions are con-

tinuing as they have been continuing in days gone by. We want to see about the life of those motors for the fishing boats and about the provision whereby the repairs can be made cheaper so that the Government will not be left with the security of merely old iron; it is a fact that if the motors are not good, then the Government will only be left with old iron. The actual motors will cost more than the boats and if you do not maintain and keep them in order, all you will have left will be old iron as your security

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I see that in paragraph (d) of Sub-clause 1 of Clause 2 of this Bill, provision is made to enable loans to be taken out for maintaining marine insurance policies in respect of fishing boats, and in paragraph (b) provision is made for converting fishing boats where they are propelled by sails into fishing boats propelled by engines. Sometimes it is necessary to commend the Government on what it does, and I certainly want to commend them on the speed with which they have moved to pay attention to the conversion of sailing boats into powered boats. In January, last year, I tabled an Address here pointing out to the Government that considerable members of these sailing crafts were lying idle and rotting on the beaches, because their owners could not get crews for sailing them. Throughout the Island, there was this dearth of men who are willing to take out sailing boats, because they were accustomed to getting out to sea in mechanised boats, whereby, they had less work to do and they spent much less time at sea. They were, therefore, more willing to go to sea in these powered boats, than in sail boats. The Address of which I gave notice on the 8th January, last year, was as follows:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House is deeply concerned over the position of the owners of fishing craft with sails who in consequence of the availability of mechanised boats, are finding it impossible to obtain crews to man their boats at sea.

In view of the past contribution made by these craft to the economy of the country, the present distress of many of their owners and the fact that these boats which represent a considerable investment on the part of the owners are at present rotting on the beaches, the House is of the opinion that some assistance should be rendered to them to enable them, wherever practical, to convert the boats into mechanised units.

That was over a year ago. You can well understand, Mr. Speaker, that in the intervening period, as to those boats which were lying idle on the beaches, their condition has even further deteriorated. There are some which I know have deteriorated so far that it may not be possible to convert them into mechanised boats at all, because they have been lying on the beaches exposed to the elements for over twelve months. Some of them have so much deteriorated that it would be impossible to do anything with them now; therefore, they represent a complete loss to the owners. We have to be concerned about these matters, because quite a number of these boat owners still owe a considerable amount of money to the Government; they have had loans to build or repair the boats; the boats could not go to sea because of the impossibility of getting crews to sail them; they remained lying on the beaches and certainly some attempt should have been made before now to make these loans available for this purpose. Where a man owns a boat fitted with sails and he owes the Government money on that boat, if he did not repay the loan, he could not get any more credit. He could not mechanise the boat, because of the lack of finance, and if he could not work it, then his investment was lying idle. He had no income, and therefore, he could not attempt to repay the loan which he owed the Government. In their own interest, therefore, the Government should have been more anx-

ious to attend to this matter before now. The loan is secured by the boats in some cases, and if the boat is useless, then the security is also useless. You will find that with this provision here, quite a considerable number of people will now approach the Government for financial assistance to convert their boats into mechanised units.

I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, how much I regret myself that the Government has not seen fit or did not see fit to take this particular step before. It cannot be said that it was not drawn to their attention, and the idea of the Opposition tabling matters like this is not merely to take up the time of the House or to take up their own time, but to impress upon the Government the necessity for acting along the lines suggested in the Address, because the Government must understand that the Opposition is just as much a part of the Government of a country as the Government itself, and it should be taken as seriously in the best interest of the Government of the country. When we take it upon ourselves to present Government with conditions affecting any phase of insufficient activity which in our opinion demands the attention of the Government, the least they could do is to investigate immediately if it was not drawn to their attention before, or if they themselves had lost sight of the matter, to attempt to implement suggestions presented by the Opposition. This does not apply only to fishing; it applies to other aspects of industrial life.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with the Fishing Industry now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I mean it can be applied in a general manner. It is impossible to emphasise more the fishing aspect as I have already done, and I say Sir, that while my remarks apply most directly now to the question of fishing, it can be advantageously applied in other directions in all aspects of the life of the community, because the Opposition expects that sometimes the suggestions it makes will be taken by the Government seriously at the time it is made, and not at a considerable time after - especially when, as in this case, Mr. Speaker, the Government itself is so directly involved financially, because it is bound to lose some of this money which it has advanced from the Treasury, because help will be coming too late.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Taking up the burden from where the hon. member has just left off, I am not speaking in respect of my own constituency in St. Peter where we have in Speightstown, and Six Mens very many power-driven boats, but in the parish of St. James represented by the hon. member on my right.

I remember being told by fishermen in the Paynes Bay district of St. James that they had been severely handicapped by owing the Government money for loans on ships that were driven by sail, and finding it a great handicap as they found themselves in competition with power boats in other districts of the Leeward coast; they were in a very desperate condition. This section will bring relief to the fishermen of the Paynes Bay district who will no longer find themselves in such a position. As it happened with them going out to sea in boats that move slowly on to the fishing grounds, they could not sell their fish and could not even get as big catches and as quickly as those who were able to sail in power-driven crafts, and they have been complaining for a long time. I have met them occasionally, not at political meetings, but at meetings of a different nature in the Paynes Bay district and these complaints have reached my ears from fishermen in Paynes Bay. I think they have probably spoken to the hon. junior member for St. James and I am rather surprised to see that he has not joined the hon. senior member for St. Philip to make amends in this direction. It is a piece of legislation which though probably a bit belated, is very welcome. The Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries who represents a maritime parish knows that as well as any of us, and as far as one particular section of fishermen in this island is concerned, I am glad to see that those at Paynes Bay

will no longer have the complaint that they were handicapped by having to confine themselves to these boats as there were large outstanding debts which they could not easily pay off, finding themselves, as they did in competition with power-driven boats. That is my only observation, Sir.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Interpretation Act, and it sets out quite clearly its intention. I think members are aware of the fact that sometimes an officer is on leave pending retirement, but a substantive officer cannot be appointed until the actual leave has expired. Perhaps we have a case in point. Members will remember that not long ago the Chief Secretary went on leave pending his retirement from the service of this Colony; no one could be appointed to the post permanently because of the limitation of the Act, and this Bill now seeks to amend the Act in such a way that when an officer is on leave pending his resignation, retirement, or whatever the case may be, the Governor can appoint someone in his place to receive all the emoluments and perquisites applied to the office.

I think it is pretty simple, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the copy of this Bill here today. You do not know when the Government is going to deal with things. However, without looking at this Bill I want to say that what the Hon. Minister has just said introducing it does not really explain things. Why do you want the Interpretation Act amended for this thing? Last week when I raised the question about your having two Labour Commissioners the Hon. Minister started reading something from the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, and from that Act he said that we could do it and there was nothing wrong. The Hon. Minister said that this amendment is giving them the right to do what I was querying last week. If that is so, then you do not want this amendment to the Interpretation Act. We have now two people as Labour Commissioners, one, Mr. Pickwood, is in the United Kingdom seconded as Liaison Officer. He is not leave nor has he retired from the Government Service; he is still a member of the Government Service and is still pensionable.

The Objects and Reasons of this Bill state that difficulty sometimes arises when, on the retirement or transfer of a public officer, it is desired to replace him while he is on leave and, therefore, still holds the office which he was about to relinquish. Of course, that is a different thing. When you are about to relinquish a post, you know you are on pre-retirement leave; you know that you are going to retire shortly; say, your age for the retirement is going to be in October and, as you know that, you go on pre-retirement leave in April.

