

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th March, 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. L. E. SMITH, J.P. (*Chairman of Committee*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. St. A. THORNE, Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; and Mr. T. W. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

Hon Sir Grantley Adams and Mr. Husbands entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that there is a gentleman from America who is desirous of taking a few snap-shots of the Chamber and I have given him permission to do so.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following: Message No. 7/1958 with regard to the Address of the House of Assembly concerning the cause of unrest in the Bahamas.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1958.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay The Post Office Advances to the Payment of Money Orders to 31st January, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the waiver of charges on funds made available to the Development Board by the Government from loan funds.

ATTENTION OF HOUSE DRAWN TO LATENESS OF ORDER PAPER

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day:-

Hon. M. E. COX: If the hon. member will give way for a minute, Mr. Speaker, I should like at this stage to announce the reason why the Order Paper for today was not sent to hon. members' homes. I want to say here and now that there was absolutely no fault of the Government Printery, neither any fault of the Clerk of the House. The House, as you will remember, had a Special Meeting on Thursday at which these items were laid on the table of the House and it was not possible in the present circumstances to get the Order Paper and other papers out as if it had met on a Tuesday which is the regular meeting day.

I have already explained to this House that these items have to be sent to the Government Printery and then sent back to the Clerk of the House to be checked and then the final print is done. I want to say again and emphasise, and I hope that the hon. senior member for St. George will appreciate the fact, that it is absolutely no fault of the Government Printery or any fault of the Clerk of this House, but it is due to the short time that the items were sent to the Press.

As I have said, they have to be checked and sent back to the Clerk of the House, and then sent back to the Printery for the final print. They were ready this morning sometime around 8 o'clock; so I think, realising that Saturday was a half day and also that Sunday is not a working day, I do not think any blame can be attached to either of the parties concerned.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I shall never tire of reminding Your Honour that the correct procedure in this House, which hon. members have time and time again pointed out, is that proper notification will produce proper debate. Here it is, I now see for the first time the Order Paper for the Day and the first three items which I am supposed to deal with amount to \$42,904 of the taxpayers' money.

I, Sir, do not feel myself competent in a matter of minutes to be able to speak on \$42,904 of the taxpayers' money. The excuse of the Hon. Leader of the House is lame. If in this Island of Barbados we are unable to plan any further than a week ahead to have the administrative

side of planning in such a situation done in two days or three days and we cannot have before us better and longer notification, I say it is a sad case. Your Honour must forgive me for saying that responsibility for allowing this lies on your shoulder. Your Honour has allowed the permission of matters to be circulated on the same day on which they have been printed. It is unfair to genuine members of this House to be faced with such a situation. It is a well known fact that members of the Government know all and they are in a position today to deal with an Order Paper which has only been printed and produced this morning. Frankly, Sir, I do not credit them with that ability.

I do not wish to be lengthy, but I repeat that I look to Your Honour to protect us from this outrageous conduct. We are members of this House, although the Hon. Leader does not think we have any right to be here at all. We have a perfect right to be here and to be treated as hon. members of the House, and I say again, that our Order Paper has not arrived in time for consideration. If these papers do not come to us in such time, that we can give proper consideration to the matters, it is Your Honour's duty to say that there should be no House.

3.25 p.m.

It is for you, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, to protect us as members of this Chamber. If you can honestly say that any member could sit here today and pass an opinion or give a vote on \$48,000 of the taxpayers' money, having just been presented with his Order Paper - I do not think you could do that. I appeal to you, Sir, to see that the procedure in this House is conducted in such manner as to be conducive to proper debate which should take place on any measure. There is only one other alternative for hon. members to take, that is, to talk nonsense without knowing where he is until he gets something to bite upon.

I repeat, that the Prime Minister of Australia has pointed out to the United Nations in a speech made in London to lawyers, the necessity for time and correct procedure. I appeal sincerely once again for time and correct procedure in this Honourable House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks which have been made by the hon. member who has just sat down. Those of us in the Opposition are still members of this House. (Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Are you in the Opposition?) I am a member of the Opposition and I could never, I reflect, think of associating myself with hon. members over there since December, 1956, knowing the low, mean and depraved act I was served. I am a member of the Opposition and I am proud to be one of them. This is an occasion when we would be justified in walking out of the House; I have seen hon. members with more responsibility than I have ever had in this House, walk out of the House. On an occasion like this, I am speaking on the privileges of this House. How could it be reasonably expected that those of us who are not members of the majority party who need ever look at any single document which comes from the Clerk - some of them may know about it and others may not know about it - how could those of us who are able to discern something from the documents of this House - those of us who are not only to discern but to contribute something to the Debates of this House - be reasonably expected to come here at the eleventh hour and be presented with these documents and do justice to the people whom we represent? It does not matter in the case of hon. members who are on my right; they can sit there, close their eyes and vote "Aye"; but that is not expected of us. Much more than that is expected of us.

I do not attach any blame to you, Sir, but the time is coming when you will have to take a very strong hand in this matter. It is becoming monotonous in its regularity. Hon. members cannot afford just to laugh off matters and think that they are making fun at the Opposition; they are making fun at this House and the people whom they serve. How is the business of this House being conducted? We come here today and find an Order

Paper and we see the business of the House attached in an accompanying document. We get on our feet and stumble on some obvious point in a Bill or a Resolution. Are we doing anything? Are we doing justice to the people when we do business like this? This is happening because if hon. members walked out, others could go on. Imagine the Premier sitting on this side of the House and this sort of thing happening! You would be subjected to some fire, Mr. Speaker, and most of us would have to redouble our efforts in order to support you. This is an occasion when we have to admit - and whenever the House is finished, the fact remains that we have not had sufficient time to study any matter. That is indefensible; you cannot get away from it. It stares you in the face as something outstanding. We are not spectators in here; we have not come in here to entertain people; we have come here to study seriously the business of this House, and we cannot do that when documents are handed to us as soon as we come in.

Before I got on my feet, I was trying to sort out, these documents and to look at the business of the House, but hon. members on my right have not got to do that; they can sit there and close their eyes and vote. I am a member of the Opposition and I will always remain a member of the Opposition as long as I am here. There is no taking back of that. I am a member of the Opposition, I repeat, and I could not look in your face, if I were otherwise. (Hon. M. E. COX: You were talking to the contrary the other day.) To whom did I say anything to the contrary? I never said anything to the contrary; the hon. member was speaking contrary to me.

To come back to the point, Mr. Speaker, I deprecate this sort of treatment which is too regularly meted out to members of this House. I am hoping that some hon. members on my right will rise up and do the business of this country, because they cannot do it if they remain under that yoke. I have seen an hon. member of this House walk out of the House with less provocation than this -- as a matter of fact, with no provocation at all - an hon. member who has more responsibility than I could ever have. I could do that now more justifiably than he, but I am more responsible than that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it is essential that every hon. member of this Chamber be supplied with his papers within a reasonable time. It is even more essential for members on this side of the House to receive their papers so that they can have the opportunity of studying them. They are not in a position like that of the Ministers of the Government for obvious reasons. The Ministers are *au fait* with every matter which is brought down by the Government to this Chamber.

3.35 p.m.

We are not in the position of Backbenchers who may, when they meet in conference with the Ministers, glean something of what is about to be brought down. In any event whether or not they glean something, they realise that their duty is to give tacit acquiescence to whatever is brought down. You can only have a good Government with an efficient Opposition; and there can be no efficient Opposition if it does not have the opportunity before hand - it may be short - of studying the matters with which the House will be concerned. Although I appreciate the gesture of the Leader of the House in explaining the reason for the delay in this case, we arrived today without an Order Paper and without copies of the various Resolutions which are the first in Government business; when we arrived we found these matters before us at our seats. It is not good enough, Sir - whoever is at fault, whether it is the Clerk of this House, whether it is the Government Printery or whoever it is - for us to be presented with these papers a few moments before the House is about to sit.

There are some matters which you have to consider not merely in the light of what is printed before you; you have to do a certain amount of research to see how the subject matter of the Resolutions compares with something which you recall was passed some months

ago or which you remember having discussed some time ago. There is absolutely no time for research work when on the very afternoon you are discussing the measures you see them for the first time.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Leader of the House said that we last met on Thursday. We did not adjourn so very late on Thursday as we often do; it was well before midnight when we adjourned, and they had the whole of Friday and Saturday, and I think the Trade Union Regulations would permit people to work over time for double pay or a substantial increase, if the work is of an urgent nature and it is important that that work should be done. In the interest of its name and reputation, I would suggest that the staff of the Government Printing Office should not be unwilling to do as any good Trade Unionist in an emergency, when there is work of this sort, and the time is very limited. If we decide to meet on Tuesday, let them be prepared to do extra work for the additional remuneration such as the Trade Union would call for on their behalf. It would not be the first type of employment which one finds engaged in work occasionally in an emergency on Sundays. The alternative would be that if it is known that we cannot have the papers ready for the following Tuesday, you should adjourn from Thursday to the following Thursday or Wednesday, whichever is the earliest date on which it is felt the papers would be available for us to have at least one day before, in order that we can have an opportunity of perusing them, doing any research and making any enquiries that would be necessary in order to give of our best in the interest of the people who sent us here.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that enough has been said on this occasion to ensure that it would not happen again and we would not receive our Order Papers at as late an hour as we did this afternoon.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is so many years since I have been in the Opposition that it is difficult to get back into the mentality of the Opposition. We do expect opposition whether it be from the soft voiced member for St. Peter, the loud voiced member for St. George or the intermediate-tones of the member for St. Lucy; but it is slightly difficult to follow in this instance. If I were in the Opposition and the Government attempted to pull a fast one in serious matters overnight, of course, I would do what they have done. What is the good of saying that we are going to pass over \$40,000 if it is something on which we agree? The trouble with the Opposition is, that they make a noise in and out of season; therefore, when they have something to say, nobody takes notice of it. We are so accustomed to the Opposition shouting when things are wrong, right or indifferent, that all seems alike. Looking at the member for St. Peter, from his appearance - I hope I am not being offensive - he is in a sporting mood. He really missed this place for a tennis court; he came here by accident.

