
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th April, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at twelve o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the 14th and 21st April, have been circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following :-

The Civil Establishment(General)(Amendment)(No.6) Order, 1959;

The Civil Establishment(General)(Amendment)(No.7) Order, 1959;

The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.8) Order, 1959;

The Civil Establishment(General)(Amendment)(No.9) Order, 1959;

The Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers)(Amendment) Order, 1959.

The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

An account of the transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island, for the quarter ended 31st March, 1959;

The Barbados Statistical Service - Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 9 - March 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.6) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.7) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.8) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.9) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages)(Amendment) Order, 1959."

A Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

A Bill to amend the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936.

Hon. M. E. COX:-

A Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export (Amendment) Act, 1953.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: -

A Bill to make provision for the interim control of the development of land.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the Bill to amend the Peasants Loan Bank Act, 1936, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export (Amendment) Act, 1953 was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, the Bill to make provision for the interim control of the development of land was read a first time.

**MR. HOLDER APPOINTED TO ACT AS
CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES**

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

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

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

**HON. DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS LAYS STATEMENT
re INCOME TAX PAYMENT**

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before entering upon the Orders of the Day, I think this might be an appropriate time to make this statement. I had promised the hon. senior member for St. Peter last Tuesday in consequence of a question he asked me to furnish the House with certain information in connection with the payment of Income Tax.

12.25 p.m.

He wanted to know about the increased collections of Income Tax since the introduction of the P.A.Y.E. system. It is estimated that the increased collection due to the introduction of that system is between \$400,000 and \$500,000 a year. The hon. member also wanted to know something in connection with the amount of arrears and the collection of those arrears. Up to the assessment year 1957, the arrears amounted to \$931,422 and collections were made as follows: Through the Court \$224,500; paying by instalments \$220,000 and assessments under objection, \$247,000. The amount of \$166,000 is in relation to taxpayers who left the island, dead, have no assets, gone and unknown, cannot be traced or assessments made on non-resident persons. The balance of \$74,000 represents the tax payable on a large number of small cases which cannot be classified without a considerable amount of work. That Sir, is the information.

RESOLUTION re REPAYMENT OF LOAN TO GOVERNMENT BY THE BARBADOS CRICKET ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to waive the repayment of the sum of \$12,000 in respect of a loan made to the Barbados Cricket Association (Incorporated) towards the rebuilding of the pavilion at Kensington Oval.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which came before this House during the last session in connection with the repayment of a loan to the Government by the Barbados Cricket Association, and it was felt on that occasion by certain hon. members that the Resolution was not presented in the right form. Your Honour will remember that; we have brought back the Resolution in the same form. There was one dissenting voice as to whether the relief which this Resolution seeks to give to the Barbados Cricket Association should be agreed to. As I have said, the Resolution has been brought back in the form which we think is the correct form in which it should be brought. As hon. members will remember and observe, the Government has adopted a policy of granting assistance to sports generally in Barbados.

It will be remembered that during the last Session two Sports Officers were appointed and the Government and the Legislature made that possible by granting the necessary amount of funds; in consequence of that policy, we feel that the terms as set out here in connection with this loan to the Barbados Cricket Association are favourable and in keeping with the policy of the Government to give support to sports generally. I think that hon. members are fully acquainted with the history of this loan to the Barbados Cricket Association. This loan was originally a loan of \$24,000 in 1947 and the Association has not made any repayment. The Association did say that a certain amount of money was collected and spent on the further erection of stands etc., and I think that most of us have seen and have occupied those stands. I repeat that in consequence of the policy of the Government to give support and encouragement to sports generally in Barbados, we feel that we should relieve the Barbados Cricket Association of

\$12,000 and the remaining \$12,000 should be paid as follows:- Repayment of this \$12,000 subject to the approval of the Legislature with the terms of payment being the payment of \$500 by the end of the calendar year and the payment of the balance within five years by equal annual instalments. There is nothing more which I can add to that.

It might also be remembered that the Government derives a certain amount of revenue from sports which take place at Kensington, from cricket, football and other sports which are held there. I do not know that there is anything further I can add to what I have already said; I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion I was opposed to this Resolution and I am opposed to it more so today. In 1947 when this suggestion was made that the Government should make a loan to the Barbados Cricket Association, the then Premier was opposed to the idea of making this loan to this Organisation. He said that there were people who play cricket, and there were some old cricketers, who could have subscribed the money for the erection of the pavilion. I did not agree with him; I thought that in view of the fact that Kensington Oval was regarded as a national park in the sense that many people use it, and having regard to the state of the pavilions which were burned down, it was a very unhappy situation. All the pavilions were burnt down and I felt that the Government should make a loan to the Association on the basis that they repay this money. That was done. Since then, the West Indian Cricket Board of Control have undertaken the administration of cricket in a general way and in many ways they have made money. They made two tours to the United Kingdom; on the first tour they made £30,000 and there was an unholy row as to how this money was to be invested. The second tour made another £30,000, and with one or two exceptions in the West Indies where the tours have not been profitable, the West Indian Board of Control have been making money. I do not know if that is in the rate today.

12.35 p.m.

Let us come back to Barbados. The Hon. Premier is not a logical speaker by any means, so you cannot make logical conclusions from what he has said, because he said that Government's policy is to support sport and that it must be remembered that we get revenue from sports in view of the entertainment tax and therefore this is nothing. To carry that to its logical conclusion, one could say that you get revenue from drinking rum and ask you why do you charge for a licence. In any case, you are only acting as distributors; so why make a man pay for a licence when you get so much money for your revenue? It is not therefore a question that you are getting entertainment tax, because that is the policy you are adopting in order to raise revenue, and not from the point of view of raising revenue to subsidise sports; and then you have this whitewashing that your policy towards sport is such that you have appointed a Sports Officer.

I need not say much about that because sports is not a political matter, although some people believe that they could make politics out of sports. You have cricket and football at your elementary and secondary schools, but you cannot make politics out of that; so you have to have people who understand what they are doing in these things are to be organised. If the Barbados Cricket Association of which I am a member is not in a position or does not know how to run its affairs and run them profitably, then I do not see why the taxpayers of Barbados should make a grant of \$12,000 to the Association. We today are asked to agree to a free grant; we made a free-interest loan which would have amounted during the years to over \$10,000 if you had given them that loan at 4%. We agreed, Mr. Speaker, to the loan because no pavilions were there and we wanted to help to erect stands. Kensington was like the Savannah without stands, but what is the situation today? We erected stands which became a money-earning affair at Kensington.

More money is made at Kensington from Football than has ever been made. I am one of the Vice-Presidents of the Football Association, and we pay \$40 a evening to play football at Kensington. People are paying voluntarily to see the game and yet you are taking the taxpayers'

money to give to the Association. The Premier would not have taken his money to give anybody a free grant as he is doing today with the taxpayers' money under these circumstances, because he would not take his money to give somebody a grant when the same person is running a business in which he is making profits. Let them run their affairs properly.

Kensington is supposed to be the property of the Cricket Association. If the Cricket Association foolishly allows the Pickwick Club to have all the income which is accruing through the pavilions you have built at Kensington, whose fault is that?

I was looking for my copy of last year's Financial Statement of the Barbados Amateur Football Association. Last year - and I speak under correction - the Football Association paid to the Pickwick Club something in the vicinity of \$1,600, and you will realise that that is a short season beginning in February and ending in May or June. You should ask for a statement now of how much money was paid in this year. You cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that it was not paid to the Cricket Association but to the Pickwick Club, because nobody would go to Kensington if there were no stands. Why should we now say that we are going to give a free grant? You are subsidising something that is not a public park. The loan is in order, but you are giving something to a private organisation over which you have no control. The Premier has been to England on one occasion. You can go up to Lords; but the British Government does not have to pay for Lords. I have been to Wimbledon. Is it because you have a Sports Officer dealing with cricket and football that you are duty-bound to give the taxpayers' money to the Cricket Association because the Cricket Association is not running its affairs properly?