What you are saying is that you cannot appoint some person in the post of that officer because, strictly speaking, the person has not relinquished the post. That is so because you can call that officer back and it has happened here already where officers have been on leave and as a result of an emergency arising, you call them back to work.

The Objects and Reasons go on to state that as a general rule there is no reason why two persons should not hold one office provided that funds are available to pay the salaries of both. But this is not the case where the law expressly or by implication otherwise provides.

That is the reason why I asked that question last week. The Hon. Minister in reply said that what they were doing was all right. Now, this Bill says that they want to regularise that. They say that by this they will put enough money in the Estimates so that if the Labour Commissioner or any such person is going on pre-retirement leave, they will be able to appoint another Labour Commissioner.

The Objects and Reasons says: "the object of this Bill, therefore is to provide that when the substantive holder of a public office is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office, another person may be substantively appointed to the office and may exercise all the power and perform all the duties attached to such office. The Officer so appointed will also be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to such office, including emoluments and pension rights."

What I am saying is that all this is put in the Interpretation Act. This is where he could not answer me last week. This deals with where an officer is going to retire and you do not want the post to be held in abeyance. What I cannot get them to tell me is what has happened in the case of the Labour Commissioner. Mr. Pickwood is not retired from the Service; he is holding a non pensionable appointment in the United Kingdom. Mr. Brewster, who is also working in the United Kingdom in this Department is not a Government Officer. He was teaching at Combermere School and he was asked to resign that post and to take up this post in the United Kingdom and it means that if he is to get pension or gratuity, we will have to pass an enabling Bill. What they cannot tell us today is what is Mr. Pickwood's position. Is he still the Labour Commissioner of Barbados? He has been gazetted as Labour Commissioner on secondment on the same day as the substantive holder Mr. Odle was appointed to that office. He cannot be the substantive holder of the office if the Secretary of State for the Colonies has already appointed somebody. You say that he is seconded as Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom. You are also saying that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has appointed somebody else as the Labour Commissioner. If Mr. Pickwood comes back here tomorrow, what will be the position? If another Government gets into power, suppose it does not wish to continue with the Liaison Service in the United Kingdom, what will be the position? I see the Hon. Minister is laughing at what I say. Let me tell him that in Australia a Labour Government was in power and it was defeated. Do you know that at one time the Pope used to rule the world? Do you know that at one time Mussolini used to rule Italy and the people thought that there would be no change? The continual drops of water wear away the stone. Suppose we get into power and we decide that we are not intimating that Government in having a Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom?

Hon. M.E. COX: This is no stone over here; this is steel.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you all were steel I would not be in here. Mr. Chairman, what I was saying was if another Government gets into power or if I were running the Government, I would not want a Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom as they want him because I would not think that I would have to send a white face to tell the people in England that I want work for the people here to do. I would not subscribe to that at all. I met a trade unionists when I was in England I do not subscribe to the idea

that you have to send a white face to tell the people there what you want. Members of that Government go up there and they are not Europeans and they talk to the people up there. When the Hon. Minister goes up there and is speaking on behalf of the people out here, he is speaking on their behalf, not Mr. Pickwood.

How can you reconcile this idea of having two Labour Commissioners? Mr. Pickwood is still the Labour Commissioner of Barbados. We know that the reason for doing this is to protect officers' pension rights. Are you going to make the Liaison officer in the United Kingdom a pensionable post? The Objects and Reasons say that, as a general rule there is no reason why two persons should not hold one office provided that funds are available to pay the salaries of both. I am going to ask the Minister ---

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you addressing the Minister?

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir, I am only doing so through you. The point I am making is that I would like to know from the Hon. Minister if that is the intention, are we to understand that you can have two Attorney Generals at the same time? That is to say, if you second the Attorney General to Tanganyika or some other post, would the Secretary of State for the Colonies appoint another Attorney General to the substantive post as we would not know if the former Attorney General is coming back? Why is it that you cannot call upon Mr. Pickwood to retire?

I cannot understand why the service must be muddled up like this; unless you say that you are accommodating a situation where the person is on pre-retirement leave and he is not coming back; but you want to appoint somebody. In Barbados you have the situation where somebody is on pre-retirement leave for six months and you cannot appoint anybody permanently to the substantive post because the holder of the post is still the holder of the post. The Hon. Minister does not say anything about the situation with regard to Mr. Pickwood, which I questioned. We do not know if Mr. Pickwood is on pre-retirement leave. Mr. Pickwood would get his pension from the emigration vote, because the emigration vote belongs to the Government. You have appointed somebody to the post permanently; Mr. Odle has been appointed permanently to the post and what I cannot get from the Government is this: why is it that Mr. Pickwood has not retired as Labour Commissioner of Barbados? Why is he still gazetted as Labour Commissioner?

Mr. Brewster is no longer an Assistant Master at Combermere School; it is true that this is a Government-aided school but they have seconded him too. This gentleman, Mr. Pickwood, can get his pension rights paid by this Government, having been seconded to another Government post of which this Government has approved. The Hon. Minister cannot claim that this is any Civil Service appointment. The question of anybody working in the United Kingdom is something that the Government of Barbados requires; not what the Public Service Commission requires. If the Hon. Minister feels that the Labour Commissioner is not the person who is to be in the United Kingdom, then the Public Service Commission cannot send him there. The Public Service Commission cannot appoint a Labour Commissioner to Kenya on secondment; that cannot work. The Government must be able to approve of that. The Governor of this colony cannot take the Labour Commissioner and send him to England; the Minister concerned has to approve of that.

When I was in the United Kingdom last year, and was coming back home, I was told that Mr. Pickwood was going back to England and when I came back here, he went back to England. The workers told me that he was going back to England; they told me that they had told the Hon. Minister of Labour that they did not want the Labour Commissioner to go back there. However, that is beside the point. What I am saying is this: that is within the Minister's knowledge, and it is nothing of which he does not approve. We should regularise the position; it should not be such that you have somebody

in a substantive office, the substantive holder has not retired from the service, and we do not know how long the Government will carry on this service. Do you want to have a legacy of having two Labour Commissioners and when Mr. Pickwood comes back here, you will have a Labour Commissioner General or something like that? We are amending this Act to give the right to the Civil Service Commission or the Governor to appoint somebody to a substantive post, where the substantive holder is going to retire. The Hon. Minister has not yet said that Mr. Pickwood has retired, or that he is retiring from the Public Service, so that you have an interpretation like this: If the hon. member reads the Act, he will see that the Crown Law Officers are going to give their interpretation of it; the Act should be amended, because it would be undesirable to have a situation where people are on secondment all over the world and you are filling the substantive posts. We would be filling the substantive post and carrying pension rights which means, that we will be increasing the expenses of the colony by having two people in a post. If Mr. Pickwood retired from the service up to the date when Mr. Odle was appointed to the service, his pension would become due from then. You have not retired Mr. Pickwood, and do you realise that our liabilities as regards pension rights are greater, because Mr. Pickwood's pension rights are continuing so far as this Government is concerned, and at the same time, we have a substantive holder of the post?