Look at the Resolution for \$38,683. I had not seen it until just now, and when they were talking, I read it through. There is nothing in it that one single member of the Opposition would object to. They are merely making a noise, because all they can do is to make a noise; but as long as the people in Barbados remain outside of the Lunatic Asylum, we will remain in power. This Government is going to remain in power during the life time of everybody in Barbados today until they become lunatics. I have not checked the figures but the total of the hon. senior member for St. George may be right. He may have added \$3,000, \$1,221 and \$38,683 to make it over \$42,000. If you look at the actual words on the Resolution, you will see there are items for Old Age Pensions and Estimates for things which have proved insufficient. Not one single item is controversial, but they have to make a noise and therefore they make a noise. I do not even refer to the fact that Federal Elections are around the corner. Members have spoken already and therefore they cannot reply, but I would invite them to find in the Supplementary Estimate for \$38,683 two items with which the Opposition does not agree. The member is saying that we should not pass this \$42,000; all I am asking them to do is to find one item with which

they do not agree. Unlike the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is making rude interruptions, I do not only read the Queen's English, but I understand it. There is not one single item in the Resolution to which anybody can object.

3.45 p.m.

If the hon. members who have already spoken and cannot speak again write down what they have to say and pass it on, and any of us would get up and read it out. It is so easy to stir them to anger and to make them lose their temper; but I repeat again: I have gone through every single one of these items that add up to thirty-eight thousand dollars. The notes are full.

Mr. HUSBANDS: What are you doing?

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am merely drawing to the attention of the House that every one of these items is an item which the hon. members on the other side can vote for. All I am doing is to ask hon. members to look at them and see if there is any single item to which they can object.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take note of the objections by hon. members with regard to the late papers. I say here and now that I deprecate the situation that arises when papers come late, especially where money Resolutions are concerned; and I will also say that this is the last time when I as Speaker will allow the situation to arise. (Cheers).

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.

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

Supplementary Estimates 1957-58, No. 76

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$3,000 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1957-58 No. 76 which form the Schedule to the Resolution. We will deal with the Heads separately.

The first is Head XXIII - MEDICAL (1) DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES. Under it we have Item 36, Expenses under the Druggists Act, 1894, for which the sum of \$200 is to be voted. As hon. members will see from the note, the Druggists (Examiners Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 1957 allow for an increase in fees from \$4.80 to \$10.00 and from \$14.40 to \$30.00 per examiner and those regulations come into effect after the 1957-58 Estimates had been approved; therefore, it is necessary to vote this \$200.

In short, this House have already agreed to this increase of fees; therefore, despite the fact that the hon. senior member for St. George did not get his papers in time, this is nothing new.

I beg to move that Head XXIII (1) Medical Services, stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Before you put that, I do not see any mention in this Resolution for the sum of \$200; I see \$750. I know that I am a dunce as the Hon. Premier

tries to make out, but he does not have to push me on my feet; he knows that I am quite capable of getting on my feet without his help. (A VOICE: We are not dealing with that Resolution.) I am sorry. I have not had the time to examine the Resolution before me carefully to see with which one we are dealing. That is just what I said just now. If I had the time I would have had each one numbered, because I would have done so in my own time when I got them. This is the sort of thing that happens when you are rushed into doing things. You do not have the time and, therefore, you pick up the wrong one. When one is rushed into doing things, you pick up the wrong paper, while if you were at home and sitting quietly and studying your work studiously you would be able to study the papers, and when you come to the House you would be in a position to pick up No. 1 first, because you would have had your pile arranged with No. 1 at the top, then No. 2, then No. 3 and so on. You would be able to follow them all consecutively and you would know how to tackle the problem. Of course, that is if you were given the opportunity of getting the papers in time. When the Hon. premier forces you into doing these things in this manner, it is quite liable that you would pick up the wrong paper. I may say that I am nervous now in having to deal with the matters of the people in this 'rush' manner; therefore, I do not know how long it would take me to find the correct paper. I am a member who tries genuinely to do my work. When one tries to belittle you, you must get nervous. Of course, the public is quite capable of judging in the long run.

I have just been able to find the correct Resolution with which we are dealing. I thought it was the one which dealt with Head XXIII - Maternity Hospital. The Clerk helped me to find it. I mistook that for the one with which we are dealing.

The Hon. Premier has told us that we agreed to this increase already. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to see when it was agreed upon, whether it was in this term of the House. My memory needs refreshing, and if I had the opportunity of reading these papers at home I would have been able to find out because I have all these papers put on several shelves. First of all, I give these documents a number and then I properly file them away. Had I been able to get sufficient time to find out what the Premier said, that we have already agreed to this, I would be able to tell the House exactly when we did agree to this
3.55 p.m.

This Item 36 is: "Expenses under the Druggists Act, 1894." That is what is here and as an honest member of this House I would have to look back at the Act before I attempt to find out anything else. Then I may have to find certain Regulations and so on, but I have not had the opportunity to do so. Of course, we know that the lawyers have these things at their finger-tips and they are capable of saying anything ex cathedra, ad lib, any Latin phrase at all. The note to the item says this: "The Druggists (Examiners Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 1957, which allow for an increase in fees from \$4.80 to \$10.00 and from \$14.40 to \$30.00 per examiner came into effect after the 1957-58 Estimates had been approved. An additional sum of \$200 is required to meet expenditure to the end of the financial year."

I wonder if you, Mr. Chairman, would allow me the time to see these Regulations which refer to this particular matter. Having obtained those Regulations I would then be able to verify whether it is a matter of an increase in fees from \$4.80 to \$10.00 or whether it might have been 20/-. I am not quite sure when we changed over from sterling to dollars and cents. In all these Regulations and so on, the denominations were written in sterling, but nowadays we are dealing with dollars and cents. The matter is not fully clear to me yet, but in the meantime I will await developments in order to see whether this is correct or not.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in the American Congress I have read that people have read the New Testament and they go on filibustering for as long as ten hours. I cannot expect the hon. member to open the New Testament, and therefore, he has

to adopt a different method of filibustering. Mr. Chairman, could anything be more preposterously stupid than for the hon. member to have in his hand the usual supplementary Estimate with the usual explanatory note and then he says he has got to be satisfied first before he agrees to it? These are the laws of this colony; you do not have to prove any laws not even in a Law Court, let alone the Assembly which has passed them. We have passed Regulations increasing the Druggists Examiners Fees and the note merely refers to that fact and says that as a result of doing that, we are \$200 out and we are asking you to pass this money. And the hon. member could stand up there for more than five seconds and make a speech! Whom does he think he is convincing? Everybody knows that he is just wasting time and if he thinks that Government members have got to stay here just as long as the members on the opposite side of the House choose to keep them, he is completely mistaken in that.

I do protest against any member on that side of the House asking the Chair to give time so as to look up the law - something which we ourselves have passed in order that he might then be in a position to see how to vote. I repeat that there is no difference in this Resolution from any other Document which is brought down here for a Supplementary vote which says that we have to ask for more money, because the estimate does not cover the running of the Government since the Estimates were passed. It is either that the Estimates were not enough or we passed the Godsall's scales or something like that, and therefore, we have to vote some more money. That is as plain as daylight; any two year old child can read and understand it. Mr. Chairman, there are times when I listen to hon. members, when I feel that I have been completely mistaken as to my attitude towards compulsory education. If we had compulsory education 40 years ago the hon. member would not have made that speech. He would have been educated in elementary things; he would have got up and asked a question and he would have sat back down. But we have to deal with these semi-illiterates who still infest the public life of Barbados.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I would not begin on the note on which the hon. member has just ended, because I would have to begin to refer to the educational deficiency of hon. members of this House who ought to have benefited by compulsory education, 10, 20, 30 or 40 years ago I know that there are hon. members around me who might still be able to benefit from it today.

The Note to this Item reads as follows:- "The Druggists (Examiners Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 1957, which allow for an increase in fees from \$4.80 to \$10.00 and from \$14.40 to \$30.00 per examiner came into effect after the 1957-58 Estimates had been approved." Since the 1957-58 Estimates were approved and the 1958-59 Estimates have now approved by this House, I am wondering if this matter could not have come before us before now.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The 1958-59 Estimates start from the 1st April, 1958, and therefore his money must be paid out before the end of this month. That is the answer to what the hon. member is asking.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Not entirely; a similar Resolution could come down before now. The hon. member has only answered half way. Whom is he fooling? He is fooling those who do not know; he can only satisfy those who cannot think - not me.
4.05 p.m.

This is still too late; you can satisfy them with that, because certain people cannot think, but not me. This could have come before. Do not tell me that this could not have come before, because then to use the Premier's own words, it is talking "wet".