Ask the Association what is paid to the Secretary as an honorarium year after year. I do not begrudge him the money, but this is not an Association in adverse pecuniary circumstances if it can afford to pay a man £100 for doing a job for three or four months. If you are in straitened circumstances your honorarium should reflect the type of circumstances you are in. Therefore you should not come back to the Legislature saying that they want you to waive \$12,000 as if people go to Kensington free.

Do you know what are the charges at Kensington? I am a member of the Cricket Association and I pay \$10 a year as subscription. Any person who wants to join the Association must pay \$10 and an annual subscription of \$10. It is a private organisation and if you intend to help sport, you should look at some of the other grounds.

I am a member of another Club which does not get an endowment when the year comes, and it is Empire Club whose walls were blown down during the hurricane. It is an old cricket club in Barbados. The grounds at Kensington are used for other purposes but it is mainly a cricket ground, and you could lend the Empire Club \$12,000 to put up a pavilion and pay back on the same basis as you had with the Cricket Association. When you come now and say that you are going to give a free grant and you are satisfied that the Association is not making money, you are saying that the people do not pay for the grounds.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce ran Carnival some months ago at Kensington, and with the 13,000 people entering Kensington each day, are you suggesting that you could not make charges to bring in revenue? Do you realise what it would mean to have a small charge added on to 25¢ in these things which would go to pay for the use of the grounds? If the Government's attitude is not to make voluntary organisations and those who sit and claim they are knowledgeable men use their imagination and run their affairs properly, I do not think that I should be the one in here to underwrite inefficiency. I am a member of a voluntary organisation; can I come to Government and say we are putting up a building in Fairchild Street and ask for assistance? The Trade Union Movement is much more important than any sport because industrial relations and industrial life is very important. Should I be in a position to come and say to Government that we are putting a build-

ing over there which is going to cost \$50,000 and ask them to chip in with \$20,000 because we cannot afford it? It is our business to run our own organisation, and allow members to erect what is theirs. The public through voluntary methods have to go to Kensington. Are you telling me that Government's policy on sport is to produce cricketers or footballers as national assets? These are things which come through the medium which has been given.

If you had the Olympic Games or some big national event taking place in Barbados which does not come to the country more than once in its whole history, you would do what you could to help them to erect stands for these games. 12.45 p.m.

What did we do? We loaned \$24,000 to the Association free of interest and without any strings attached to it, and yet after twelve years not one single penny has been paid back. Ask yourself what is the situation in respect of any of the incumbrances to which they committed themselves then. Some of the members of this same Cricket Association are prominent people in business life. You read the Report of the Barbados Fire Insurance Company and I am sure that you have read that that company made a profit of \$117,000. That is a profit making company; but you do not ask that company to make a loan to the Cricket Association and I am almost sure that some of the members of that Association have been bound up with that company. You do not ask that company to make a loan to the Cricket Association free of interest; but the Government makes a loan of \$24,000 free of interest! As I have said, you do not know what other loans that Association had at the time nor do you know if it has repaid any of them; but you come back to this Chamber and ask us to waive half of the payment of this loan to an organisation to which the public pays money every day to see sport.

Sir, I have not seen anything conducted at Kensington which you do not pay money to see. If you go to see an ordinary club match, a fee is collected. There are very few things which are free at Kensington. I am saying that the Cricket Association must conduct its business in an efficient manner and they can conduct their business in such a manner because some of the members of that Association are some of the biggest business men in the country. What has happened is that they have so arranged their affairs that the Pickwick Cricket Club gets all the financial benefits which are accrued as a result of the renting out of the Oval. If that is so, why then should we underwrite this loan? Why cannot the Barbados Cricket Association determine what they should get from the Pickwick Cricket Club to pay this loan as a result of the renting out of the stands? However, that is their business. Why should we pay the penalty? Why should we now grant them a waiver of repayment of \$12,000?

Sir, \$12,000 is not a lot of money in context to our whole financial budget, but it is a lot of money in a community where 24,000 are unemployed and where you cannot get enough money to meet all the pressing needs which you have to meet. I am saying that if the public is willing to pay for sport - and I know that they are willing - let the public pay directly. Recently, the people went and enjoyed themselves at the Coney Island shows and there was no question of where the money came from. They went there, they liked the various attractions and they enjoyed themselves. Any voluntary organisation like the Barbados Cricket Association which runs such affairs as that must be prepared to make its games so attractive that the people would patronise it. They cannot run their affairs with such inefficiency and like a dunce and then come and beg the Government, cap in hand, to help them. Why should I get up in here and agree with the Cricket Association running its business in such a manner that they cannot get enough money from the people who pass through their turnstiles and, therefore, they come here for money to meet repayment of their debts?

Sir, I am a member of the Barbados Amateur Football Association and I would be prepared to vote a sum of money from this Association annually to the Barbados Cricket Association for the purpose of redeeming its debt because we get the benefit of the use of Kensington Oval.

We do not get it free. We pay \$40 per evening to play football there. As a matter of fact, ordinary matches are \$40 and when it comes to intercolonial matches, the fee is \$80 per evening. If we invite Trinidad or some other team to play football here, the fee goes up to \$80 and that fee is paid to the Pickwick Club. What I have said does not mean that I am opposed to the Pickwick Club charging the Football Association for the use of the Oval. I say that because the Pickwick Club keeps the grounds in excellent condition, and they deserve credit and payment for so doing. If you are a voluntary organisation and you want the use of the grounds, by all means you should pay for it because it is the Pickwick Club who is keeping those grounds in excellent condition all the year round. If that is so, you should pay something that relates to what is reasonable. What the Barbados Football Association pays for the use of Kensington Oval can be compared with what you pay for the use of Madison Square Gardens. Sometimes what we pay amounts to \$13,000 a year.

I ask again, why should we waive the repayment of \$12,000 of this loan which we made to the Cricket Association twelve years ago? Why should we do that? We have given them this loan interest free for all that time. That is a contribution. I would be quite willing today to waive repayment of part of this loan if it were a voluntary organisation; but it is not like the Y.M.C.A. where a man can go and get a bed at half the cost of what he would have to pay if he got it from the Marine Hotel. Kensington is a place where sport is organised and when you go there you pay for it. If there is a touring cricket team playing there, you pay for a season ticket something like \$15. Apart from the fees they charge for the use of the grounds per evening for football, they make a charge of 15 cents for an evening.

Sir, all I am saying is that we need not burden the taxpayers or the Treasury with this type of burden. If we have spare money, we want it to use for other purposes. I do not feel as a matter of principle that we should do this. The circumstances do not merit it. The Barbados Cricket Association must put its house in order; and from all the charges which are made to the various organisations and groups which use Kensington Oval, certainly, this loan of \$24,000 can be repaid by the Association and there should be no question of a waiver of part of the repayment because that would be a positive waste of public money.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, we of the Official Opposition are not voting against this Resolution, but I certainly can confirm the fact which has been put by the hon. senior member for St. Peter before the House that the Football Association has to pay \$40 for an afternoon rental by the Pickwick Cricket Club for the use of the grounds for a football match. Some weeks the B.A.F.A. play at least three afternoons a week and when the Football Season is coming to a winding up, they play at least four or five afternoons per week. The cheques are endorsed to the Pickwick Cricket Club.

I was amused with the remarks of the Hon. Premier when he just said that the Government have adopted a policy of granting assistance to sports in general and he asked that we waive this amount. It is my feeling when we waive this amount that they are not going to pay the other \$12,000, and in due course we would be asked to waive that too. I am sorry the Hon. Premier did not give us the reason which the Cricket Association gave him as to why no amount of this loan was repaid during all this time. I am wondering whether they conduct their business in sufficiently an efficient manner as to make allowance for the repayment of this loan.