We have two things; we have a Labour Commissioner, who has not retired, and you have a substantive holder appointed to the post, and his pension rights will begin from the time he was appointed. If you carry on things like that, you will have our financial liability above what it should be. You are now providing for the salary of the post and in any event, you would be paying out some of it even if you did not pay but one-half of the amount. There are regulations to the effect that if a man acts for a period of seven months, he gets the full salary of the post. On that basis, that would be requiring the Government to pay the large sums they are paying now; but I want to make this point clear: the Hon. Minister asked last week what I was aiming at. I am not aiming at anything so far as this officer is concerned. I am asking if you are satisfied that the interpretation which is being given to the enactment on the Statute Book is a desirable one, because it places you in a very invidious position to have a situation in which you have two substantive holders of a post and you are not sure that the other one is on retirement. I read the *Official Gazette* last week for the hon. member to see what the position is in order that his mind might be made clear.

It is a matter of examining these things, as otherwise you will not be able to assess them. Before I sit down, I should like to tell the hon. member that he should read this Interpretation Act to see that if he tries to give an interpretation of the Act, this is to regularise a situation which is somewhat similar to that and which was not intended. I want to make the hon. member understand that it was not intended to create two posts; that was done in order that the officer should not lose his pension rights. By this you can second a man to the Regional Economic Committee or to the Federal Government, because you are not sure he is going to hold the post all the time, and you will allow him to hold on to the job so as not to lose his pension rights. Usually when you second a person, you make a contribution towards his pension, and therefore, his pension goes on. Mr. Mordecai was seconded from various Governments here, but the Regional Economic Committee contributed towards his pension; that was to help a situation like that. You may appoint a Chief Secretary in the post because you know he is not coming back, but in the case which I raised last week you had the Secretary of State appointing a Labour Commissioner, and that is why I raised the question which has not yet been clarified.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do feel, Sir, that both the House and the community are entitled to some explanation of the issue raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

This is the second occasion on which he has raised the question, and therefore it cannot be claimed that the Government were not apprised that we wanted information on the matter.

My interpretation of the Bill before the House is slightly different from his in the sense that while he thinks it is designed primarily to protect the interest of the man going out, I think it is intended to protect the man coming in, and to ensure that his emoluments and pension rights and all privileges attached to his office become effective from the date of his appointment, even although there may be someone still holding the office who is on pre-retirement leave; but be that as it may, it is not important. The particular aspect to which the hon. member is directing attention applies specifically to the Labour Commissioner and demands clarification. From the beginning it was felt that Mr. Pickwood should not be the man who would be appointed to the United Kingdom: We are not discussing whether or not he is the most suitable person for the post, but in view of the fact that the Colony is now saddled with the emoluments and pension rights of the Labour Commissioner in the substantive post of Labour Commissioner, obviously the question arises over what is the position of Mr. Pickwood who formerly held the post, and who according to the hon. member's contention is still gazetted as Labour Commissioner of Barbados.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there is one single other colony in any part of the West Indies in which a situation like this would exist for any length of time. All of us sat here last Tuesday and heard the hon. member for St. Peter belabour this question at length, and it is to be assumed that what he said had not fallen entirely on deaf ears in so far as Government is concerned; and it is further to be assumed that they raised the question in appropriate quarters after the meeting was over. Today in this appropriate circumstance, he again raised the question. Well, certainly, Sir, the logic of his contention should by now impress itself upon the Government's mind, and in the interest of proper administration of the country for which they are primarily responsible, they should have made some endeavour, even without raising the question again today, to clarify the situation. We cannot afford to have two Labour Commissioners, both simultaneously enjoying all the privileges attached to the office of the Labour Department. It is neither fair to the colony from the point of view of having the affairs of the colony administered in the most efficient manner and certainly the Government itself should not be presented with this point. It is no wild, illogical question which the hon. member is asking. They must understand that they are starting a very bad precedent for the future, because there is no reason why in future we should not have two Income Tax Commissioners when Mr. Marriott goes on leave, and two Attorney Generals or two Commissioners of Police or anything like that. There must be some explanation and I feel that the House is entitled to it from the Government Benches.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, like the hon. senior member for St. Philip who has just sat down, I remember last week I laid emphasis on the fact that my fears surrounded the present post of the Labour Commissioner.

Now, last week when the Minister asked what I was getting at, I said there was a possible eventuality. I think that eventuality has shown itself up; there is a certain Officer, I do not know if he has yet retired, may be he is hoping to do so, - a very high ranking Officer of this island known as the Chief Secretary - who is not in Barbados, and we know that this gentleman will not be coming back to Barbados, but I think up to now he is still Chief Secretary of Barbados. As far as that is concerned, Government probably is able to make this piece of legislation to solve this issue, knowing that this gentleman cannot return to Barbados. That is all right, but I do not like this sort of legislation at all. I do not believe in any sort of legislation which tells that a man can hold two posts at the same time. However expedient

it may be to solve present difficulties in relation to the Chief Secretary, I will never live long enough to appreciate this type of legislation on the Statute Book.

As we know, when people go on retirement, they go on three or six months' pre-retirement leave; they seldom get a year. In the interim somebody acts for him and at the expiration of the term or as near as possible after that, somebody is appointed to the substantive post. I think it is a general rule that should hold; but when we come to make this little piece of expedient legislation to accommodate particular and individual cases, I can never give my wholehearted support. This may do for that particular case because we know he cannot come back to Barbados, and you will want to appoint a Chief Secretary because you cannot let the office go hanging for years.

This might solve this: but looking at legislation as I regard legislation to be, this is not the sort of legislation which I would live long enough to approve. I would not give this my general sanction; it savours of something too patchy. The Government has to use its imagination. Only last week I spoke of a possible eventuality. Of course this piece of legislation was already in draft form; so, as I have said, this might solve that. However, we cannot go on making legislation just to meet individual cases.

As far as the Labour Commissioner's case is concerned, this does not solve that, that is still what it is; that is something which to my mind is out of the ordinary, absolutely abnormal and extraordinary but I would not say anomalous because Mr. Pickwood - so it has been said - is not going to return to this Island. Although it may be known that he may not be coming back here, yet that does not mean that he cannot come back and somebody has already been appointed as Labour Commissioner; therefore, it does not ease the case and I still have my fears on behalf of the present holder of the office. My fears may well be unfounded but they remain because no one has clarified the situation and I will tell Your Honour that you will have to bring a good jurist to clarify them for me, not an ordinary politician. As far as this is concerned, I would never approve of it in a general way. Having done it to suit Mr. Adie's case I would say "yes"; as a general rule, I disapprove.

Hon. M.E.COX: I thought I had explained this to the satisfaction of hon. members on the last occasion. As far as the Bill under discussion is concerned, there is absolutely nothing wrong with it. As I pointed out, the Objects and Reasons explain in detail the intentions of the Bill. What is the intention? I quoted a case where you have your Chief Secretary who has just resigned from the post. What are you saying? He has resigned but he is on leave and you are asking the House to agree to this Bill so that you would be able to appoint a substantive holder to that post. Somebody is acting now, but if this Bill is passed, there is no necessity for the person to be appointed to act in that post; that person would be appointed permanently.

This Bill seeks permission to appoint a substantive holder to a post during the time that somebody holds the office but intends to relinquish but whose term leave has not ended. It is just like pre-retirement leave for six months. When you take pre-retirement leave, you go out of office before going on retirement and we are asking permission to appoint somebody substantively to that office during that time.