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of explanation.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am quite able to explain what I have said.

Mr. VAUGHAN: If I may interrupt the hon. member on a point of explanation.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Let the hon. member sit down and keep his feet cool. You can explain it to them; open a night school for them. This Resolution could have come before; why wait until now? If it had come before, we would have had more time to examine it. We see the need for it since nobody can argue that since the God-sall recommendations these Resolutions must not follow. If they follow from hat or from any such source, then we have to pay the money. We say they have come too late since this came into effect after the 1957-58 Estimates.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to say is this: the Druggists Examinations take place in January and July, and perhaps the vouchers for January this year have just come in and Government is now aware that they owe more money to the Druggists.

..... Mr. DOWDING: We are still on probabilities, although the more literate has supported the fact that we do not know what we are talking about. The word "semi-illiterate" does not worry me, because I am honest and represent some of the semi-literate and literate.

Now, Sir, I still have not been able to find these Regulations, and I should like to have some light shed on the direct question as to whether or not they were laid on the Table of this House. If we can have some light shed on that, perhaps then, we would be able to get a little further. As far as I have been told, these Regulations have not been laid on the Table of this House.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I apologise to the hon. member for using the word "semi"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is - - -

Mr. DOWDING: No, Mr. Chairman. I asked a question and was hoping to get an answer. The non-appearance of these Regulations lead to foolish questions, but knowing the ability of the person handling this, we should obviously get an answer because in this House we must not expect to have all University educated persons. We do need a few literates now that it has been changed from semi-literates, because the illiterates need representation. I have asked a question and I would certainly like an answer. (A VOICE: What is the question?) I should like to know whether these Regulations have been laid on the Table of the House. I am speaking now with absolutely no knowledge at all. I have asked the Clerk and have been told by the Marshal that they have not been laid. Perhaps, Sir, I could be enlightened on that point, otherwise, the question can be put and as you know, we would have everybody over there saying "aye, aye, aye".

The question that Head XXIII (1) Medical - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXV - Public Works

Head XXV - Public Works - was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Note explains this. In the Estimates \$9,000 was provided to cover the travelling expenses of fourteen officers as compared with an expenditure of \$8,495 for thirteen officers in the previous year. There is more work to be done in the normal maintenance of Public Works and it has turned out that this amount is inadequate, and therefore we are asking for \$1,000 more. It is as simple as that.

I beg to move that Head XXV - Public Works, stand part.

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

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

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services, was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is even more simple. This is to make provision for a refund of contributions under the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Act, 1928. It is just like paying back people who pay too much Income Tax and Death Duties; it is one of those things which obviously you cannot estimate for accurately; people may not die when they should and so on. I said that to see who thought we were living too long and I knew the member for St. Andrew would be the one to take it up. You have got to make these refunds, because some people may pay in and not get the benefit of the Widows' and Orphans' fund and therefore we have to pay them back. Just as with motor car insurance, if you do not make a claim in a year, the next year you do not pay as high a premium. It is perfectly straightforward and \$1,800 is needed to pay the refunds to which people are entitled under the Act.

I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services, stand part.

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

The question was put and carried without division.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for \$3,000 do now pass.

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

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

4.15 p.m.

Supplementary Estimates 1957-58, No. 77

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$1,221. There are six items under it and the first is under Head XXIII - MEDICAL (8) Maternity Hospital. The sum of \$24 is required for a labourer and the Note explains the item fully. Again, with regard to all these supplementaries, is merely because you pass Estimates and then the money turns out not to be enough, sometimes because after passing Estimates we decide to add another man to the staff or to increase the salary or anything like that. It is as simple as that; therefore, you have to come back and ask the House to vote something more to the initial money. What we put in last year's estimates is not enough to pay the people at the Maternity Hospital. In this respect it is purely a Labourer who cleans up the grounds. Having increased the labourers wages, there is not enough to pay this labourer. Nothing can be more simple than that.

I am going to deal with this Resolution as usual, that is Head by Head.

I beg to move that Head XXIII (8) Medical Maternity Hospital, stand part.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I only want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Social Services that in the end, this Government would be judged by the number of social services established in this colony and I think it is high time for more Maternity Hospitals to be established.

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

Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment

Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The first item under this Head is for medical expenses. As the note explains, out of the 1957-58 vote of \$2,000 for medical expenses, \$960 is the salary of the Regimental Medical Officer and from the remaining \$1,040 dentist, oculist and hospital bills have to be met. The vote was exhausted in November 1957 and the provision of \$500 is required to meet

these expenses for the months December, 1957 to March 1958 inclusive.

The Notes from 3 to 6 cover the other Items. As regards Item 41, (new) Beds for R. S. M. (I)'s Quarters, the R. S. M. (I) is by contract provided with furnished quarters. Two additional beds at a total cost of \$129.06 are required to accommodate the new R. S. M. (I)'s family of four. The previous R. S. M. (I) had only a family of two.

As regards the next Item, (new) Hydraulic Jack for which the sum of \$250 is to be voted, the Note to it is quite clear. It is to replace a previous Jack which broke down beyond repair when moving a vehicle..

The sum of \$117 is needed for an Oil Cooker for the R.S.M. (I)'s Quarters. As the note says, a Board of Survey condemned the original oil cooker and the replacement cost is \$116.07.

As regards the last Item, Purchase of Wireless Sets, the note is as follows: "Of the \$2,300 provided in the 1956-57 Estimates under Item 42 for the purchase of Wireless Sets, \$1,606.52 lapsed. During the current financial year, however, bills have been received from the Crown Agents for parts which they have had delay in obtaining. A revote of \$200.00 is therefore required."

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as regards the last Item, \$200 for the purchase of wireless sets, it is explained in the note that the amount previously voted lapsed so that this is a revote required. There is delay in obtaining things through the Crown Agents. I would like to know whether the delay is due to the part of the Crown Agents or whether it is due on the part of the people from whom the Crown Agents were ordering them or whether the Crown Agents regard themselves as being wedded to a particular firm from whom to obtain these things. It is deplorable when you have this sort of thing happening because when an Item takes six months to come, you usually find the taxpayers having to pay so much more for the Item than when it was originally ordered.

I will like the Hon. Minister to know that we are watching the situation carefully in respect of goods ordered through the Crown Agents and we deprecate these revotes caused by these delays when this amount could be saved if the Crown Agents had acted perhaps more expeditiously.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not blame the hon. member for what he said for more reasons than one, but I would say this. I visit the Crown Agents almost every time I go to England and I am more than satisfied that all the nonsense talked by the Chambers of Commerce about your using of the Crown Agents instead of using the merchants does not pay off, is even worse than nonsense. The Crown Agents are a body set up to trade on behalf of the colonies and they do so without making any profits, and, if they save money for you, they give it back to the Government. The Crown Agents are merely agents for the people of the colony.

When I met Sir George Seel, on the last occasion, I told him how we were getting attacks when we were dealing with Estimates and sometimes at normal meetings of the Chamber of Commerce as regards our dealing with the Crown Agents. I said to him: "I will be dealing with the Annual Estimates next March; for God's sake, give me something to explain what is the real position as regards Crown Agents." I was amazed at the literature he put into my hands. Let me say that the Crown Agents do a good job of work for the colonies and they never hit back at the attacks of merchants in different parts of the world. A special commission was appointed in the Gold Coast in the days when it was the Gold Coast and they reported strongly that it was far better to deal with the Crown Agents than merchants of the Gold Coast. I discovered the same thing talking with him and with Sir Alfred Savage who, I know, nobody

would say would do anything to hurt us. I had to ask him: "why is it that you remain so quiet instead of letting the world know what you do for us?" They do not pay any attention to these attacks.

While I agree with the hon. members that there is a danger of their being negligence, I am perfectly satisfied as to their work at present. They do their best for the colony. The two Crown Agents, Sir George Seel and Sir Alfred Savage, both of whom lived for years in Barbados, know the objections made from time to time down Broad Street.