12.55 p.m.

The Barbados Cricket Association is happy in the thought that the Government will not levy on the pavilion and in my view they had no intention of paying back this money; they had no intention of paying it back, except that as I am throwing out this warning now, they may repay some small portion of it. We are now supporting the waiving of this \$12,000 particularly as the Hon. Premier has said that the Government has adopted the policy of assisting sports generally in Barbados. In waiving this amount of \$12,000, which is to assist in the rebuilding of the pavilion

at Kensington Oval, we regard this as a precedent and I may as well remind the Hon. Premier - and of course he knows - that there is a pavilion in Bank Hall known as the Empire Club which need rebuilding, and what is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. What you are going to do for Kensington you will do for Bank Hall which is an even more needy case than the one which is before us now. Since 1914 the Empire Club has been in existence with the same pavilion, and that Club has not been in receipt of any Government loan or other assistance other than voluntary. We are not opposing this precedent; we welcome it but we will be hearing more from other sporting communities in the near future even on the basis of dollar for dollar, just as we are giving this assistance in respect of funds to the Barbados Cricket Association.

Apropos to the building of a pavilion at Kensington Oval, the Premier can look forward to other request for assistance, and I can certainly tell him about the Empire Club. I do not know what would be the Government's attitude, if the Football Association is ever able to save enough to buy grounds, in respect of the Government's help of \$24,000. I mention that now so that the Hon. Premier will realise that we are supporting this Resolution, but we are regarding it as a precedent to be followed at the first opportunity that a request is made to the Government to further implement its policy of granting assistance to sports generally in Barbados. If we have sports, then there must be somewhere in which to house people who attend the sports. It is in furtherance of the policy of the Government that I allow the Minister of Finance to know that the Government will have the opportunity in the very near future to give consideration to applications for assistance in respect of more worthy buildings even, with this proposal as a precedent.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the passing of this Resolution. I feel now, as I felt in 1947 when I happened to be a member of the Executive Committee, although my voice was not sufficiently vociferous. I feel that cricket is a national game and as such, in the absence of an auditorium or a stadium or something of that sort, Kensington Oval with the new pavilions fills that role. All Barbadians, irrespective of class, colour or creed feel intensely proud of having proper facilities and amenities so that when Intercolonial teams visit this island, they have some proper place for competition. In the absence of an auditorium or stadium, I feel that we should all feel proud and happy to have proper facilities there. If the Cricket Association finds it difficult to repay this money, as is evidenced in the fact that ten years have now elapsed since this loan was effected and if the Government policy has changed from the shilly-shally policy of not knowing whether to lend or to give - I am glad to see that the present policy is one of lending - if it is acknowledged that cricket is the national game, then you need these facilities for the public of Barbados; you need to set up a proper concern when intercolonial teams come here and you need to have things done on a proper basis and footing. The present policy of the Government is in support of these things and they regard cricket as a national game; even the former Premier has played cricket in England but he would not grant the Cricket Association here a dollar by way of a gift or a grant.

I am in favour of this Resolution and I am in agreement with my colleague, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that if the Government intends to help the Barbados Cricket Association as distinct from any club - and I may say that if a plea is being put in for clubs I will put in one now for a pavilion for the Christ Church Foundation School. The position is that this move is an ideal one and now that the policy of the Government is a clear-cut and definite one, I commend the Premier on this stand and on further evidence of the policy which he has now evinced.

Cricket is a national game; it teaches you how to play the game of politics, how to live and so on. If you are helping the Barbados Cricket Association as distinct from the Pickwick Club with this money, why not help them with the entire amount? It would not be the worst \$24,000 which has ever been spent in this Chamber; probably, it will be the best money we have spent. I feel from the taxpayers' point of view and from that of the electors

as a whole, that we should vote this money to assist in having proper pavilions in which to entertain visitors as well as the Barbados public from time to time. I say that you should adopt a proper policy and not a cheese-paring petty policy which is too often evinced in this Chamber. You have helped the Cricket Association with a loan which you know they cannot repay and after ten years they come back and say "We cannot repay this money." 1.05 p.m.

Having given it as a loan in the first instance, the present Government is adopting a weak-kneed policy. You should help them half way, only if they prove that they can help themselves. I feel that you should write it off. What we are doing today, as the Leader of the Opposition has said is tantamount to writing off the entire amount. In another ten years, this whole thing would be reviewed and revised and nothing would be paid and you would have to write off the other \$12,000. If you were going to write it off, write it off once and for all, and not adopt a middle-course policy based on what happened ten years under the last Premier of Barbados. You should either make a grant of \$24,000 or let it continue as a loan on a proper footing; it is either a loan with interest or a gift. You should adopt a clear-cut policy and not a middle-course, diplomatic policy which in my view does not make sense. If they cannot pay it back, you should let it continue as a loan on a proper basis with proper security and let them pay interest.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, to co-operate with the last speaker, if the Barbados Cricket Association asked for a loan of \$24,00, I agree that they should pay it back. If they wanted a grant, they should have asked for it; but if they have received a loan, they should repay it. If they are not in a position to pay they should have asked for a grant of \$24,000 and this Government would have been satisfied to give them. After a man has asked anyone to loan him a certain amount of money and the time has expired for repaying it, why should he ask for it to be given to him? Has the Government sought to know whether or not that Association is in a position to pay? If they are not in a position to pay, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer the Government to give them the \$24,000 instead of giving them half. You should either give them all or let them pay all. I hope in future that they will take a better hold of their affairs and not allow this to happen again. Let us make them understand that in future if they borrow, they must repay, because they would not have to repay if you give to them.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Premier introduced this Resolution, he noted that we were all acquainted with the history of it. I knew that I was not acquainted with the history, but I certainly have learnt some of the history by listening to the various speakers.

It is the policy of this Government to encourage sports generally, and under that guise it is probably a good thing that you are helping the Barbados Cricket Association by waiving part of this loan here. However, it is also a matter of grave concern to listen to the statements which have been made by some of the other members when they were able to bring facts to show that a lot of the receipts from these Kensington stands are paid to the Pickwick Cricket Club as such, and therefore I am certain that we are right to expect that our Government would look more carefully into the administration of the affairs of any of these bodies that use public funds in order to be sure that when we do make any concessions like this, we are utterly satisfied that the concessions are made on good ground.

I believe, Sir, that that must be the reason why our Government is not therefore writing off the whole \$24,000, but rather by writing off the \$12,000 here is saying today that - not as we read in the second paragraph "no amount of the loan has been repaid" but - "We are certainly checking into it to see if any attempt has been made to repay any of the loan." That is a matter for concern, not whether any of the amount of the loan has been repaid but rather if any attempt has been made to repay it; and if it is indeed a fact that a profit is being made by the Barbados Cricket Association or some other private body as a result of this loan made to the Cricket Association, I therefore say that

we must check very carefully to find out how these funds which we have loaned to a private Association have been administered, whether they are in keeping with the purpose and the content of the loan which had been made to them; and we therefore must not at any rate make any private Association feel that they can just borrow money, make no attempt to repay it and then come back and have it waived.

I believe, as I said already, that perhaps the Government is checking into that and that is why the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is not the suggestion being taken by the Government to waive the whole \$24,000, but rather to show that you are interested in helping sports generally, and at the same time show that you are interested to know how the money which was borrowed has been administered and whether any attempt has really been made to repay the amount which you are waiving.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, while this is a matter of sports, I think it is important enough to warrant the serious reflection of all members, particularly in the light of the speech made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Is this country rich enough and have we advanced to the point in all our other ills that we can say we are at a point to grant \$12,000, \$24,000 or whatever hundreds of thousands of dollars this precedent will create? I, Sir, am rather doubtful that we have reached that stage. I hear rumours concerning national stadiums, theatres, and the like, and while I am in wholehearted agreement that sport should be supported, I, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is on my right, feel that those who want support should put their backs to paying for it and it should not be a matter for the taxpayers to pull their pockets to supply the sport for the general public.