Now, Sir, as regards the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter in respect of Mr. Pickwood's position, I have explained that to the House already and have quoted the Civil Establishment Act of 1949 which gives the authority to His Excellency the Governor to appoint somebody in that post. I will read that part of the Act again. In sub section 2 of Section 5, it says: "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." I pointed out that Mr. Odle is Labour Commissioner just as if the office were vacant and I also pointed out on the last occasion when we discussed this matter that Mr. Pickwood was not coming back to Barbados. (Mr. F.L. WALCOTT: Therefore that Act conflicts with what this Bill provides.) How does it conflict? One is not at variance with the other. I said that for all intents and purposes, the office of Labour Commissioner became vacant because the Labour Commissioner who was seconded to the office of Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom had been sent back to the United Kingdom to carry on in that office in which he was carrying on before he came back to the island as Labour Commissioner and that he was not coming back to the Island. I say again that that needs no more clarification. The Government has no doubt about that; the Government is not worried about it; the Government is acting under the laws laid down. This is nothing to take back to the Executive Committee. The law provides for that and we are acting under the law. Mr. Pickwood has gone back to the United Kingdom in the post to which he was seconded in 1955 and, as I have said already, the Government has an agreement with Mr. Pickwood as Liaison Officer of the United Kingdom and I say again that Mr. Pickwood is not coming back to Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT: He should retire.

Hon. M.E. COX: I agree but I think that the hon. member will appreciate, he having just talked about pension rights and so on, that Mr. Pickwood has not yet reached the age where he can retire and draw his pension. Why force him to retire to lose his pension just to carry on the job in the United Kingdom? I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows more of Mr. Pickwood than I. As Your Honour knows, an officer in that bracket can retire when he reaches the age of 50 years but Mr. Pickwood has not yet reached that age; therefore, why say that he should retire? It is not fair, because he would lose his pension; and for that reason he remains as Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom and at the same time he will get his pension as soon as his service comes to an end which I do not think would be very long from now.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the workers in the United Kingdom told him that they did not want Mr. Pickwood to come back there. Well, Sir, I would like to say this: I cannot say that that was the consensus of opinion. You might sometimes hear the workers say something, but I am sure that the feeling of the workers, who are scattered all over the place, could not have been ascertained at that time. I have met a few of these workers and I would like to say that we should be grateful and thankful, and we should say a word of praise about Mr. Pickwood, because he was the pioneer in this good work which we have set up over there. I am sure that everybody with whom I have come into contact when I was in the United Kingdom, did say that Mr. Pickwood has done a good job, and we know that he has done a good job. I say quite publicly, that this Government is thankful to Mr. Pickwood for the work which he has done and we highly appreciate that good work.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke about Mr. Brewster. I have also had a very good report about him. Everybody feels that he is very keen, very efficient, very co-operative and very well respected by employers and employees alike; therefore, I can very well see that he is definitely the logical successor to Mr. Pickwood. I go further and say that if the hon. member had expressed his praise and laudation of Mr. Brewster as he has done, perhaps recently, that would have been a good thing; but I say that there is absolutely nothing wrong with the position as it stands. Mr. Pickwood will not be coming back to Barbados. Mr. Odle has been gazetted as Labour Commissioner of Barbados; he performs the duties of

Labour Commissioner and there is no question of Mr. Pickwood's coming back. There is no doubt in my mind, or in the mind of the Government as to what the position is with respect to the office of Labour Commissioner or of Mr. Pickwood, who is Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom. I regret that the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who has led off this attack, is not as well aware of the arrangements and agreements which we have had, otherwise, I might say that he would not have wasted our time in making it appear as if something has gone wrong, whereas, in truth and in fact, this is the usual manner in which the functions of the Government and the various officers concerned are carried out.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. M.E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think it is right that I should take this opportunity to reply to remarks which the Hon. Minister has made. I take strong objection to the Hon. Minister talking about my wasting time in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Clause 2 of this Bill, and I am asking the hon. member to keep to that Clause. No second reading speeches can be made now.

Mr. WALCOTT: In normal circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it would be out of order. I cannot see that you have any right, before I begin to say anything on this Clause, to tell me that there cannot be any second reading speeches being made now. I think that is very improper. I say that I am taking this opportunity to reply to the remarks made by the Hon. Minister when he said that I am wasting the time of this House. I am saying that I am an elected member of this House, and I have the right to speak on any issue which comes before this House in the manner I feel like doing. In reply to what was said -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see where the hon. member can make any reply on this particular Clause. The explanatory note will tell you what this Clause is all about and the hon. member can only speak on that. There cannot now be any reply made to what the Hon. Minister has said.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you cannot see it, Mr. Chairman, that is not my fault. The Hon. Minister made a speech in which he made reference to me as wasting the time of the House and I have a perfect right to say that I object to that statement. This is in relation to the point I made with regard to the situation and as to the right of officers on secondment. This is what this Clause says:

2... "The Interpretation Act, 1949, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section twenty-five thereof the following new section-

25A. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any subsidiary legislation, when the substantive holder of a public office is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office, it shall be lawful for another person to be appointed substantively to the same public office and such person shall be the substantive holder of such office and may exercise all the powers and perform all the duties attached to such office to the exclu-

sion of the officer on such leave of absence and shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments and pension privileges) notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any rights or privileges which the officer on such leave of absence may have in respect of emoluments or pension."

I you were following this matter, Mr. Chairman, you would realise that the Hon. Minister was speaking on the Civil Establishment Act, but the wording is changed in the matter of the payment of a pension. The Hon. Minister has now said for the first time that the reasons why the Officer mentioned was not called upon to retire was due to the fact that he had not reached the age at which he has to retire and draw his pension. If that is the reason for it, then they have done something in order to accommodate a particular officer in these circumstances with which I say I do not agree.

Hon. M.E.COX: That applies to everybody.

Mr. WALCOTT: But I do not agree with it, because what you have done is to give a person a post of higher emoluments and at the same time allowing him to hold on to his pension rights, so that he must decide which master to serve.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, the office is not higher; that is misleading.

Mr. WALCOTT: The emoluments are higher; the emoluments to the post in the United Kingdom are higher than those of the Labour Commissioner. You say it is not true, but I am going to show you where it is true. He does not get less in England than in his substantive post, then he gets allowances and other things, therefore the emoluments must be higher.

Hon. M.E.COX: Surely we all understand emoluments.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are not saying they are pensionable, but with his allowances he will be drawing in actual cash in his hands in excess of his substantive post.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is referring to emoluments in his hands. When you use the words "in his hands," whom do you mean?

Mr. WALCOTT: "In his hands" referring to the case of the Labour Commissioner. We are drawing a case to point out what we mean by passing this Act. What I am pointing out to the Hon. Minister is that you cannot pass this Interpretation Act to do something that Government has done already. In fact, Mr. Pickwood will retire from this post. He is a Civil Servant. This Bill reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any subsidiary legislation, when the substantive holder of a public office ..."