I just want to say that there is no foundation for the suggestion. I am not saying that the hon. member is saying that the hon. member is saying something which he does not feel. He has a fear, but it is a fear for which there is no complaint. I feel absolutely sure that the Crown Agents do their best. It used to be called the Crown Agents for the Colonies but they are also independent importers for alien countries who also use them nowadays. The people from Africa and Persia use the Crown Agents because they have such faith in them. Although these are alien people, they use the Crown Agents to purchase things for them and I think it is only time that somebody did say that all the accusations against the Crown Agents for wasting money are unfounded and that we have no reason to shift from the Crown Agents to somebody else.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I only rise to say how recently - I think it was either late last week or yesterday - that I have come across literature endorsing substantially everything that the Hon. Premier has said; it is something which I did not know before, that foreign Governments deal with the Crown Agents. I am glad to be able to say that I have read that recently and having read what I have read, I can confirm every sentence which has been made by the Hon. Premier.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like an assurance from the Hon. Premier to the effect that when the West Indian Regiment comes into being, members of this particular Force be given adequate consideration in being enlisted in that Regiment. I mean that in the case of those boys who are now rendering a voluntary service, they will be given adequate consideration for membership in the full grown Regiment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was not here earlier, but I want to say that this sort of thing wants to be ripped up. Nobody has any right coming in here and starting any business like this. If the Premier wants to do things like this, let him have a revolution and let the people give him the power to do them. We cannot sit under this nonsense all the time; it is time that we tell the people that this sort of thing ----

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not stopping; I am not dealing with any Resolution like this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with an Item in a Resolution under Head XXIV in the Supplementary Estimates 1957-58.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, a Resolution which I did not have. I come in here to do the people's business, but not in this ragged trousers manner. Why did I not have my Order Paper at home so that I could know with what I am going to deal? I am here representing the interests of the people who have sent me here; I am not just coming here to get \$220 a month.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must deal with the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have had no notice of the Resolution before. I have a right to know with what I am going to deal when I come here. When we are spending the taxpayers' money, do you not think that we should consult somebody outside? We are not the reservoir of all

knowledge; we must consult the opinion of somebody from outside on this or that matter. I have the right to be informed as to how every penny of the taxpayers' money is going to be spent. Now that an election is on, they can go on the platforms and say things. The day when the Ministers can spend their money in this way, that is all right; that is none of my business. I am entitled to consult people in public in order to know whether they are in agreement with any matter or not. Hon. members of this House have the right to get knowledge from outside. This is not the Premier's country; this is our country. The Premier has not been given the power to run the country as he likes; he has been given the power to run the country under constitutional procedure. I am not looking for any favours from the Premier.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Am I out of order for objecting to dealing with this Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going away from the Resolution. If he is speaking about the late circulation of the Order Paper, he may do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: History will prove that people like you will have a lot for which to answer in acquiescing in wrong in the face of everything that is patent and clear. Somebody is afraid of his skin; I am not. We cannot get the Speaker to agree to our giving notice of a question unless we give notice to him of it on Friday, so that we can give notice of that question in this House on Tuesday. This means that it does not involve the Government in anything, but as soon as we come in here, we are given this Resolution! I repeat, that I am not looking for any favours from anybody other than the people who have sent me here. If I am not elected to the House, then I am satisfied; but as long as I am elected, I am elected with the knowledge of who I am. I was wondering what was going to be done in the House today; I come here and find that there are three Resolutions with which we have to deal.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rang up a member of the staff of the House this morning about eleven o'clock to enquire if the House would be meeting today, and he said "Yes". Sometime after that, he told me that he had the papers for today's meeting and up to that time, I did not get any papers at all. The Resolution with which we are now dealing was actually presented to the House last Thursday. If you will recall, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the House presented a cyclostyled copy of the Resolution and asked the House at the conclusion of the Estimates debate, to remain a little longer and deal with the Resolution and the Opposition objected to that. There was only one single copy in the Chamber and you could not follow it thoroughly. If these Resolutions were actually tabled last Thursday, there could not be any excuse for the fact that up to mid-day today, we did not know whether there would be a meeting of the House or, if there was a meeting, with what we would be expected to deal. It is either a question of laziness or indifference or actual contempt for the members of this House. The idiots over there are supposed to walk in here when the Government says that there will be a meeting and puts matters with which they have to deal before them. Nothing like this has happened in the history of this House as far as I know; for all the years since I have been in here, I have never seen the affairs of the colony degenerate to the point to which they have got. A stop will have to be put to it at some time or other. 4.35 p.m.

Hon. members opposite have absolutely no respect for the proper procedure of this Assembly. With the introduction of Ministerial status we should have had some sort of Question Time at which certain important matters affecting the Government of the country could be discussed. That has not been done, and even the normal routine affairs of the House are conducted in this scandalous fashion. It must be somebody's fault and certainly the Government and the Ministers who are handsomely remunerated for the job they have to do should endeavour to see that the affairs of the House are carried out in a

most appropriate manner. This is not the way to do business. Here we are asked today to deal with several Resolutions involving expenditure of public money, and as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has pointed out, except either you are a member of the Government Party and have had previous knowledge of the matters in these Resolutions, or you are a genius and know everything, you have to come here and deal with anything they put before you intelligently. We are not rubber stamps. In some cases, Mr. Chairman, this sort of thing results from a deliberate effort to stop debate; some may be indifference, but some is deliberate. On more than one occasion important matters have been pushed before us at the latest hour merely in order to stifle debate, and if the Government wants to clear itself of these charges or demonstrate that it is worthy of the responsibility it has, it has to conduct at governmental level the affairs of the country in a more efficient manner. No member of the Opposition should be satisfied to get copies of documents to be dealt with this afternoon when last Thursday the same matters, at least some of them, were tabled on the floor of the House. That is to say, we have not had a chance of perusing them properly, because one copy was pushed around here late last Thursday when members were asked to deal with it.

The question that Head XXIII - Medical, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1,221 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$38,683. As hon. members will see from their notes which are full, these are ordinary Supplementary Estimates of the kind which we have just passed. We will do them in the normal way by taking them Head by Head.

Head XVI - Prisons

Head XVI - Prisons, was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the hon. member is not in his place, because he is always saying that we do not feed the prisoners good enough. The amount provided in last year's estimate has proved insufficient. There are a number of outstanding accounts which have to be paid for incidentals and other expenses which are given in the notes.

As hon. members may remember, stenotypists typed the Report of the Commissioner of Inquiry when the prisoners went on the roof. The Honorarium was paid from Incidentals and it is now sought to have a reimbursement because the outstanding commitments against this vote have to be met before the 31st of this month. (There is also an item under Travelling Expenses for which we are asking for \$48.

As hon. members are well aware, the Court of Grand Sessions lasts, I would be inclined to say, too long nowadays and Travelling Expenses have been exhausted.

I therefore beg to move that Head XVI - Prisons, stand part.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, there is one point which I should like to draw to the attention to the Hon. Minister of Social Services and it is this: very often when a prisoner is at Glendairy Prison and the Assizes are on, he is brought down to stand his trial in Bridgetown, and I have known that prisoners have been brought down from the Prison and for the whole day did not get any-

thing to eat. I should like him to check on that because it is not fair to a man who is forced to come down to stand his trial, because up to the time when the Jury says "guilty" he is presumed to be "not guilty." I should like him to give directions to the Prison Superintendent to send along breakfast for any prisoner on remand who has to stand his trial. A prisoner who is sent down to stand his trial should get something to eat and not have to wait until he is taken back to the Prison in the evening.

The question that Head XVI - Prisons, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If Your Honour would permit me, I am sorry I did not get up to say that any point would be taken care of by the Hon. Minister of Social Services, who is even more soft-hearted than the member for St. Andrew.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to make a point

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Head has already been passed.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: It is unfortunate because I wanted to reply to the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew; but if it is closed, I do not know whether I should ask to have it re-committed.

Head XXI - Science and Agriculture

Head XXI - Science and Agriculture, was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, these figures are high it is true, but the explanation is there. The people employed in the Agricultural Department whether it be General, Pine Plantation and Central Livestock Station or the District Agricultural Stations received increased production bonus. Nobody expected when the Estimates were made that we would have had this record crop, and the result is that we did not provide enough in last year's Estimate for the amount of money that has proved necessary to pay out in crop production bonus. 4.45 p.m.

Apart from that, as hon. members are aware, the basic rate of wage has been increased and we did not in last year's Estimates provide any increase in basic wages. That is why it amounts to \$6,000 to Labour, - General, \$500 to Labour - Entomological, \$6,000 to Pine Plantation and Central Livestock Station, and \$2,000 to the District Agricultural Stations. I do not know if I can say anything more than what appears in the note. That is just how it happened. I beg to move that Head XVI stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there can be no justification of the failure to make provision for increase in the basic wages. These Estimates come before us normally the last week in February and let us say that the Departmental Heads must submit their estimates sometime between November and December, if not before. Normally, the price for sugar is fixed after negotiations with the Ministry of Food somewhere around November, so that Mr. Chairman, there can be no excuse at all for failure to vote some sort of increase in the basic wage unless Government intends to rob the Agricultural labourers whom it employs. If Government estimated to pay the same wages after the sugar price has been increased, what example is Government setting to plantation owners? When these Estimates came here last year in March, Government was well apprised that the price for sugar had gone up and they must have also had some knowledge that some of the increase in price must be passed on to the plantation labourers that are employed; therefore, this is a lack of foresight on the part of the Government. It could only be slackness. You can see what it really means if the Workers' Union does not get around to do this business on the part of the agricultural

workers. It would mean that the agricultural workers employed by the Government would be robbed. In other words, it is Government's business to set an example. If the Government has labourers at the Pine Plantation, the Agricultural Stations and elsewhere, and it knows before the Estimates are prepared what sugar is worth, it should be able to estimate and publish the rates it intends to pay for the ensuing crop year. It should not, knowing that as there is an increase in the price of sugar, therefore there would be an increase in the rates of wages to agricultural labourers, go ahead and make provision to pay the same rate to these people as they paid before Government should set an example to public enterprise. When plantation owners and the sugar industrialists see that the Government has estimated to pay the same rate of wages as they paid before, naturally these people would resist stronger the increased wage rate on the ground that the Government estimated to pay the same rate although the Government knows that the wage rate has gone up.

I hope in the future not to hear the excuse made in this House today over this matter. It is just a plain bald statement that we must vote more money to pay workers because the Government failed to make provision for the increase in rate although they knew beforehand that it would be increased. That is not good enough and unless the Government wants to lay itself open to a charge that it is willing to exploit agricultural labourers just as much as a private employer, this is not the manner in which these Estimates should be worked out.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when you read this Addendum you can see that this is really a joke and not only in reading the Addendum but on hearing what the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution had to say on it. Do you realise that this Resolution is dealing with something which is nearly a year old? Do you realise that this was agreed to by the agricultural industry in March, 1957? This was agreed upon in March, 1957, and in 1956 it was known to the Government that the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association were negotiating the increase on the basis that the union was asking for a 25% increase.