But that is not the main point, Sir; have we got the money *ad lib* to make grants to sports of all kinds in this island? I say, Sir, that we have other much greater and more needy cases for money to be spent on; I rather got the impression from parts of this debate that from now on the Government will be subsidising sport while other matters of greater urgency will be left in abeyance. \$12,000 is a lot of money when one goes around this island and looks at the conditions of the houses and the Alms-houses etc., and I should like the Premier to state that it is not as a result of the grant of this \$12,000, Government's intention to spend money *ad lib* on sport; that, Sir, would be sport. That is the warning which I want to give. 1.15 p.m.

I must say, Sir, that I would have liked to hear more of the facts. I, myself, am not a cricketer; as is well known, I am a boxer. I know nothing whatsoever of cricket and that is a fact. I would have liked to have heard the details for the necessity of this loan and I would have liked to have heard the financial position of this Association.

I must say, Sir, that my one and only reason for supporting this Resolution is the fact that cricket has meant more for Barbados than anything else as regards putting Barbados on the map, and that is so even more than the contribution of a great many members of this House. For that fact alone I think we should give careful consideration to the giving of assistance in this direction. However, I am somewhat concerned with the impression that from now on sport will be given assistance *ad lib*. It strikes me, Sir, that apart from knowing something of the financial position of this Association, to which this Hon. House is entitled, if this Government is going to grant this money to the Association, it should have some say in the matter. I am not suggesting that the Government should run the Association, but I am suggesting that it is possible that an appointee or two of this Hon. House may be included in the affairs of the Association. I personally feel that this House is entitled to know how its money is being spent. If we grant this waiver of a repayment purely on sympathy and the achievement which the name of Barbados has gained from cricket, that is all well and good; but I do hope that in his reply the Hon. Premier will assure me that it is not the Government's idea to grant this money absolutely and utterly without strings attached and (2) that from now on the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will be able to come in here - and not only him but I will be there with

him - to ask for grants for support of the various cricket clubs throughout the parish of St. George and even in St. Thomas, too. I am hoping he will give us that assurance. Sir, I opened my remarks by saying that while we were dealing with sport we should also give a certain amount of serious reflection on this matter because the aftermath will be somewhat greater than we expect.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I know a great deal about how the money is paid for the use of Kensington and to whom it goes. The hon. senior member for St. Peter says that he is a member of the Football Association; therefore obviously, he would know something about that. He says that the revenue collected for the use of the Oval goes to the Cricket Association.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of correction. I did not say that. What I said was that the Football Association pays a fee of \$40 per evening for the use of the Oval and that fee goes to the Pickwick Club; and because of that I say that I am not prepared to underwrite inefficiency of the Cricket Association by having an arrangement in which money is being paid in to a private club and the Association does not share in part of that money.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry that I did not understand the hon. member correctly. If I did not gather that from him, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy also said that these collections go to the Pickwick Club. I am not in a position to say who gets them. However, there is a Balance Sheet as well as a Statement which was presented by this Association up to the end of 1957. We have not got that for 1958 yet. This Statement shows that the Barbados Cricket Association is in debt to the tune of \$48,057.96. I also notice that for 1957 the excess of receipts over expenditure was \$3,072.42. I have just pointed out that to show that even if they did collect some money in 1957 in excess of what they spent that that excess is small as regards the indebtedness they have of \$48,000 and that excess of \$3,000 could not go very far.

Be that as it may, I think the hon. senior member for Christ Church adopted the correct attitude when he said that cricket is the national game of Barbados. Everybody except the hon. senior member for St. George plays or has played cricket at some time. That hon. member is a boxer. He would like us to know that he is a boxer although he did not say whether he does shadow boxing or what. However, Sir, we, the Government, take the view that cricket is the national game of Barbados. I may add that the original application for this was not a gift but was for a loan of \$24,000.

Sir, I was about to say that the Government had taken the view from the figures produced that the finances of the Association were not in such a rosy condition as to allow them to pay back this money right away and that is why we say that with the consent of the Legislature the Government was prepared to write off \$12,000 and that the Association pay the other \$12,000 in such a way: \$500, immediately, that is to say, by the end of the current calendar year and the rest of it should be paid in equal instalments in five years time.

1.25 p.m.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, who is not now in his seat, and which has been stressed by the hon. senior member for St. George, cricket, I repeat, is a national game and we are interested in the national game; but I do not want any hon. member to think that because of this Resolution a precedent has been set and that the floodgates can be opened as a result. I want that to be clearly understood; the floodgates will not be opened as a result of this Resolution. The Government is not helping any particular club in this respect; it is helping the Cricket Association which is the mother, the guardian of all the clubs. I think that this Resolution will meet with the approval of all hon. members present (Mr. Walcott: Not mine) and I commend it to them.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Hon. F. E. MILLER; Messrs. HOLDER; SEARLES; CORBIN; DOWDING; TALMA and BRANCKER - 11.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT - 1.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.2) Order, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.2) Order, 1959. This Resolution is concerned with the increase of staff at the Airport. The Airport is now being operated on a 24-hour basis as from the 1st of this month; the status has improved and it is now being operated on a 24-hour basis. Consequently, in order to share the duties up there equally on the 8-hour basis, the staff will have to be increased. A few years ago we had an Airport Visiting Officer who was responsible, except for certain occasions of leave, for the operation of the Airport on a basis of less than 24 hours; that is to say, the planes were few and he knew exactly when they were coming; he had quarters and when his services were not needed in the office he went to his quarters and rested, and on the approach of aircraft he was warned. As the number of flights increased, this Officer was assisted two or three years ago by another Visiting Airport Officer and they shared the duties between them. They relieved each other by certain arrangements and everything worked very well; but with the coming into being of a 24-hour period of operation, we could not expect these two Officers to carry on as they have been carrying on, and it is now proposed, in order to share the duties equally, to appoint another Visiting Airport Officer. All that is due to the fact that the status of the Airport has improved. We are now operating on a twenty-four-hour basis, which will permit Aeroplanes to call at Seawell at any time, either late in the day or early in the morning.

Figures have been quoted to show the extent of the improvement. In 1950 they were 2,632 flights and in 1958, just last year, that number has been increased to 6,216 - almost three times as many as in 1950. By this increase, it is proposed to add a secretary to the staff of the Director of Civil Aviation; he and the Assistant Director are doing certain clerical and secretarial duties and now as the result of this increased work, it is proposed to give them a secretary. I think that everybody in this island will be glad to know that the activities of the Airport have been increased to such an extent that today we have to grant additional staff in order that the work may go on. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No.3) Order, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is another Resolution to approve a Civil Establishment Order dealing with staff and change of salary; this time, this is a Report of the Anomalies Committee. Hon. members will remember that after the Godsall Report and the implementation thereof, certain anomalies were discovered in the recommendations of Mr. Godsall, and, of course, they brought some dissatisfaction in their wake.

1.35 p.m.

These anomalies were referred to an Anomalies Committee, and in that Report has been explained matters in connection with other staff which is not now before us. I say that because members might want to know why we are presenting this piecemeal Report instead of one comprehensive Report; but this portion of it which is now before us deals with established staff and the other Report which we will come to later on deals with secondary teachers who are not yet established at schools assisted by Government.

The first Department is the Market. Godsall recommended a salary for the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk at the figure \$912 rising by increments of \$48 to \$1,248. There was some dissatisfaction about that and as I said, it was referred to the Anomalies Committee which recommended the same minimum figure of \$912 with the same increments, but has extended the maximum to \$1,392.