Mr. Pickwood is a public officer; that is the point I am trying to make clear. He is on leave pending his retirement.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, he is reading into this what could not apply to Mr. Pickwood. He is not on leave of absence; he is on secondment to the post of Liaison Officer in England, which is quite a different thing to a man being on leave.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should not get up and say that when earlier he said that the reason why you have to maintain this technical term of arrangement is because you do not want to call upon him to resign and lose his pension rights, and the reason for the secondment is to allow him to keep his pension rights. I say that is not right and I do not agree with it, because under normal circumstances if this Interpretation Act is passed today a person would be able (a)

to hold an office like the Labour Commissioner and (b) take up another job which is non-pensionable. In this instance he does not retire from the post because he is on secondment, but he has no intention of returning to this job. We do not agree with this method, because this Interpretation Act in essence is now being passed to regularise a situation which you have created; but you say the creation of this is only a question of secondment. It is only a question of secondment, because out of your mouth you said by this Act you can use any interpretation. I have nothing against the officer concerned, but he is getting a privilege from the Government who is permitting him to carry on until pension time, and therefore he would be getting higher emoluments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are saying every time that this particular Clause is being passed to accommodate a certain officer.

Mr. WALCOTT: Let me read the Bill for you so that you will understand the full implications of this Clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must keep to the particular Clause.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have the right to speak on this without being interrupted, and you cannot rule me out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must deal with Clause 2.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am dealing with Clause 2, and I am going to deal with it in the way I think it should be dealt with.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I will deal with you accordingly.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot deal with me. I have been elected in here by the people and not by your good wishes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must keep to the Clause.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am keeping to the Clause, but if you cannot understand, it is not my fault. I will go on to read.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any subsidiary legislation, when the substantive holder of a public office is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office, it shall be lawful for another person to be appointed substantively to the same public office and such person shall be the substantive holder of such office and may exercise all the powers and perform all the duties attached to such office to the exclusion of the officer on such leave of absence and shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments and pension privileges) notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any rights or privileges which the officer on such leave of absence may have in respect of emoluments or pension."

What I am pointing out is that this officer who is on leave, and whom you say is on secondment.

Hon. M.E.COX: This officer is not on leave. The Act here applies to a person on leave.

Mr. WALCOTT: This officer which you now say is seconded to the United Kingdom is not coming back to the island, but he is not retiring because you want him to maintain the same rights which you have in this Bill, because if you call on him to retire he would not be entitled to this pension. He has not put in the service to entitle him to pension, so you have seconded him in order to retain him in the public service. Do you want a more flagrant misinterpretation and distortion of the Act? The Act says if a man goes on pre-retirement

leave he should get these rights. You know that the man is going to retire, but you are allowing him to remain on the Establishment long enough to become pensionable; therefore you are creating a condition for an officer to get his pension. We say we do not agree with that, and there is nothing in the world to make me agree with that. If you feel it is right, you can do it; but I do not feel it is right. If I had a man and he had to retire to go to a post with higher emoluments, I would give him more money in the post, and if it did not suit him to accept, he just wouldn't. This is a dangerous precedent you are setting in this island. You are setting up such a dangerous precedent that if a man would lose his pension rights because he was not eligible by two years, you could second him to a post in Jamaica at three times the salary he is at present getting, and still allow him to hold on to this post until he was entitled to his pension rights.

You do not see the seriousness of it. You are doing it because Government has decided to second him in your Department, but you have to look to the future. What is going to happen to an officer who is seconded to a job outside the Government service and which is not pensionable? We all know he is not coming back to this post, but he is still gazetted as being the holder of the post until he becomes pensionable. What is going to happen to your young officers? Can't you not see it is not fair to them? The very purpose of this Act which we are passing tonight is to give you authority to do something for which you did not have authority to do before and the Objects and Reasons of this Bill say so. The Hon. Minister has admitted, and what he has admitted is the truth, that the reason why you had to second this officer to that post is because he could not go on retirement right away.

Hon. M.E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I did not make that statement. We seconded him to do work in the United Kingdom, not to get a pension.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister said that Mr. Pickwood is doing a good job in the United Kingdom and he also said that if Mr. Pickwood was called upon to retire now, he would lose his pension; therefore, that is the reason why he has not retired. He said that it would not be fair to ask him to retire now to lose his pension rights; therefore, I am saying that the reason why Mr. Pickwood is seconded to that office is because you do not want him to lose his pension.

Hon. M.E. COX: Nonsense.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have never yet heard such crass ignorance in all my life.

Mr. Chairman knocked the gavel.

Mr. WALCOTT: I love this sort of impartiality. You are knocking the gavel at me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not knocking the gavel at you; I am knocking the gavel for order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have never seen such crass ignorance in all my life. You get the Hon. Minister making the statement that the reason why he is seconded and still holds the post of Labour Commissioner is to preserve his pension rights. Mr. Pickwood is still gazetted as holding the post of Labour Commissioner and the notice appears in the same copy of the *Official Gazette* as that which gives notice of Mr. Odle's appointment as Labour Commissioner. If you give that as a reason, I am saying that no officer should be refused pension because he loses out by a year or two. What you have said means that you are keeping on your Establishment this officer just for the sake of giving him a pension. That is so because under this Act - The Civil Establishment Act, 1949 - he is still a member of your Establishment although you say that he is not coming back. Another point is that from the date you appointed Mr. Odle as

Labour Commissioner, you were creating two persons pensionable under the Act as Labour Commissioners although you knew one was not coming back into that post. The person who stands to gain is the officer who is seconded. The Public Treasury has to pay out this money and we have to provide this pension on the salary that he was getting as Labour Commissioner and you have the position where, simultaneously, two pensions are accruing to the post of Labour Commissioner.

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

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

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF AREAS OF LAND FOR QUARRY SITE FOR DEEP WATER HARBOUR.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour: To move the passing of the following Resolution: 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. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the compulsory acquisition of certain areas of land at Bagatelle for the quarry site for the Deep Water Harbour. The Schedule sets out the parcels of land involved and the Addendum sets out very briefly why it was necessary to bring down this Resolution. As the Addendum says, we had to act very quickly in this matter because any long delay in the acquisition of this quarry site might involve us in added expenditure, something like \$1,000 a day; therefore any delay which can be avoided should be avoided and anything which can be done to expedite the work on the Deep Water Harbour should be done.

This course was necessary in order to expedite the work. While negotiations were going on, we had to take advantage of this situation and go through this procedure in order that the contractors who are working on the Deep Water Harbour can enter the land.

There are some 16 different landowners involved and there were some difficulties involved in treating with each of these 16 landowners. As hon. members can see, the greater part of them owned less than a half acre of land.