Now, the Government is saying that they did not anticipate the increase. The price of sugar was increased and everybody knows that the Union was asking for this 25% increase. They say that they did not anticipate the increase and yet at the time they said that some of us were campaigning for election to this House on that ticket; some of them had the effrontery to say that the 25 per cent increase in the basic rate of wage was only asked for because of political reasons.

You are bringing down a Resolution to supplement something for which the wages were increased as from the 1st January, 1957, although that wage increase took place in March. What can you say now? You are now making provision to pay money to agricultural workers in the Government when all of the people who were entitled to it have received it already. The production bonus was paid out in November. Are you suggesting that you are now paying to labourers who work at the Pine and the various Agricultural Stations their production bonus? Why have the Government labourers been kept back for six months?

Only an illiterate could have written this Note. It reads thus:-

"The rate of crop production bonus was increased from 7% in 1957 to 25% in 1957. An increase of this magnitude was not anticipated and provision for labour in the current estimates is accordingly insufficient. In addition there was an increase in basic wages to agricultural labourers from January, 1957, provision for which was not included in the current Estimates."

Now, crop production bonus is not a rate. Crop production bonus is based on what the production is from year to year. It is not a rate like the rate of wages. There is no crop production bonus unless the crop reached a certain percentage. You are now bringing down to this

House a Resolution to give agricultural workers of the Government an increase which has already been made a year ago to workers in the industry. If you have not paid this money out I would like to know why is it that people working for the Government must wait for so long to get it. If the ordinary plantation workers did not get it, you would have heard a human cry. What is the excuse? How can you say that this was increased since 1957 and you have now come with provision for these workers on the 19th March, 1958?

4.55 p.m.

What is the excuse for that? How can you say that this was increased since 1957 and you now come down to us with it on the 18th March, 1958? Far from that, this is a supplementary estimate of the 1957-58 Estimates and we have just passed the Estimates for 1958-59. What I cannot understand is the legal position in Barbados. You are passing a Supplementary vote today after you have passed the Estimates for 1958-59. It is true that these Estimates have not passed the Other Place, but here it is that we are now giving the agricultural workers their money based on Production Bonus when all other persons have been paid! It may be that the Government knows that an election is on and that I have a meeting in an agricultural district like Belleplaine tonight. I want to know if this is a matter connected with Haggats Experimental Agricultural Station. (ASIDES) You went last night and I am going there tonight, and this Resolution has come down now. I want to say that any Government who can keep back agricultural workers from getting their Production Bonus which is paid out in October, should be damned. Are you now making an excuse for not paying out money which should have been paid to the agricultural workers, who must have got in debt again, and you are now asking us to agree to this Resolution? (ASIDES) Some hon. member says that they must have paid the money out of another Fund; but what is the authority which they would have to pay this money out of any other Fund? That is not stated in this Resolution; it is not stated here what the Fund is or what is the authority for paying out the money. Let them say so; but do not let them say that this is a revote. You are giving us the impression today, that you are asking us to vote this money, because you could not estimate the amount, and if you have paid out this money, this is a dishonest note. All the Note says is that you want this provision to be made out of the Treasury. You can very well realise the serious plight of the financial position of this colony where the Legislature knows nothing about money having been paid out, and you have come to this Legislature a period of five months after. This is an occasion when nobody would have a good word to say for the Government and it will be an excellent opportunity for me when I am going into this country area tonight.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I did not wish to enter the debate, but because of certain misstatements which have been made by previous speakers ---

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks. The hon. member refers to misstatements made by previous speakers and I was one of those speakers.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Ask the Marshal to leave there and you will hear.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to know on what you are speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am raising an objection to what the hon. member has said; anyhow, I will reply to him.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The facts are very clear and simple. We reaped a bumper crop last year and the amount which was payable to the labourers in the year preceding that was 7% and in the following year, we had to pay 25%. All the agricultural labourers have been paid ever since, but what has happened is that when the estimate was made up, it was not known how much was

paid by way of Production Bonus and the Department did not include it. Now, they have come to the end of the year, they find that they need more money for the purpose of carrying on the normal working of the Department. That is all. When you talk about robbing people out of their Production Bonus and detaining them from getting their money, do you think that could happen in my regime? Never. (Mr. WALCOTT: You have no regime.) If it is for a day, I have had it and it is now a question of history. (Mr. WALCOTT: The note is misleading.) Nothing is wrong with the note; we have paid out the money. The facts are plain and simple; now, we know what the amount is, we are asking that the amount be paid. We are only asking in a normal way to give us the balance of the money so that we can carry on until the end of the financial year. I repeat that those are the facts pure and simple.

Nobody in Barbados could say that I would be against the agricultural labourers and delay them with this payment, let alone this Government collectively. This is what the Note says:

"The rate of crop production bonus was increased from 7% in 1956 to 25% in 1957. An increase of this magnitude was not anticipated and provision for labour in the current votes is accordingly insufficient. In addition, there was an increase in basic wages to agricultural labourers from January, 1957, provision for which was not included in the current estimates."

Having paid this increase, we are now faced with a deficit and we have come here and asked for permission to pay this increase.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are just two statements which I want to correct. We are told that everybody is happy at the Pine, but I do not know when the last hon. member who spoke went to the Pine, and I would suggest to him that he gets up there very quickly. You have the entire staff of stock-keepers at the Pine who have been for a long time asking the Government to put them on the permanent staff, being employed as casual labourers; and up to now, in spite of the fact that Petition after Petition has been presented and interview after interview has been made with the personnel and staff at this Government Department, these people are still being employed as casual workers. It is now a year since they have received a memorandum to the effect that the matter is being actively considered and it would soon reach finality. However, the matter is still being considered.

5.05 p.m.

From the time the Livestock Station was established at the Pine, the stock-keepers there have been employed as casual labourers. I know for a certainty that for a long time they have been asking that this should be considered and that they be put on the permanent staff. Up to about four weeks ago, I was told by two of the men that the matter, so far as they knew, had not yet been attended to. If this is so, I suggest that immediate attention be paid to it if the hon. member really wants everybody to be happy at the Pine.

Now, Sir, there is one further point; it is of course as plain as a pikestaff that the Government had failed to estimate for an increase either in wages or in production bonus for its agricultural staff in respect of the past financial year. The principle is wrong; all that Government does is to present to the public a wrong estimate of the financial state of the island, because so long as Government intends to pay the current wage rate to agricultural workers, it could not be an accurate estimate to present the same wage rate as the year before when the Government knows that the price for sugar has gone up. The Government could not tell then accurately what would either be the wage increase or the production bonus, but certainly some provision should have been made for it, and in this case the Government should not wait for finalising of these rates between the Union and the Sugar Employers. The Government is running an estate and is in the position of an employer; Government is among the plantocracy; Government knows what the increased price of sugar is; it knows what it has to allow for depreciation and floating stock, and although

it cannot know what it can allow for labour, Government should, immediately the sugar price is made known and with the figures before it, say what it would pay to agricultural workers and set an example to private enterprise.

Sir, you have the spectacle of the Government coming down in March and telling you they are estimating by paying the same wage rates as the year before when the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out that the Union and the Employers are in the throes of a struggle for a twenty-five per cent increase demanded by the Union. Government should be able to pay a little more to their employers, and if the Government came down with an estimate for an increased wage rate based on the increase in the price of sugar, it would strengthen the hands of the Union. That is the duty of a labour Government, because if Government comes down and says it is going to pay 25% or 30%, it means that the Union which is asking for 25% would have its hands strengthened, and if private enterprise thought that they could not do what Government was doing because Government would not be paying 6% to some creditor or paying the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank money which they had borrowed to run the estates, they could at least pay 22%. In other words, it is Government's duty to set a good example and not a bad example; and failure to estimate for an increase either in the wage rate or the production bonus rate when it has all the figures before it, is another way of saying that it is not prepared to set an example, and it is going to pay the same wages as last year and wait until the struggle between the Union and the Industrialists is completed to pay those rates too. That is not good enough for a Labour Government; it would be all right for a Conservative Government. The Labour Government was elected on the votes of the working-class, and is obligated by virtue of its position to set an example in the field of labour in so far as it competes on the same basis as private enterprise; and in this case as an employer of labour it is on the same footing as any plantation owner or any industrial combine. Think of what it would mean to the Trade Union representative if in any year Government fixed its wage rate, because it could not fix the production bonus rate until the end of the crop, based on the maximum which it could pay for the price of sugar, and did not wait to fix the wage rate during the negotiations of the Union and the employers. Think of what it would mean in this country and the impetus it would give to organised labour to have the Government coming up with better wages which private employers may eventually offer after bitter negotiations with the Unions' representatives. From time to time there has been talk in this island of nationalising the Sugar Industry. Hon. members have used the argument to and fro that if Government bought a sugar factory it would have detailed knowledge of the operation of a sugar factory and be in a better position to pay the appropriate price for canes. That has been the argument and as the hon. junior member for St. Lucy will tell the Committee, it has been all along his considered opinion expressed repeatedly on the floor of this House that if the Government owned one sugar factory - and I recollect that you yourself have in the past urged upon Government the advisability of acquiring a sugar factory, Joes River, if I am not mistaken - not only would it provide machinery to process its canes but it would give Government details and accurate information as to the operational cost of a sugar factory. In the case of a plantation Government has not got to go and buy one; Government has more than one, and the workers on the Government plantations are not of a different category from people in private plantations. Not one single plantation worker is entitled to pension although he is employed in a Government concern; he is in precisely the same category as the agricultural worker in private enterprise, and therefore there can be no excuse at all for Government continuing the habit in the past of estimating wage rates when it fully knows what the increase in sugar has been.