The next is the Attendant, Law Library. That office has received similar treatment by adopting the same figures \$912 by \$48 rising to \$1,392.

The Senior Education Officer of the Department of Education is now being put on a flat scale of \$6,240 rather than remain under the one proposed by Godsall, \$5,760 x \$240 - \$6,240. For the Education Officer with a first or second class honours degree, the scale recommended by Godsall was not accepted and the Anomalies Committee recommends \$5,280 x 240 - 6,000. Then there is another class of Education Officer, that is, one who does not hold either a first or second class degree and the Godsall recommendation gives a maximum of \$4,392 starting from \$3,000 in different stages and the Anomalies Committee has increased the minimum to \$3,360 x 144 - 3,648, and then by further increments of \$192 - \$5,184, at which point he who does not hold a qualification bar ceases. If he happens to hold a qualification, he goes on to \$5,424.

Then there is the Supervisor at the Housecraft Centre for whom the Anomalies Committee recommends \$3,000 as an initial salary rising by increments of \$120 to \$3,360, then a further increase to \$3,528 x 144 - 3,816.

The next is the office of Woman Tutor, Erdiston College for whom the Anomalies Committee has recommended a long scale. The Godsall scale was \$3,792 to \$5,328; the Anomalies Committee recommend \$3,936 x 144 to 4,368 x 5,328 at which point there is a qualifying bar and if the holder has the necessary qualification he goes on to \$5,568.

The next office is that of Instructor, Technical Institute and the salary recommended by the Anomalies Committee is \$4,896 x 192 - \$5,280 with a further increment of \$240 to \$6,000 at which point there is a qualifying bar and with the qualification the holders of that office will go on to \$6,240.

Next is the Senior Technical Teacher, Technical Institute. If the holder of that office happens to have a first or second class honours degree the salary recommended is \$3,600 x 144 - 4,320 with a higher increment of \$192 to \$5,280 x 240 - 5,520 with an efficiency bar at that point; with the necessary qualification it goes on to \$5,760. Without these first or second class honours degrees the scale recommended is \$3,120 x 120 - \$3,360 x 144 - \$3,648 x 192 - 4,800 at which point there is a qualifying bar and with the qualification that salary goes on to \$5,040.

Then there is the Public Works Department Surveyor. His salary as recommended by the Anomalies Committee is \$3,528 x 144 - 4,392 which with the qualifying bar goes on to \$4,560 x 192 - 5,520 x 240 - 6,240.

The next Department that comes in for treatment by this Committee is the Department of Science and Agriculture and the office of Lecturer in Natural Sciences, and for that office the scale recommended is \$4,896 x 192 to 5,280, then by an increased increment of \$240 to \$6,000 where the qualifying bar operates and with the necessary qualification goes on to \$6,240.
1.45 p.m.

I will point out here that it is recommended that for persons holding certain posts if they happen to be graduates they will be eligible for payment on the graduate scale. The holders of the following posts are those eligible for payment as graduates: Building and Handicrafts Officer; Supervisor, Housecraft Centre; Inspector of Nutrition; Inspector of Domestic Subjects; and Inspector of Infants' Methods.

It is also suggested that there should be a change in the title of the posts of Surveyor Draughtsman to Surveyor in the Department of Highways and Transport and the Waterworks Department.

Sir, that concludes the Officers dealt with by this Order and the salaries recommended by the Anomalies Committee. I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing this Order; as a matter of fact, I am quite pleased to see the proposed salary for the Attendant of the Law Library. Certainly, he has done an excellent job and he needs some assistance. As it is now, he has to work all through the day without a break because there is no one to relieve him. Just at the moment he may wish to go out on a private business may be the time when his services are required and he will have to either leave them unattended or will have to shut his office at an important and vital period of the day.

Now, Sir, I am seeking information as regards the Education Officer (b) without first or second class honours degree and the Senior Technical Teacher, Technical Institute without first or second class honours degree. When that phrase is used "without first or second class honours degree" does that mean without any degree at all or does it mean a person with a third class or pass degree? I gather that this means not without a degree at all but that the person should have a third class or pass degree. That is the thing which worries me most about this Resolution. Certainly the person should be in the possession of at least a third class or pass degree to qualify.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I wish to say that I, too, agree with the proposals set out under this Resolution and I feel satisfied to know that the work of the Anomalies Committee is still continuing and I hope that other grievances would be probably taken care of in due course. However, it seems to me that since we had the last salaries revision which was in 1956, it has taken almost two and a half years for these grievances to be redressed; and when I consider the fairly long time that it has taken I am wondering whether any back pay should be given to these people in view that you admit that they have been wrongly assessed and their salaries wrongly fixed by the Anomalies Committee in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, while agreeing generally with this Resolution, there are one or two comments which I would like to make in the case of the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk. Now, there is only one Assistant Refrigerator Clerk. Let me say that this is not the creation of a new post; it is a question of adjusting the salary of the present Assistant Refrigerator Clerk. Although I am grateful for small mercies, yet I regard the fixing of the salary for this post by this Committee as not strictly in order. In other words, the post of Assistant Refrigerator Clerk is not a glorified messenger as such. The person who fills this post is a technician. He is not only an electrician but he is also a mechanic. I speak with some knowledge because I have had something to do with it. He has to perform the duties of Refrigerator Clerk in the absence of the Refrigerator Clerk and he also performs duties as a technical man and not as an office messenger.

I regard this salary as entirely out of proportion. I tried my best to have this salary adjusted and met with all sorts of obstacles and I was never permitted to do what I consider is right, fair and just. As I have said, the person filling this post is a technical man. He is not a messenger; he is a mechanic and an electrical engineer

to some extent and he has been holding that office for some ten or fifteen years.

In attempting to revise his salary, the Anomalies Committee after two and a half years is suggesting an increase from \$912 x 48 - \$1,392. I have no grouse for the beginning salary. Perhaps, you may say that he has learnt a lot by working there although I know that you must have some knowledge about it before you go there. According to the proposed salary now, you are making a raise of salary from \$1,248 - \$1,392. That is not good enough for the case of one who is a mechanic. I take it that you are taking undue advantage of some people in the Government service, because they cannot speak for themselves and because they have to be so grateful and glad for the little job which they are doing.

Dealing with this particular matter in 1955, I attempted to increase the salary of this post, and for the reasons that this officer has to act as Refrigerator Clerk and because of the fact that in his capacity he has thousands of dollars to take care of by way of beef, pork, or whatever commodity it may be that is put on cold storage. Certainly, he has a lot of commodities which are consumed by the public of Barbados to take care of and if you have somebody who is inefficient in that post any amount of harm can be done to the public of Barbados. I regard this as a responsible job and I feel that the salary attached to the post should be more in keeping with that of a Refrigerator Clerk itself.

1.55 p.m.

If you look at the Estimates - I am speaking from memory now - but I think that the Refrigerator Clerk gets about \$220 or \$240 a month and the Assistant gets \$116 a month. The disparity between the two salaries is too great in that each of these Officers in turn is called upon to perform similar functions. There is too great a disparity in this case and I hope that the Premier will direct that a further revision be made by the Anomalies Committee in so far as this particular post is concerned. I am speaking about the post now, not about the Officer. In this case the present holder of the office has been there for the past fifteen years or longer and with the salary scale and the range for promotion, the whole thing is preposterous and ridiculous. You have a salary scale of \$912 x 48 - 1,392 as compared with \$1248. This Officer's promotion is very small in the first instance; it is only an increment of \$4.00 a year and in any case after a few years he will receive the maximum which is \$1,392. I would have thought that technical officers are being encouraged. We have just had a big display in the presentation of prizes at the Technical Institute, and if we are going to pattern our education on a basis whereby we will encourage technicians and skilled men, this is certainly no inducement. Only a competent mechanic and a properly - trained technician you can get to work on the Refrigerating Plant. The Assistant Refrigerator Clerk can only be a younger man and when he sees what salary is attached to a post of that sort, it will not serve as any incentive. I hope that sufficient importance will be attached to such a post as this in which the life of the community is endangered.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m., of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum in the House and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time (*Pause*). There being no Questions ready, the House will proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph:- To move the passing of

an Address to His Excellency the Governor in Reply to His Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislative Session 1959-60.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, the Address the passing of which I am about to move reads as follows:-

" HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session 1959-60.