Therefore, this does not mean that negotiations are not proceeding amicably and that there are any particular difficulties about the price of the land, but all this had to be done in order that there should not be any delay in getting ahead with this matter.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I merely want to say that apparently, the harbour contractors have the Government very properly sown up; that is to say, that all their rights are very well protected under the terms of the contract, under which they are operating. We are told in the Addendum to this Resolution, that the Government must provide the lands from which the stone should be quarried. This means, therefore, that the contractors protected themselves by putting the responsibility on the Government to provide

the lands for quarrying the stones, rather than face the necessity for dealing directly with the owners of the land, since the Government has the power to acquire the lands under the Land Acquisition Act. If the Contractors were dealing directly with these land owners for the provision of these stones, they felt that they might be held to ransom by some of the owners whose land they required. In all aspects of this contract, the dice are exclusively or entirely on the side of the contractors; they really have everything in their own way. They charge what we consider a very reasonable price for doing the job; they are doing almost all of the work themselves and in connection with these same stones of which we are talking, do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many local lorry owners were looking forward to transporting the stones from the quarry to the Deep Water Harbour? (Mr. MOTTLEY: And carry on a racket.) I do not mean that they would carry on a racket; I mean that they felt that when the construction of the Harbour was commenced, they would obtain employment in transporting the stones from the quarry to the site of the Harbour. Even that, Mr. Speaker, the contractors are doing themselves. They have brought in their own transport and they do not have to depend on the private lorry owners for transporting the stones, and certainly the transporting of stones from the quarries to the Harbour site is not really a matter of construction. Normally, our interpretation of the construction of the Harbour would be the engineering part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering if what the hon. member has said is anything to do with this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This means that from every single point of view the contractors are protecting their interests. If they were dealing with the owners of this land, they would not have the assistance of the Land Acquisition Act and they would have to face bargaining with the owners for the price of the stones. All I am saying is that the contractors are so farsighted in this respect - as to have all the dice lying in their favour. I mentioned the case of transport which was not a matter of engineering construction. So far, that is the only issue which has been brought to the attention of this House in which it is clearly seen how will the interests of the contractors be protected. It is to be sincerely hoped that all along the line all the dice will not be laid in their favour. The profits accruing from a job like this are enormous; you do not get a Deep Water Harbour to construct every day.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that got to do with this matter?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I only mentioned that, so as to emphasise my argument.

Mr. SPEAKER: The terms of the contract are not here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Addendum refers to the terms of the contract. The Addendum says that even with the provision of land from which the stones are to be obtained, the Government has the responsibility of providing that land. It all means that the contractors protected themselves before they presented the terms of the contract. The contractors say that the Government must provide the land in case that the owners want exorbitant prices for it ---

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter has been settled already.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not with the House, though.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Resolution deals with the question of acquiring compulsorily certain spots of land.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We have no knowledge of the terms of the contract.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, you are not entitled to discuss it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not follow that; we can only discuss the terms of the contract when the Resolution comes before us. The Resolution is before us, because of the terms of the contract. If the contract did not compel the Government to provide the land for the acquisition of the stones, we would not be dealing with this Resolution today.

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter has already been settled.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter has been so much settled, that the contractors are going ahead working.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But I am entitled to criticise the contract if the Government has made a foolish contract. I am not saying that they have made a foolish contract; as a matter of fact, I do not know. For instance, if they have compelled the Government to provide the land and they are using their own transport ---

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the hon. member cannot discuss the terms of the contract, because that is not what is before us now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not discussing the contract at all. I am discussing the specific item in the contract which is before us now, and the specific item in the contract before us is that Government has to provide land to prevent them from looking around.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is whether you are objecting to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am entitled to voice my opinion, because if we have this Act, we will have to pay this money for years and years to come, and all the advantages are going to the contractors and none to the community. If for instance the Compulsory Powers Acquisition Act permits Government to purchase this land at what the owners regard as an unreasonable price, it would mean that the contractors would be using the provisions of the contract to make an unfair deal with the owners of the land; that is what it would mean, and it would not be fair to the community. The contractors cannot have everything; therefore one hopes that in the actual prices of acquisition in the Act the rights of the owners of the land will be protected, because I would hate to think that they came here to build a Deep Water Harbour and get the price they are going to get, and have all the avenues for employment which should be open to certain members of the public, like lorry owners, because the contractors are doing their own transport. The least that should be done therefore would be to pay a good price for the land.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think any of us can discuss the contract because we know very little about it. It is one of the closely guarded secrets of the Barbados Government not to let the public know about the contract. It may be for some motive - I do not know if it is ulterior - but I say it is a closely guarded secret.

You say that we cannot discuss the contract, but what we can discuss is the fact that this Resolution is to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of certain lands for the purpose of providing a quarry site in connection with the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. It would seem alright to me if you made a contract and the contractors asked you to provide the land from which to get the stones, because they would not know the type of stones that could be provided. But the closely guarded secret about the Deep Water Harbour is something which you have to get from the Trinidad Guardian.

The Addendum reads as follows:

"The provision by Government of lands from which stones can be quarried for use in the construction of the Deep Water Harbour forms part of the conditions of the contract for this project. The purchase of these lands by private treaty has presented difficulties, namely, in the case of the first parcel of land, agreement cannot be reached on the purchase price, and in the case of the other lands, very early occupation was necessary and it was not possible to negotiate with the individual owners in the time available. The Queen's Solicitor has therefore advised that these lands should be acquired under the Land Acquisition Act."

The Queen's Solicitor has intimated that it would be difficult to deal with these people individually, and that you cannot agree with the price according to the Addendum, and therefore it is suggested by the Queen's Solicitor that this is the safest way of doing it, because you must get on with the Deep Water Harbour. But I have something to say.

The hon. member is smiling. Those of us who have children will take what I am saying quite seriously. A correspondent of the "Advocate" wrote a letter the other day about these lorries being loaded with stones up to a certain height and coming around corners where there are schoolchildren. I was interested in that and got in my car and went to see for myself. I saw these lorries come helter-skelter around these corners and the stones tumbling off. You are criminally responsible if you do not put your foot down on that between now and tomorrow. There are six hundred children coming out of school at St. Stephens where these lorries pass, and I went out of my way to see whether the statement appearing in this paper was true. We are serious about this matter, and I know that you, Mr. Speaker, will join with me. Today I say the same thing again; the lorries come with tremendous speed with the stones that are put on with some mechanical device - not trimmed and settled - and as soon as they come around a corner, the stones come off. Fortunately the man who wrote the statement signed his name, and I hope, Sir, that the Hon. Minister will look into the matter and tell us shortly something about it.

Now I have a little surprise for the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. Last week the hon. senior member for St. Peter raised the matter of a letter which appeared in the Trinidad Guardian relative to the Deep Water Harbour. The Hon. Minister of Communications in his reply, said that as a result of the letter, Government had made enquiries and had a satisfactory report from the contractors. I did not join in the debate at the time, because I thought I did not know sufficient about it. I am going to make a statement here that is going to surprise the Hon. Minister. In the presence of three other Legislators, a member of the Legislature of this country said to us at a social gathering that a member of the staff of the Deep Water Harbour made a statement to the effect that this was either the fourteenth or sixteenth job they had to do, and that the money being spent in Barbados was being wasted and the job would never be finished. I am speaking, not as an anti-Government member, but more as a Government member. The member said then that he might be in the informer's company that evening, but that he was a member of the Barbados Legislature and would therefore have to raise the matter. It is my duty as an elected member to draw this to the hon. member's attention, and if you want any further information, you shall have it. If therefore, it is brought to our notice that a member of the Deep Water Harbour has said this, and it is also brought to our notice by the Minister that Government made enquiries and got a report from the contractors that what was said in the Trinidad Guardian was not true, and the Minister went on to say that there were people who were against building a Deep Water Harbour, and that this was wicked and malicious propaganda, I have discharged my responsibility in telling you what was said.

It may be that everybody at the social gathering was not quite so .. (Hon. R.G.MAPP: Sober.) I am not suggesting that, so if the Minister is saying that the

people working on the Deep Water Harbour are not sober people, I am not saying it. Very often these things must come out even when you are sober, but the fact remains that we are demanding a further investigation and a statement made about it.