5.15 p.m.

It must be the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture to set an example to employers in the Sugar Industry. Without awaiting any negotiations some businesses have paid agricultural workers up to the maximum price irrespective of whether or not it coincided with

the rate agreed upon by the Workers' Union and the Employers Federation. That is the duty of the Labour Minister; therefore it is even the more scandalous in a Labour Government presenting its Estimates in the March of a given year and refusing to take account of the increase in the sugar price fixed in the November of the preceding year. There can be no excuse for it and for what the Addendum says. The principle behind it is completely wrong and could not be more wrong.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that he is not a candidate for the Federal Elections. I would like the Hon. Minister to know that as long as he is a candidate for the Federal Elections and as long as he is a member in here, he is a politician. You remain in here by the work you do in here. We are accused by the Hon. Premier of playing politics. Let us go in a carpenter's or a mason's shop or do a job other than what politics requires us to do. This is a political field and we have to deal with political issues.

The Hon. Premier does not know how serious is his statement. Last year, you constructed a budget based on the fact that you were going to get a higher price for sugar and the rates of income tax were calculated on the same basis. There was no excuse to say that you did not know. Where the hon. member has made a mistake - and it is as clear as a pikestaff, - he does not realise that the production bonus was not 7% in 1957. They have got so arrogant and stupid over there that they cannot realise that the Addendum is wrong. In 1956 it was 7%. They say it was 7% in 1957. The note in the Addendum which they wrote or which was written for them is wrong. When the Hon. Premier was constructing his budget in 1957, the production bonus for 1956 had already been paid: so they knew the increase on that.

What he should know is that when they were constructing their Estimates and they put down in 1956 so many thousand dollars under this general labour Head, quite obviously they could not budget for the same amount in 1957. They knew in 1957 that the production bonus would be higher than that of the previous year because at that time the crop was estimated. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, it is true, was not a member of the Chamber then, and so what he is now talking on is something about which he knows nothing. He read back something from a file. He was not the Minister who dealt with it because he was not the Minister of Agriculture in 1956.

In 1957 the percentage was 24.47%. There is not such a thing as a rate on production bonus. Production bonus is based on the amount of the crop over a certain tonnage: so when he talks of a rate increase, any fool reading this would believe that this is a rate fixed on production bonus. In the Hon. Minister's private capacity as a planter, he should have known then when these Estimates were passed that the production bonus for 1957 was going to be higher than it was in 1956. He must not arrogate to himself all this knowledge; he must not state that people are making misleading statements for political purposes. If he is afraid of being a politician, I am not afraid of being one.

Mr. DOWDING: It might be marvelous, Mr. Chairman, to reach a point in here when you can read the Note to this item in the Addendum and say it is as clear as a pikestaff and that it explains itself. As I read the Addendum in my illiterate manner, I cannot understand it. It says that the crop production was increased from 7% in 1957 to 25% in 1957. I would be very grateful if an explanation can be made whether it is by some wonderful means of the intellect at their disposal it is possible to explain how the production bonus was 7% in 1957 and again it was 25% in 1957. I cannot understand exactly how this Addendum is written but if I take it as an indication of the manner in which Government Business is being done, well, perhaps the example is being set by the Ministers.

The point raised is a very serious one to me because when we make out these estimates which we just passed, it looks to me as if we need not do that; we can come in everyday with supplementary estimates. Nothing is known of the finances of the Island and we continue in this manner all the time. I am wondering if the Hon.

Minister can say whether or not there has been any provision made in this year's Estimates for this purpose. One would expect that it would be possible to estimate at this time of the year what the crop is going to be, and knowing the agreement which obtained between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation, one would be able to arrive at what the production bonus is likely to be. But I do not see any reference to it in this year's Estimates, neither do I see the same sub-head allocated to this particular matter in this Year's Estimates.

5.25 p.m.

That again throws one out, because from time to time, one would expect the main Heads and a sub-Head to remain so that you would have an opportunity before coming to the House to sit down and try and trace these matters. It is hoped that those who have anything to do with the matter - I cannot find out exactly at what point in this year's Estimates has allowance been made for this payment. I would like to know if it is an error of judgment on the part of the persons concerned in not making this allowance of which he would know well in advance, or if this is the manner in which it is expected that this work will be done. Are you going to have this amount brought to us to be supplemented every year at this time for the year before? I do feel that the staff at the Department should be in exactly the same position as any private person to be able to estimate within 1% or 2% what the Production Bonus is going to be. I would like to know if any amount has been included in this year's Estimates for this year's Bonus. It is absolutely wrong to say that there is any particular rate of bonus; it is an agreement on which we work. The Note says that it was 7% in 1957 and 25% in 1957; is that correct?

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the Hon. Minister that the figure (5) should be inserted by the second line after Item 76, otherwise the Note reads like this. "The rate of expenditure has been higher owing to increased activity", and then it goes on, "the number of school children attending the Dental Clinics for examination etc". I do not know if the hon. member understands what I am pointing out. You should have Item 35 and then have (5), otherwise, the explanation which follows is a continuation of the explanation to Item 76. It may seem to be an unimportant matter, but it should be dealt with in order to save time. As the Note to Item 76 is worded, it appears as if the explanation to Item 76 is one continuous explanation.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, all that the hon. senior member for St. George is asking is this: can you tell beforehand what this crop season will produce? He is saying that we should have been able to estimate and bring down to this House during this season how much Production Bonus we will have to pay when the production payment comes off. It is tantamount to that. We never know about these things until the crop is finished, and we have the overall figures. What has been said is so ludicrous that I did not want to answer, especially when the hon. senior member for St. George poses that question and makes himself look so foolish. He is a factory-owner and he cannot tell you how many tons of sugar he will make this crop; he does not know what the overall position will be; and therefore we cannot now estimate or put in the Estimates what the production bonus will be. If you think that you will grab power out of our hands, it is not so. You come here with absolute foolishness; you are asking people to believe that the Director of Agriculture and his staff can, at this moment, use a miraculous wand and by the stroke of a pen be able to say how much production bonus will be paid out, so that we can come down here and say: "We want so much for production bonus for the Pine." If the hon. senior member for St. George can tell us what he will pay at his factory, then we will tell him what we are going to pay now. We have to wait until the crop is finished and then arrive at figures. I particularly said that the rate of crop production bonus was 7% in 1956 and 25% in 1957. (A MEMBER: The Addendum says that the rate of crop production bonus was increased from 7% in 1957 to 25% in 1957.) We cannot fix anything until

the price of sugar is known; nobody knows what the free sugars will bring. All that information has to be gathered in. Suppose we get less for sugar! The price of molasses is down and all of that has to do with this matter; therefore how could we estimate how much we should put down for production bonus?

5.35 p.m.

It is absurd for us to think that the Director of Agriculture or his staff could get these figures produced in time for the Estimates now. What we do is to go ahead and ask for so much money in the Estimates. We have based our calculation on that; but if the crop exceeds more than what we estimated, the normal procedure has always been to come back and ask for more. That has always been the case because you cannot arrive at an exact figure. Agriculture is like that. Even with the Loan Bank, you may go and borrow \$5,000 or \$10,000, as the case may be, and then find that certain things have been altered and you have to get an increased loan. The Pine is not run by one of the Banks; the Government finances it, and therefore we who hold the purse strings must release money when they want money to carry on the work. If it were a commercial venture there would be no need to come to the House, because in your commercial deals you have sometimes to go back to the Bank and ask for a further loan.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to be charitable to the non-member. The hon. member must bear in mind that this is an estimate, and he should not say that he cannot estimate for an increase, because your whole Budget is an estimate of income tax, death duties and so on. Your Budget is built up around the sugar production of Barbados, and therefore every year you find out what you are likely to make, and then make us pay taxation. Your fiscal policy is based on that; so you cannot say that if your fiscal policy is based on something that you cannot estimate something in detail. You are saying that the Department of Agriculture could not estimate what the crop was going to be in 1957. In December 1956 it was estimated that the crop would be 175,000 tons; on that basis the Department would have known that the production bonus would have been higher because they were dealing with free sugars. I can tell the hon. member that the difference in free sugars is annually the difference between what you get for negotiating sugars and what you get for free sugars. 129,000 tons is sold at guaranteed prices; so it is not a question of knowing how much you are going to get; the amount you will get for free sugars is above that, and if you know that your total is going to be 180 tons, there are 51,000 tons on which you cannot estimate the price factor. What we are telling you now is that the production bonus is not going to be determined on what you do with the 51,000 tons, because as soon as you go over 129,000 tons, you get production bonus on every 5,000 tons and the only difference you would get would be the few cents in price which would not make any difference to your production bonus. We are saying that you can estimate for an increase if you know the increased price of sugar, because that must bring an increase in wages to the workers. I will tell the Minister that he must not sit there and allow "that" to lead him when it comes to sugar business. The sugar factories cannot tell you the final price to pay for canes nor can they ask you to wait until the end of the crop to pay you; they have to pay you in advance. You can make an estimate on the known fact that there is going to be an increase, but we are not asking you to give an accurate figure, because the budget is not an actual amount. If you budgeted on an actual amount, why would you budget for one million dollars and come back for \$1 million more?