The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island and other matters referred to in Your Excellency's Address and beg to assure Your Excellency that all these and other matters submitted to them will be given their careful consideration and support during the Session.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is customary to make a few comments on His Excellency's Speech when one moves an Address of this sort and I think Sir, that the second paragraph of the Address can bear repetition. It states: "The House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economical advancement of the Island."

It has been suggested or intimated by some people that that is, perhaps, an over statement - the reference to the financial stability of this Island; but events have proved, when one looks at the record of the present Government and how the finances of the island have been kept over the past years, that that confidence, which is so necessary for proper development, has been expressed not only in words but also in deeds.

2.35 p.m.

That confidence which is so necessary for proper development has been expressed not only in words but in deeds when one refers to the fact that a loan for the financing of the Deep Water Harbour was raised with such despatch when it stood on the London market. There has been a lot of debate on this already, and it is not necessary at this stage that we should initiate another long debate on that particular item; but it suffices us, Sir, that such a loan could not be raised unless the people who granted the loan thought it was a good, sound business investment, and they would not have thought it was a sound investment were it not for the fact that they had confidence in the financial stability and the progressive attitude of our present Government.

It is also to be noted, Sir, that in His Excellency's Address he mentioned that there are certain major items under the current Five Year Plan; but His Excellency also mentioned that this Government is already paying attention to the drafting of another Five Year Plan. I will read from that part of His Excellency's Address.

"The period of the current Development Plan will expire on the 31st March, 1960, and my Government have under preparation a Plan for the next five years. The first priority in the new Plan will be the completion of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, the contract date for which is 20th August, 1961. It is estimated that at least a third of the cost of this project will fall to be met during the period of the new Plan. The second major project which will fall to be completed is the new General Hospital. In considering other priorities my Government intend to give preference to projects which will strengthen the economy of the Island."

I think, Sir, it is something to be noted that our present Government has found it necessary when they came into office to work on two things; first, to see if they could raise the standard of living of the people and to be sure that they worked an increase through social services so that people would not be going in need of essential social services; and having put their hands to that, they have also noted that for the continuation and consolidation of these social services, it is necessary to pay attention

*start
5.15*

to projects which will strengthen the economy of the island. I think, Sir, that that is certainly a heartening feature to know that not only would a Government be thinking of doling out finance, but also be looking around for projects which will increase the economic stability of the island.

It is also to be noted, Sir, that a start has been made in industrial development and perhaps it is not widely known that loans totalling \$313,000 were made by the Development Board to assist in the developing of small industries. Since the amendment of the Act to permit the granting of assistance to hotels, five such loans totalling \$290,000 have also been made, and I think that we can already see the effect that this measure has been having on the tourist trade when one considers that this tourist season has been quite a helpful one, and that the prospects of the tourist industry as such in Barbados are certainly getting brighter every day.

It is also noted with satisfaction from the field of industrial relations that discussions continue with the Barbados Workers' Union and employer organisations on proposals to amend certain of our Labour Laws in the light of the report by C.O. J. Matthews of the International Labour Organisation.

Certainly I would like to repeat His Excellency's remarks here. "It is hoped that it will be possible to introduce legislation on the subject of Workmen's Compensation during the new Session."

Sir, there are many items in this Address which are worthy of note, but I think I would like to stress just two of them right now. One is that we have undertaken to create a Ministry of Education, because we have understood and we see it quite clearly that when we think of development, we do not only think of development in agriculture or tourism or things of a material nature, but we have to pay attention to the development of the people who would have to effect these other projects in operation. I think the remarks of His Excellency in referring to the creation of a new Ministry of Education is, to say the least, a measure of credit to this Government, that they should have had the courage and foresight to have a separate Ministry of Education in as much as we are spending at least one-sixth of our finances on the project of education. It is true that it is well realised that we can never spend too much money on education, and of course I know even under the present circumstances the Government finds difficulty in getting all the money they would like for education; but nevertheless one cannot overlook the fact that the development of people must go along hand in hand with the development of other material projects; and if we have our people here we must invest in them just as much as we invest in material resources.

The final point I would like to make is the reference that the Government are aware that there has been some increase in the cost of living since the last salaries revision and have under consideration measures to grant some relief to the lower paid employees of the Government.

Sir, as I said, I do not want to spend an exhaustive amount of time on all the items which were mentioned in His Excellency's Address, but certainly this last one where again we are dealing with the standard of living of certain categories of our people - and this is public service - it is to be noted with acclamation that the Government have under consideration some relief which should be granted to the lower paid employees of Government.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks which would just be nothing more than a summary of what I consider to have been the high points of His Excellency's Address, I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to second the passing of this Address to His Excellency the Governor, and I do commend to hon. members of this House that we have no controversial remarks whatsoever. I assure them that this Government has in its way a genuine desire to do all it can for the good of the people of this country, and therefore I would ask all hon. members to give His Excellency's Address the support which it demands.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am moving the deletion of the entire ultimate paragraph of this Address in order to substitute a paragraph of my own. I would just remind hon. members that in thanking His Excellency the Governor for the Speech delivered, we are thanking the Cabinet because the Speech is now their responsibility; and as Cabinet Ministers it is their duty to prepare the Speech to be read by the Queen's Representative in the island.

What struck me about the Speech was the remarkable lot of vital omissions. The fact is that the persons who prepared the Speech are the Queen's Ministers in this Island and they seemed to have overlooked many of the vital things; if they did not overlook them, they failed to regard the importance of them in that they failed to include them in this Address.

There are many of these things that they seemed to have overlooked and I am sorry that I have not more than one copy of my amended paragraph so that hon. members can follow my amendment. I am formerly moving that the last paragraph be deleted in order to substitute the following:-

"2. The House view with dismay observations in that Speech 'in connection with appointments to the Legislative Council,' and in particular the amazing statement that the function of the Minister without portfolio is to speak for the Government rather than for his Party;" this notwithstanding that the Minister in question was an unsuccessful candidate of the Barbados Labour Party of the 1956 General Elections. In these days of Party politics a remark that "the conclusion was reached that the representation of political parties in the Council would not be in the best interest of the Island" not only is utterly incomprehensible but is indicative of abyssmal ignorance of the purpose and function of a second Chamber in a modern democratic age. Necessity for representation of Government and Opposition Parties in that Chamber is as imperative as it has been proved to be in the House of Lords. The best interest of this Island can never be served unless and until Her Majesty's Opposition is represented in our nominated Chamber.

3. Reference in the Speech to the New General Hospital makes it necessary to stipulate that not only is it essential to provide accommodation of one bed per patient in each ward at this institution but also that adequate equipment and personnel must be provided to deal with cases of brain surgery and other cases which presently cannot be treated at this Hospital, to the detriment and disadvantage of such patients as cannot afford to travel overseas for treatment.

4. The House note that the fishing fleet now contains four hundred and forty motor driven boats and deplores the absence of any reference to the establishment by Government of a properly equipped workshop for repairs to engines of fishermen's launches, a vital necessity in view of the high cost of such repairs now effected by private firms.

5. The House is surprised to learn that "no reliable statistics of unemployment are available", notwithstanding the existence of a Labour Department (including an Employment Exchange) costing taxpayers annually over \$84,000 total recurrent. It is vitally necessary for Government to obtain and publish up-to-date statistics of unemployment without further delay.