I have no quarrel with the Resolution before the House, because you have started the Deep Water Harbour; I have served on the Committee and was always in favour of it; so if you have decided what type of stones should be used and you know the districts from which to get them, the only thing Government can do is to acquire the land, and if they are legally advised that compulsory acquisition seems the best way of doing it, I say we must pass this. But besides what I have said to you, I maintain that those of us who have an interest in children cannot stand by and see lorries loaded with stoned weighing in some cases half a ton, pass by a school of six hundred children at any speed. I understand that members of the Government have investigated this and said that it is absolutely impossible for any danger to come to these children. Really and truly I am suspicious that the man who signed the letter in the Press as regards this danger is a school teacher or if that is not so he must be very interested in school children. Coming back into Bridgetown, I found out that what was written in the newspaper was true because I discovered that some of these stones fall off the motor trucks. Suppose there were children on the street at the time! It is a pity when these things happen that the Ministers are not passing in their cars!

I am therefore suggesting to the Hon. Minister to investigate this matter quite thoroughly. If this is not done very quickly, I am going to move the adjournment of the House when you think you want to go out for tea or lunch and I surely will talk very long on it. I see that the Hon. Minister of Trade is smiling. At one time he had associated himself with teaching and I think he should know that this is creating lots of anxiety in the minds of parents - the impending danger when they see these trucks passing up and down the streets when school children are passing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to give approval to the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of these areas of land for the purpose of providing a quarry site in connection with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour but when you look at this question of the construction of this Deep Water Harbour, it is a question of your spending \$25 million; therefore, any public-spirited person must realise that we cannot lose the opportunity of discussing any aspect of this question because it takes up too great a slice of our economy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am warning the hon. member. You are not to discuss all phases of the Deep Water Harbour. You should only discuss what is in this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is why I prefaced my remarks by saying that whenever we deal with any aspect of the Deep Water Harbour it is very important to discuss it thoroughly because we are spending \$25 million on the project. You will very well realise that any aspect of it is very important because as a taxpayer it hits me heavily, and I think it hits other taxpayers just as heavily, especially those whose incomes are known.

In the Addendum to the Resolution, it says that the provision by Government of lands from which stones can be quarried for use in the construction of the Deep Water Harbour forms part of the conditions of the contract for this project. Now, this forms part of the conditions of the contract for this project. We do not know what are the other conditions of the contract, so we can only take this opportunity now that we are dealing with this to query whether you are satisfied that all the conditions of the contract are working in the interest of the people of Barbados. Are you satisfied that the conditions of the contract are working in the interest of the people of Barbados? We have to ask that question because we do not know what are the conditions. What we can see is

that you have fallen down on this question of the acquisition of these areas of land for a quarry site and you have to come with this in order to obtain them.

The hon. senior member for the City raised the question of the type of transport that is provided for removing these stones from the quarry site to the site of the Harbour and the way it is being done. Those are relative questions and I am taking this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Government that this is a matter of public duty and we would be failing in our duty if we do not draw all these things to your attention. Moreover, I go further and say that the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Philip is not a question which we can brush aside lightly. That question comes within the conditions of the contract. Surely, we cannot sit by and see any \$25 million being given to a contractor to carry out a contract unless we are satisfied that the people of this Island get the amount of employment commensurate with the amount of money we are spending on carrying out the project. Therefore, I do feel that one of the conditions of the contract should have specified that where ever contracts are made for carrying out projects that Barbadians should be employed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member heard me tell the hon. senior member for St. Philip that he is out of order to discuss the terms of the contract of which we know nothing about.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am speaking within the context of this Addendum. It sets out that this is a question of providing land from which stones can be quarried for use in the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. Within that context, you are bound to give any one the opportunity to ask that other things be allowed. It is not only a question of taking stones out of this quarry because they do not come out by some atomic press button; they are taken out and carried to their destination by motor lorries. Just as the conditions of the contract are such that the contractor of this Deep Water Harbour is not forced to make a contract with these private land owners as regards the taking over of their land so that if there be repacious landowners they would not be able to hold him up to ransom. We are saying that the contractor should not be parsimonious in providing the people of this Island with employment within the context of the agreement. I will only say this for the benefit of members of the Government. Governments in some countries other than British Colonial Territories insist in contracts which they make that the utmost safeguard be given to the local community and the only thing to which I would have any objection is if that point slipped this Government. This question of providing employment for our people is something which we would expect out of the \$25 million which we are spending on this Deep Water Harbour. We feel that the spending of this amount of money would provide a substantial amount of employment for our people. It might have slipped Government to have that as a condition of the contract. I am sure in any country, especially in independent territories, you always get a Clause in contracts insisting that jobs be given to the local people. If I may just make a comparison, when the Seawall Airport was being built, one of the things which was insisted on was that you should use local labour wherever possible, and we were only permitting them to use anything which could not be provided in Barbados. I think that normally in things such as the transporting of stones, the contractor should use our services; he should only use outside services when such services cannot be provided in Barbados.

And that is the point which I want to raise. I think that all of us in this Chamber owe our allegiance to the people of Barbados who have elected us here, and if it is a part of our duty to state these things, I think we should do so. I do not think the Ministers are impervious to reasonable argument and the argument which we have used is a hint which to the wise is sufficient.

Hon. M.E.COX: I just wanted to reply to a single

point which is in the Addendum to the Resolution. It is not true to say that the contractors held up the Government to ransom or that they tried to squeeze ---

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say anything about the contractors trying to squeeze the Government.

Hon. M.E.COX: The hon. member said something about the Government being held up by the contractors. I should like to say that from the time we discussed this matter, it was the intention of the Government to own this land, because after the stones have been taken away, the land remains the property of the Government. We wanted to blow up a cliff at Mount Pleasant and we would have had the land on which we could build houses. We felt that it would be a cheaper way to assist in the construction of the Deep Water Harbour if we purchased this land. That would be an easy way for the construction of the Harbour, because hon members will see that where the Government owns the land under the Compulsory Powers Act, we could go in and work right away. No private person could do that, and in that case it would take a long time before we could arrive at any agreement. It is not a question of the contractors holding up the Government to ransom or having the Government in any squeeze.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I hope the hon. member is not insinuating that I said dogmatically that the contractors are holding up the Government to ransom. I said that the dice are laid in the contract in such a manner that the contractors are making the Government acquire this land I expressed the hope that the Government is not being held up to ransom.

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

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:— To move the second reading of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. It is an annual Bill, and I do not think I need say very much on it. It merely deals with the continuation of various expiring laws. (MEMBERS: We all agree on that.) I thank you.

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

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M.E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Preamble was postponed.
Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.
The Schedule was called and agreed to.
The Preamble was called and agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M.E. COX: I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker,

that the House resume Committee of Supply at this stage.

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

COST OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution with which I am now dealing is Resolution No.2 on the Order Paper -- a Resolution for the sum of \$1,531 in connection with the provision of Traffic Lights. The Addendum explains the matter fully. It states:

\$3,000 was provided in the Capital Estimates for 1956-57 to meet the cost of the purchase and installation of 2 portable Traffic Lights. Only \$1,696 was spent during 1956-57 since all the accounts had not come to hand. The actual cost of the lights and installation was \$3,227. The supplement is required to provide a revote of the lapse amount of \$1,304 and \$227 additional cost.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 4 under Private Members' Business as the next order of the day.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I regret to object.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is objecting to leave being granted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Has the Government finished its business?