The Minister of Agriculture should take a leaf out of the Chief Minister of Trinidad's book. This is what he tells his people: when you are estimating, you do not put down bogus figures because when you put them in and place the budget before the community, it means that you are either going to inflate or deflate and the community would not know what it has to bear. Even now, I would put it to the Minister that he knows that he has to pay workers at the Pine increased wages; so it is no point in saying that you do not know what the actual

amount is going to be. We are not asking you to do that, but you can put in a figure for increased wages. It is a very serious thing to point something out to you and for you to say that we are making misleading statements. You have misleading statements here which we are pointing out to you. We are pointing out that the 7% which you paid was not in 1957, and before you gracefully say that it is a mistake in the Addendum, you are saying that we are reading wrong.

I am trying to be charitable to the Hon. Minister because he made an effort to explain the matter; but he must not be arrogant in a matter like this in which other people are involved and know about it. He must not chide people every time we tell them something by saying that we want to take away the Government as though it were a toy or a sweetener. The people of Barbados will take it away from you. You have this idea that you are going to govern the people for ever, but the people will take it away from you.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, Oh how simple! After listening to the Minister's statement, I am more than ever convinced that deep down in my heart that is the reason why we will continue to get the finances of this colony more and more involved to a point where we will never understand. In referring to me, the hon. member talked about my private capacity and so forth; thank God in my private capacity we can see a little further; we can see at least a year in advance, I think if the Hon. Minister would ask or read the newspapers he would have seen where the Department of Agriculture estimated this year's crop to be X tons, and if I had an opportunity of studying my papers, I would have produced here today a document from which you have arrived at the 7% or 25% with which the hon. senior member for St. Peter is fully acquainted, and on which figure I would have been able to give him what percentage to pay in this Year's Estimates.

5.45 p.m.

This is an agreement laid down between the Barbados Workers Union and the Sugar producers Federation on which this percentage is based and it starts from one and so many thousand times above what the average crop is based on. Having had this year's crop already estimated, you should have been able to estimate accurately in this year's Estimates how much production bonus is going to be needed for the people whom you employ.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the hon. member. If the hon. member knows anything about the estimating, there is a tentative estimate and a firm estimate. Which one are you referring to?

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I have never heard of a firm estimate in all my life. I must get a dictionary in here for hon. members on the other side—I really would like to find out what is a firm estimate. What I am trying to suggest to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is that in my firm, perhaps we might have ways and means of acquiring a firm estimate but that would be an estimate by the firm! (Laughter) Frankly, this matter is very ludicrous to me because even in making out bills for things like freight which we have to pay on every cart load of canes on arrival at the factory, it is always necessary to be able to estimate what your production bonus is going to be and it is included in the total rate to be paid. In my firm, it is as simple as I say it. We take the estimate of the Department of Agriculture of what the crop is going to be and we work it out. In the particular year when the production bonus was worked out by the Department at 24.47%, we made it 22%. As you know, a difference of 2% would make no difference whatsoever. All I am saying is that it is possible for the Department of Agriculture to let the taxpayers know what it is going to cost them in labour. They might not be able to tell you quite exactly but the estimate can be pretty near the correct figure. If hon. members on that side think that it is the production bonus which was increased from 7% in 1956 to 25% in 1957, that is all nonsense. The bonus has not been increased but the total crop has increased and you allow your bonus rate at the beginning of the season to be commensurate and as

agreed between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar producers federation.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand where I have made a misleading statement on this matter, and I think it would be wise for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to get the Director of Agriculture to estimate what it costs in production bonus.

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

Head XXIII (1) – Medical

Head XXIII (1) Medical was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIII (1) stand part.

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

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

Head XXIII (7) – Medical

Head XXIII (7) Medical was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIII - (7) Medical stand part.

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

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

Head XXXVIII – Old Age Pensions

Head XXXVIII - Old Age Pensions was called.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXXVIII stand part.

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

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

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$38,683 do now pass.

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

The question 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 three Resolutions 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 Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH ITEM 11

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 11 on the Order Paper as the next order of the Day.

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

AMENDMENTS OF OTHER PLACE TO CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL, 1958, CONSIDERED.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; to consider the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, this is a simple amendment. It is merely to insert the marginal note against Section III of the Bill and the words of that note are: "Amendment to Second Schedule of the Principal Act."

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

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

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

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

5.55 p.m.

ORDERS POSTPONED

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 Larceny Act, 1868.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 2, 3 and 4 and to take Order No.5 as the next Order of the day. I am also asking leave for the Hon. Leader of the House to take charge of this Order in my absence.

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

SAVINGS BANK (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill as the "Objects and Reasons" explain. This Bill seeks to amend the Savings Act 1914, so as to make provision for the appointment to the Savings Act 1914, so as to make provision for the appointment to the Savings Bank of two Additional Accountants and for their salary. A general increase in business has made it necessary to add to the staff of the Bank. 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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 to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, Mr. L. StA, THORNE 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. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am supporting this Bill, of course, but I would like to take the opportunity of saying with regard to the Savings Bank staff and the proposal to increase it, that I could not let this opportunity slip without paying tribute to the efficiency and courtesy of the staff of this particular Bank. They set an example to the Civil Servants of this Island in the civil and courteous manner in which they serve the public which they are there to serve. In my opinion, this is the outstanding department of Government in which the Civil Servants are really civil, really courteous and they really realise that they are there to serve us and not that we are there to serve them.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the ACTING 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.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Bill concludes Government Business for this sitting. I should like to say that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is desirous of proceeding with an Item under Private Members' Business with respect to the purchase of land in St. George for the erection of a Post Office, and I hope that it will be possible to allow the Hon. Minister to deal with the matter.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business having been concluded, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

SAINT GEORGE GLEBE BILL

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No.6 under the Head "Private Members Business" as the first Order of the Day under this Head.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:- To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Lord Bishop and the Rector of St. George to sell certain lands to the Executive Committee for the purpose of erecting a Post Office thereon.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to authorise the Lord Bishop and the Rector of

St. George to sell certain lands to Executive Committee for the purpose of the erection of a Post Office. This is a very simple Bill and it can be regarded as a formality. It is for the purpose of giving permission to the Church - this has been an old tradition if not a custom - to sell a bit of land for the construction of a Post Office and Library in the parish of St. George. The land is Glebe Land under trees next to the St. George Church. I think it is a very simple matter and it would be a waste of time to debate it.

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

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing this in principle but I would have thought that the Lord Bishop and the Rector of St. George would have availed themselves of this opportunity to make a magnanimous gesture and give to the Executive Committee of this island the land for the purpose of erecting a Post Office thereon. I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that instead of being asked to approve the selling, we are not being asked to approve by legislation the giving of this land by His Lordship and the Rector to the Executive Committee of this island. It is rather shocking to find that the church is prepared to get

Mr. SPEAKER: Did you say that the Rector and the Bishop were asked to approve of the price?

Mr. BRANCKER: This Bill is to authorise the Bishop of Barbados and the Rector of the Parish of St. George to sell to the Executive Committee of the island of Barbados as the site for the erection thereon of a Post Office to serve the said parish of St. George a parcel of land. I am surprised that we are being asked to approve of the sale instead of a gift by the Church. We expect the Church to set an example in kindness, charity and giving. We do not expect in these days when the Church is asking so much of us that they should ask us to approve of the sale of this land. I wonder how the hon. member for St. George really would get over that! We will allow it to pass; he has an amazing way of getting things done in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker; the less he says the quicker the things will pass. So long as he does not make the mistake of dilating on these measures, he is assured of their passage in this House. I should like him to have a word with the Bishop and the Rector - he may not have seen them since last Sunday - and tell them not to let us have anything like this again. Let him set an example of giving sometimes and remind them that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the remarks of the hon. member, I could not agree with him more. We made several efforts to reduce the price. We had a figure arranged with the previous Rector but when the new Rector assumed office, he said he would have it on his conscience if the land of the Church was sold for the purpose of erecting a Post Office and Library unless he got the maximum for it.

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. F. E. Miller seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. THORNE being in the Chair.

The Pre-amble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, at this stage perhaps I might inquire as this Clause speaks of authorising to sell at such time, for such price and on such terms as shall be thought fit to sell and dispose of all that certain piece or parcel of land, whether the hon. member would see it fit to give us some idea of the price which it is proposed to sell and dispose of at. That would encourage us to pass this section even quicker than we might if he can tell us.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I think, Mr. Chairman, it would suffice to say that we are satisfied that the price can be regarded as reasonable, although I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is so little that the Church could afford to give that bit of land. I hope that would suffice the hon. member.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I too, like the Leader of the Opposition would like some indication from the hon. member as to the price for this land. He has assured this Committee that the price is fairly reasonable, just as the price for the Central Foundry was fairly reasonable, the price for land at Blackmans, the land at Rockley and the land at Enmore. My conception of what is reasonable does not tally with the Government's at all; so I would prefer Government to give us some idea of how much the land would cost, because as I said, we have instances of Government buying land at a price which no reasonable man could call reasonable; therefore having that example before us, Mr. Chairman, as far as my Parliamentary ability enforces me, I must ask for some sort of figure, because it seems that my idea of reasonable and that of the Government do not coincide.