6. This Chamber profoundly deplores the complete absence of any mention in this Speech to all, or even any, of the following:-

- (a) Disendowment of the Anglican Church;
- (b) Erection of New Government-Aided Secondary Schools
- (c) Free Secondary Education for worthy children of poor parentage;
- (d) Free hot midday meals for children at Public Elementary Schools;
- (e) Institution of Christmas Bonus for all public em-

ployees not eligible for Leave Passages, and equivalent to four weeks, or one month's salary;

- (f) Amendment of Old Age Pension Act to provide for reduction of the qualifying age, and a reasonable increase in the amount.

- (g) Single Member Parliamentary Constituencies.

7. We observe that a Bill will be presented to the Legislature to amend the Police Act, 1908. It is hoped that due consideration is being given to the number of men in the Force which is clearly inadequate, resulting today in Police Constables being required to do 12 consecutive hours of work as one duty period.

8. The fact that the Speech concedes an increase in the cost of living since the last salary revision affords this opportunity to urge for the lowest paid of our public employees, a wages increase of at least 50% on existing rates."

2.55 p.m.

There is an omission of which, unfortunately, I am guilty. I have been reminded of it by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and I am wondering if I might conveniently insert it at this stage, after paragraph (f). That omission is "(g) Single Member Parliamentary Constituencies."

Mr. Speaker, I think that each of these things speaks for itself and one cannot understand how it is that even the present Government could have forgotten not merely one but for all of these vitally necessary matters. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that with single member constituencies there would not be any risk of Mr. Speaker's seat being in jeopardy as a result of the activities of party politics nor would there be any reason for future Speakers to feel that they should align themselves with any particular Party in order to get support at election time. It is clear that with single member constituencies the former Speaker would run as a candidate; it would be known that he was the Speaker and, contrary to a recent and most unworthy precedent, once the former Speaker is returned, automatically he is again Speaker. There is only one bad precedent to the contrary and that was found in the Barbados House of Assembly when the present Prime Minister of the West Indies was running the show which he thinks he is still running now. But the former Speaker should have his position and unless he has not been non-partisan, nobody would dream of opposing him. As long as you have constituencies as at present, there may be an attack on a member as Speaker as has happened in the case of the late Sir Frederick James Clarke, K.C.M.G., in that fight between Mr. Evelyn and the late Mr. Sergeant.

The purpose of having single member constituencies is not merely to safeguard the seat of Mr. Speaker, but because it is a sign of democratic political progress. You may be opposing one candidate, but you have no objection whatsoever to the other candidate; and therefore, you will have your constituency for which only one member is running. You will have Speightstown and you will have the rural part of St. Peter; you will have St. James, north of Hometown and to the south of St. Michael's border and so on. They are only suggestions; whatever Parties are running candidates, they would run them for the constituencies in which they have them. Single member constituencies are absolutely necessary. From the standpoint of Party advantage, the former Premier of this colony was in doubt as to whether his Party would secure the present number of seats in this House and he said that he would consider the matter of having single member constituencies for the next election, but the views of the people had not been thoroughly canvassed as to whether or not they would like to have single member constituencies. In my opinion, it is a necessary and proper thing to have these single member constituencies; and if the Government or the Legislature looks at matters only from the point of view of Party advantage and not from the point of view of the benefit of the whole community, the quicker that Government is out of power, the quicker the people in the community will stand to benefit from the change of Government.

I do not think that we, from this side of the House, need to stress our reiterated and uncompromising support

of free secondary education for the poor children who are worthy of it, but whose parents cannot afford to pay for it. Because we support that, it follows that there must be more Government-aided Secondary Schools erected; and because we want the best product to come into our secondary schools irrespective of the impecuniosity of the parents of those children, we continue to advocate free hot midday meals for children of the public elementary schools. Unless the child is adequately nourished, it cannot profit from the tuition which is given at the elementary schools, and therefore his prospects of doing well at the secondary school with a poor foundation must be almost nil.

We do not have to remind the public and this House of our support of a Christmas bonus for all public employees in the lower grade - all public employees who are not eligible for leave passages. They should be given a month's salary or four weeks' wages since they inevitably have that burden of the Christmas season to bear.

As to the amendment to the Old Age Pension Act, it is incomprehensible to us that no mention of that has been made in the Speech from the Throne, when it is so obvious that people have to carry on to the age of sixty-eight years and the small amount which has been in force for so long is entirely out of keeping with a Legislature which is supposed to be Socialist and which is running this island at the moment.

3.05 p.m.

Sir, we still wait in vain to hear something of the current progress, if any, even if it is in the reverse gear, in respect of the disendowment of the Anglican Church. We have heard so long ago when the former Premier was in this island that when he happened to be in Barbados the Bishop was out of the island and *vice versa*. Well, the former Premier seems to be in Barbados more often than he was when he was Premier, and I wonder if the Bishop is out of the island every weekend when according to newspaper reports the first Premier is back in this island. What is the position in respect of the Anglican Church? Has this present Government decided not to disendow? If so, we are entitled to know. Has it decided to carry on? If so, would they let us have some kind of interim report as to their progress? Do they fear it is a subject in which they might not take any risk except immediately after the general elections and not when we are halfway between the past and the next? What is the reason why no mention is made in His Excellency's Address?

Sir, I hardly need to stress how keenly the Opposition feels about the cost of repairs to these fishing launches. We are presented time and again with bills from our constituents in St. Lucy - my friend the hon. senior member for Christ Church and my friend the hon. senior member for St. Philip from their constituents who have their engines repaired - and they are absolutely incredible sums which are charged for repairs of the engines by the private firms. We expected in His Excellency's Address to see some mention that the Government appreciates the need to provide and will be asking for supplies from this House in order to establish a properly equipped Government workshop to do repairs for the poor owners of these fishing boats. They have to pay the instalments on the engines; they have to pay for repairs; and they also have along with paying for the repairs and instalments to the various private firms to provide for the upkeep of their homes out of the amounts which the boats bring in. We know, Sir, that every day is fishing day, but every day is not catching day.

The Government must realise that it is a matter which does not need any further delay. Do not mind how they feel towards the private firms from whom the engines were brought. These private firms are nothing as important to this community as a whole or to this House as the large number of people who make their living out of these 440 motor-driven boats. They are people whom we should look after, and the most effective way of looking after them is by providing an adequately equipped Government workshop. Do not for one minute think that I am belittling the helpful service rendered by the motor mechanics and staff of the Fishing Department; I know that they do their best, go all out to help, and are extremely useful and helpful to the owners of these small crafts, but their resources are limited. A properly equipped

workshop is what is needed urgently in order to ensure that the repairs are all effected by Government charging these poor boat owners a nominal amount, certainly until they have finished paying their instalments, for the repairs to their engines.

Since this Address was read by His Excellency, Sir, we have heard over the Rediffusion a pathetic appeal by the Manager of that concern for a little girl who, I understand, was suffering from a brain tumour. Only early in the previous year I remember a similar case of a little girl of very poor parentage whose father had to mortgage everything he had to the fullest extent in order to send that child to the United States to have an operation performed. I know that we were all glad to know that last year's case was successful and not only did the child live, but the tumour was in a position from which it was effectively removed. We hope, of course, that if in the present case the position is not such as may be removed by surgery, that other methods will prove successful; but, Sir, we cannot depend on either the parent having something to mortgage and being prepared to mortgage that something to the hilt in order to send the child away to the States, nor can we be certain that every appeal over Rediffusion will be as successful as the recent one appeared to have been.