Hon. M.E. COX: I would like to suggest to the hon. member that we adjourn for dinner and come back. We have to remember that when dinner is brought here at night, there are servants who have to get home. *(Laughter)* I am very serious about that. *(A VOICE: Do you now that?)* Sometimes, these servants have to remain until 10.30 p.m. and it is not fair. I do not care if I eat here, like the hon. senior member for the City who use nothing at all; but I do appeal to members to let us adjourn now, have dinner, and come back so that the servants would be able to go home in an early time and on that ground I am objecting to leave being granted.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. WALCOTT rose to a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is unfortunate ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are talking about leave being granted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot speak then, because objection has been made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that there should be no comment.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I would like your ruling. I would like to know if Government business is finished whether it has not been ruled by you already that you do not have to get the permission of the House to proceed to the next item on the Order Paper. It is not a matter of the hon. member objecting. Just as you went from item 4 to 5 without asking permission, you can go on to Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is not adjourning the House, he is just suspending the Sitting for dinner.

Mr. WALCOTT: I say it is within your province....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not adjourning for the day.

The question that leave be granted to take Order No. 4 under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; and Mr. TUDOR - 3

NOES: Mr. L.E. SMITH; Hon. M.E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. SEARLES and Mr. T. W. MILLER 6.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Speaking on the Suspension, I must say that we are practical men and not little children, and no member of the Government is going to come here and make jokes of us. Now you talked about keeping back the servants; what we want to say is this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to inform the hon. member that we are not on the adjournment, but on the Suspension.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I appreciate that, but what I would like to point out is that in view of the fact that our Rules do not provide for the suspension of the Sitting, the motion for Suspension becomes a motion of this House and I have the right to discuss that motion. There is nothing in this House to say that a motion cannot be discussed by me. Any motion can be discussed by our Rules, because we do not have any.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling that there can be no discussion.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a motion, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: If you want to make an amendment, you can.

Mr. WALCOTT: As an amendment, Sir, I beg to move that this House be now adjourned until next Tuesday. My reason for that, Sir, is that if the Hon. Leader of the Houses wishes to have...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an improper motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have already heard you to say that this House stands adjourned until next Tuesday. Somebody else can move the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot entertain that motion unless it is in order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock. My reason for moving that motion is this; if the Hon. Leader of this House is going to adopt this slight attitude in such matters, he will not find support from members who are willing to adopt a business-like attitude. If his attitude is that of a school boy, well then we would have to be all boys

together. At this stage of his parliamentary life, he is now beginning to think sympathetically. He is now raising the question of the servants of this House and the needs of the servants. So far as the needs of the servants are concerned, he knows that he has said already that as long as he is leading the Government, he will use whatever method at his disposal to get things passed.

Hon. M.E. COX: I never said that.

Mr. WALCOTT: What do you mean by saying that you never said that? One of his methods when it comes to this question of getting things passed is that he would go on sitting until it was passed and it is not without precedent that we have sat until as late as 9.30 p.m., without taking any adjournment because the Government felt it wanted something done. If it were the Government's intention to deal with the other Resolution on the Order Paper this afternoon, they would have done it. Because the hon. senior member for St. Lucy raises the point, the Hon. Minister is objecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are still certain restrictions, and one of the restrictions is anticipation. The second is matters of detail and the third is matters over which the Government has no administrative power.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are not raising that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I intend to give reasons why I am moving the motion for the adjournment of the House now instead of the suspension of the sitting. It is for the simple reason that the Hon. Leader of the House had finished the business of the Government for the day, therefore, it then became our right as private members to be allowed to proceed with Private Members' Business. If things are to be done in a proper form, surely, the Hon. Leader of the House had no right to object when it comes to Private Members utilising this time to do their business on the Order Paper. We have been elected by the people; we are not elected by the Ministers. When it comes to Private Members' Business, I will say that it is within the province of Your Honour to say that we go on automatically to Private Members Business after the Government finishes its business. If you allow this to happen it would mean that Parliament would become the tool of the Government, that is to say, that Private Members' Business would only be discussed when Government feels like discussing it, and I would never be a party to that.

When it comes to Government Business, we agree that they should have the opportunity to deal with their business. If you look at the Order Paper, you would see that we dealt with Orders No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Government Business and the only matter which we have not dealt with of Government's Business is the one Resolution which the Government does not want to deal with this afternoon. Is it not an atrocious thing to say that you are objecting to the second stage of this Order Paper? The Government has done all of its business and it is now objecting to Private Members' Business being discussed. This is a good opportunity for me to make it clear to hon. members on all sides of the House that Government will sit there and regard this matter as a Party issue in which they are saying that they do not want us to do Private Members' Business now; in other words, they are saying to the public that we of the Op-

position have no right to come in here to discuss any matter which we feel our constituents would like us to discuss. Look what Parliament we have! Private Members' Business is set out on the Order Paper for the day; we must seek the Government's permission to deal with the Order Paper? It should not be within anybody's province to say with what we should deal. As a matter of fact, when we finish dealing with Government Business, it is the duty of Your Honour to call the first order of Private Members' Business and if the hon. member whose name that Order stands in is not in his place, you should go to the next Order. In this case the first Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church and he is not here; so you should call the next three orders which stand in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy who is the hon. member who raised this question; there should be no objection to that.

If the procedure to which we adhered when we used to meet at 12 o'clock (noon) were applicable, there would be no question of Government giving us permission to deal with Private Members' Business. I have been in this Chamber for 13 years and the situation which prevailed in the early part of my time in this Chamber was when Government finished its business it was a matter for us to discuss our business. Now, at these last few meetings, Government is not moving the adjournment of the House but is moving the suspension of the sitting. If they move the suspension and you do not have a quorum after that, the House will have to stand adjourned until next Tuesday.

Let me say at this stage that today when we were about to meet, the Government did not have all of their own members to make a quorum and I had to come in to form a quorum. The occasion will come again and any time I am here early and they need my presence to form a quorum I am going out of the House because today's action by the Hon. Leader of the House shows me how the wind is blowing. If I had walked out after the bell rang today Your Honour would have had to adjourn this House until next Tuesday because of the lack of a quorum. I feel it is part of their duty to deal with Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Hon. Minister thinks that they are using parliamentary tactics, I will speak until 2 o'clock in the morning. However, I have taken Your Honour's word that you are coming back in here. I take it this way; if the hon. Leader of the Government had moved the adjournment of the House, I would have been your greatest critic if you had accepted the motion. With the Order Paper as it stands, and you do not allow Private Members' Business to be discussed - well, the hon. member has moved the suspension of the sitting and that is quite in order. I have taken Your Honour's word that you are coming back in here, but I want the hon. Minister to know that whatever rules you may have, you have moved the suspension of the sitting and members of the Government must be more reasonable because if you want to use political strategy --

At this stage, there being no quorum present in the House, His Honour directed that the Bell be rung.

On the Bell having been rung and no quorum having been obtained,

Mr. SPEAKER: There not being nine hon. members present, I declare that this House stand adjourned until Tuesday next, at 3 o'clock p.m.