Mr. BRANCKER: May I put it to the hon. member this way, who I know is a shrewd businessman in this island and a structural engineer of no mean class? It is proposed to sell according to Section 2 of this Bill 8,898 square feet of land or thereabouts. I am wondering if the member would tell us what the price of land in this parish would be, and if the land which is now proposed to be sold by his Lordship and the Rector of St. George to the Executive Committee is being sold at the normal price per square foot as land in that district is sold, or for less or more. Is there any reason why Government should keep it a secret from us and make us believe that the members of the Executive are ridiculously, fantastically and overwhelmingly over-generous? Would he take us into his confidence?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should recognise that this could only be regarded as a private member's Bill. Item 2 is the question of seeking permission of the Legislature for the Lord Bishop and the Rector of the Parish to sell a bit of land to the Government. At this stage, you are more or less asking too much of me. They are only asking permission to sell a private concern to the Government. At this stage I must ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to refrain from pressing for what could be regarded as an undignified request, as I have already assured him that the figure is by no means exorbitant. I have no doubt the hon. member will have some respect for the things I say on the floor of this House, but he is asking too much at this stage by enquiring into the figure.
6.15 p.m.

The hon. member must bear in mind that this is a private request by the Church; it is only asking for permission to sell a piece of land to the Government. It is not a matter of the Government yet and it will not be until the money is about to be paid. However, I want to assure the hon. member that the figure is not exorbitant. You are asking too much at this stage when you are pressing me to disclose the figure.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister who has just sat down said that he would not like hon. members of the Opposition to press him to tell the negotiated price which is now only the concern of His Lordship the Bishop and the Government. He has also stressed that this is a Private Bill. I have some reservations on that. After all, the taxpayers' money is going to

be expended on the purchase of this land, and the hon. member would not get away from the question eventually. Suppose we do not press him to tell us the price now, whenever he brings the Resolution down for the money, we would have the same opportunity of knowing it; so to my mind I do not think the Hon. Minister is in any way at an advantage by refusing to tell hon. members now whether the price is "X" cents per square foot or Y cents per square foot. I do not think he has got away with anything because he has to come back to this Chamber for that money. If when he comes back for the money and it is too much and we on this side have the majority of votes we might refuse him.

I do not think it is any great secret or that the rules of propriety precludes him from telling us what is the price, because finally we are going to know what it is. He is bound to bring down a Resolution for the amount; therefore, I think it would be better if he would disclose it to us now. I would not go as far as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in asking the Church to give away its property. I wish the hon. member God's speed in his negotiations and I only hope he proves himself to be the business man which we credit him to be and he is not being pushed up the wall. (A VOICE: He is not a business man now.) Once a business man, always a business man!

I do not think the Hon. Minister is going to get out of it; therefore, his asking us to be modest and not to press him is something to which I cannot agree. He must know now the trend of the negotiations. He must know now whether they are asking too much or too little and in the long run the Government must come here and ask our permission to get the money.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will only ask the Hon. Minister to see to it that he will use the same speed in which he wants to acquire this piece of land, if he can do so, for the acquisition of other pieces of land which are necessary for use by the Government. He is making negotiations to acquire this piece of land now. The Government finds ways and means of acquiring certain pieces of land in Barbados, but when it comes to their acquiring certain other pieces of land, they do not want to acquire it. I would like them to see if they can acquire some of Heywoods land in St. Peter too. I am asking Government when they are acquiring certain pieces of land for the public of Barbados not to pick out certain people and say: "we are going to acquire this." and when it comes to other people say: "they are not selling us."

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I think the hon. members are wasting time. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has left the House at this moment. I just wanted to tell him that it is not my way to pick out certain people's land; if we want to acquire any bit of land for a particular purpose, we take steps to acquire it. We take it to the Cabinet. You have appointed me as Minister of Social Services. I have a soul and my Ministry is part of my soul. You either want me as Minister of Social Services or you do not want me.

As regards what hon. members are pressing me for, I say again that this is not the time for that; I must come back to you with a Resolution and then hon. members can ask me about it. As an hon. member has said, it seems as if some hon. members are in the mood of playing tennis. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has accused me of picking and choosing. Let me tell him that when I am going about a matter, it is not my concern what is the name of the owner; as long as there is enough money in the Treasury to buy what it is, I will see about it. I have no concern with who is the owner; I have no favours for anybody; mine is an independent soul and an independent heart. I want all hon. members to understand that, appreciate it and respect it. You do not have to angle me in any particular channel because I am not for sale. I repeat, I ask hon. members not to press me for the figure now; this is a private arrangement between the Rector of St. George and the Bishop asking the permission of this House of Assembly to authorise them to sell a bit of land to the Government. I am asking hon. members not to press me now. Sooner or later, I will bring down a Resolution and hon. members will be free to press me. My good sports model friend is flannel --

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister should tell the Committee if he is referring to strangers in the gallery or to somebody in the House. His remarks are unintelligible. They do not make any sense whatsoever.
6.25 p.m.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I know that politeness and courtesy are so cheap that you can afford to lavish them. I see no earthly reason why my friend - and I pray he will remain my friend for all time. I have an appreciation for friendship and I respect my friends; therefore, when I referred to my Sports-model colleague and friend of mine, that is an attempt to inject a congenial atmosphere into the Chamber and I see no reason why he should cause me unnecessary pain and hurt only to believe that I could be referring to someone other than my friend.

Mr. HUSBANDS: We are glad to agree with the substance of this Bill; it is to allow the Lord Bishop and the Rector of St. George permission to acquire this land. However, I was rather glad to hear the spirit of independence as manifested by the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill, because, as my colleague has pointed out, we are very interested in the Government acquiring land for Playing Fields in the parish of St. Peter. Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going outside the scope of this Bill.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I was appreciating the spirit of independence displayed by the Hon. Minister. I think my parishioners will soon be benefiting from the outspokenness and the independence of spirit expressed by the Minister, and of course, although being emotional, he is very sincere. I will refrain from saying anything more at this stage.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4&5 were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. F. E. MILLER, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 8th April, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Speaking on the adjournment, in view of the fact that the Government intends to adjourn the House for some considerable time, I do not think that this Branch of the Legislature should adjourn for this long period of time without going on record as expressing not only the Island's gratitude, but the gratitude of the West Indies as a whole to Canada for this very generous offer to the new nation of a ship. In the Caribbean we have always been very conscious of Canada's contribution to and interest in these Colonies and I think it is time, in view of the fact that the Dominion which is about to come to nationhood is a Dominion of Islands scattered about as far North as Jamaica and separated by vast expanses of water, I think that we in this Legislature here as public persons should go on record as expressing our appreciation of the very generous offer made by Canada. The offer has been made even before the Federal Legislature has met and before we know of its composition. We, in this Island, are members of a unit and I think that not only this unit, but all

the units must be very appreciative of Canada's very generous offer. We expect, of course, the great assistance which such areas can give, but before we adjourn I think we should go on record as expressing our thanks for the interest shown and the magnificent offer made by Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not stopping the hon. member, but I am wondering if he should not proceed in this matter by way of a Resolution and that would be presented in the proper quarter.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Your Honour's suggestion is an excellent one; this is a matter of some importance and this Legislature feels that it should be regarded in the most fitting manner.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on an entirely different matter. The matter I am raising on this motion for the adjournment is in respect of the payment of certain employees of the Transport Board who happen to sit as jurors at the Assizes. I am told that these public employees are not paid, because the Manager and the Director take the view that inasmuch as these employees are being paid as jurors, they should not be paid their normal weekly wage. I would like to say that every juror is entitled to his remuneration, and as long as he is working for a weekly wage, that weekly wage goes on quite normally. It is creating a hardship on these people if this Board refrains from allowing their employees to be paid, employees who are doing jury service, on the ground that they are entitled to be paid for their service as jurors. Everybody's salary goes on when he is sitting as a juror and I cannot understand how this idea has got into the head of the Manager of this Board that if these employees are entitled to something as being jurors, they cannot draw their weekly pay packets. Although the Minister is absent, I see the

careful notetaker of the Cabinet is making a note which I am sure he will bring to the notice of the proper authority.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I do agree that we should do this in the form of an Address or a Resolution so as to present something positive, but my reason for not taking any active step at this stage is because of the fact that it has to be agreed to before it comes to the Legislature. I feel that a more appropriate time should be when it is being drafted by the Legislature to present a Resolution of thanks and appreciation for the gift. I am sure we are all thankful for the effort which is being made by the Canadian authorities on behalf of the West Indies in the proposal to offer us a ship to transport cargo and passengers within the area.

As regards the point made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I will report it, but I must say that that is a question which will have to be seriously considered, because I think he will appreciate the fact that the majority of these people who attend are duly paid. If they do not turn out, somebody has to fill their places and that is why you always get what are called "job hands." If a driver did not turn up a morning, we would have to put somebody in his place and the former would not be paid for that day unless he was sick and produced a certificate to substantiate his sickness. I will however report to the Cabinet the expressions of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th April at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.40 p.m.