It is essential that the Minister for Health in this island should persuade his colleagues - and obviously the one to persuade is the Minister of Finance - of the necessity adequately to equip and provide the equipment necessary at the General Hospital so that cases of brain surgery and other cases for which there is no equipment available presently in this island can be dealt with at this Institution, particularly for the benefit of those people who cannot afford to go away at all or who can only make a trip abroad by pledging all of their property. We know, Mr. Speaker, that if the well-to-do have a bad cold, they use that as an excuse to take a trip to the United States, Canada or England as the case may be; it means nothing to them. We are not concerned with them; as human beings we are concerned with them, but as politicians we do not have to worry about them because their top-heavy bank accounts can look after them quite easily. They are not the concern of the vast majority of taxpayers of this colony. It is necessary to have a properly equipped hospital - not of course one which is equipped to deal with every possible case which might once in a hundred years arise; but certainly these cases of brain surgery are things which should be provided for in the operating theatre of the Barbados General Hospital. May be there will be some reassurance offered us that the new Hospital will not only be big enough but will have a suitable Ward for such work to be done and equipment will be provided. I wonder if we can get that assurance from the Minister himself to whom the idea never occurred, or the Minister of Finance who is willing to release the funds.

I think, Sir, that only brief reference need be made in connection with my suggestion of the number of men in the Police Force. I see immediate justification for an increase by at least 50. Certainly it has been brought to my notice and I have brought it to the notice of the Government that there are men at the rural stations who are required to work twelve hours non-stop continuous duty period. If the officers say otherwise, they are misinforming the Government.

3.15 p.m.

The excuse which I hear being given is that the men prefer to have twelve continuous hours of duty instead of eight hours because if they do twelve hours duty, they can look forward to having twelve hours off. But that is not the point. They should only do eight hours and should look forward to 16 hours off.

Policeman from the highest to the lowest have more masters than anybody else. The Police Constable has to satisfy every Corporal who is also trying to satisfy every Sergeant and in order to do that, he feels he should take it out of the Police Constables. Then the Sergeants have to satisfy the Inspectors and the Inspectors have to satisfy the Superintendents and the Superintendents have to satisfy the Deputy Commissioner and the Commissioner, so that you can see that every rank and file has to concern him-

self and be worried with everybody above him; and, apart from that, he has John Citizen to be worried over. You know how readily the public turns to the Police Force when they are in distress and how the Police are criticised by the public. You will find out that when one rings the Police Station, one has to ring for a long time and cannot get through a call; and when dials 00, one finds out that the policeman on duty did not replace the handset on the cradle, the reason being due to the strain on the individual policeman because of the long hours he has had to carry on as a result of the staff being inadequate.

There is, Mr. Speaker, no shortage of suitable men whereby an increase in the membership of the Force can be effected. I am not suggesting to increase the Force as an employment scheme or to relieve unemployment. I have no doubt of it at all that within a few months we can have fifty well-trained men and women to swell the ranks of the Local Constabulary.

I am not associating myself necessarily with criticisms which recently appeared in the Press about the Police Force, but certainly from my experience the Force is short staffed. No public institution should be short staffed and I am sure that the Trade Union Leader in this House and yourself will agree with me that any public institution which requires people to work for twelve consecutive hours is an institution which is either badly managed or understaffed. Throughout the length and breadth of the rural areas of this island, policemen are on duty for twelve continuous hours and that is not good enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I should just refer to constitutional matters and I note in our amendment to the official Reply to His Excellency's Speech that "the House view with dismay observations in that Speech "in connection with appointments to the Legislative Council," and the opinion expressed by His Excellency the Governor, representing presumably the bulk of the present Ministers, when they reached the conclusion that the representation of political parties in the Council was not in the best interests of this island. My comment is that not only is it utterly incomprehensible, but it shows the abysmal ignorance of the purpose and function of a second Chamber in a modern democratic state.

If the House of Lords, which we always seek to imitate as the Mother of Parliaments, finds it desirable that all points of view - the Conservatives, the Liberals and the Labour - should be represented in order that the contributions made in the Lower Chamber should also be reflected in the Upper Chamber, one cannot understand why the present Cabinet should fail to realise it, if they are serious in that paragraph which His Excellency the Governor read, that representation of political parties in the Council would not be in the best interest of the Island.

Mr. Speaker, the question which might well be asked is this: does the person who would be responsible for putting the point of view of the Government take the view that it would not be in the best interest of the island to have political parties? If political parties are regarded as essential today and as the only way to govern ourselves, well then, the parties are entitled to representation in the Upper Chamber according to the representation in the Lower Chamber as a result of the Ballot box. At least there should be two representatives in the Upper Chamber of the Official Opposition party in a democratic elected Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are other members on this side who are desirous and in fact, more than anxious, to discuss the constitutional aspects of His Excellency the Governor's speech and because of that I shall defer any further comment on that. With these, as I submit, comparatively brief comments, Mr. Speaker, on His Excellency's speech, I beg formally, to move the substitution of the paragraph which I have read in place of the last paragraph in the Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech which was moved by a Government backbencher, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not seconding the amendment which was moved by the hon. junior member for

St. Lucy; I am speaking on the motion before the House. The hon. introducer of the Resolution spoke about Government's efficiency and I must say in a general way that "efficiency" could not be the word. This is not a reflection on Your Honour but certainly "efficiency" cannot be related to this part of the Legislature. When you look around, what do you find? And this is something which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be the first to press the Government for. On the 3rd February, 1959, the Governor delivered a Speech and this is nearly the 3rd of May - three months after - that we are replying to an Address thanking His Excellency for that speech. This is something which looks like a sort of anti-climax. 3.25 p.m.

With what enthusiasm could anyone speak on a matter like this? And when you talk about efficiency, what happens in any efficient Parliament in the Commonwealth is, that a Speech from the Throne is regarded as more or less a subject of immediate debate; because soon after that Speech is delivered, a reply is given and the House begins to debate the question. Here we have a period of three months after a Speech from the Throne is delivered; not only that, but a Budget has come in between and with much gusto the hon. junior member for St. Joseph brings in this Address and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has laboured through it. With what amount of force are you going to discuss something which is as old as cold pone? (Mr. CRAWFORD: What kind of pone?) Pone which is becoming poisonous. (Laughter). We have reached the stage where this is the type of inefficiency which we are getting in the highest place - and the Premier is now grinning. There are those who are responsible for work which is not done, and it is not done because no lead has been set; they are not setting any proper standards and they are getting a lot of money for doing it. You cannot get anything out of the people of this Island from the point of view of real efficiency because with those who are supposed to be leading, inefficiency is taking place. They cannot lead in efficiency and therefore there cannot be any shining light to show what we are doing and what we are getting and therefore we cannot criticise anybody for inefficiency. Today is nearly the third of May; the Speech from the Throne was delivered on the 3rd February and an efficient Government is now asking us to discuss this matter! I would be failing in my duty to my conscience, to my constituents if I allowed these things to go by.

This Address in reply to the Throne Speech is more or less a recital of some of the things mentioned in the Budget Speech, but there is absolutely nothing in it from the development point of view where you can say that you are going to do this and that. How much employment are you going to create? It is true that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a new member of this House and, as he says, he has to listen and there are lots of things to which he has to listen; but when you look at a Speech such as this and you find the ridiculous statement on the question of unemployment in an island like Barbados which is teeming over with unemployment, a more serious omission could not have been made in this Report; yet the hon. member speaks about efficiency. Here is this statement made by His Excellency the Governor: - "No reliable statistics of unemployment are available." Imagine that the Government is planning to borrow money; they get this money very quickly at 6% and at 98 1/2. That shows confidence in what? Confidence in their efficiency or that they have money in the Treasury? Yes, their fiscal policy shows that, - but their Socialist policy shows that they have unemployment, the figures of which they do not know; but you can estimate that there are 25,000 people who are unemployed. They should be embarking on a bold policy so as to relieve this serious state of unemployment.

In this Speech, His Excellency goes on to say this: "but the number registered at the Employment Exchange at 31st December was 1,162 as compared with 2,239 a year ago. During 1958, 1,239 persons were placed in local employment."

What type of fool could have written this or advised the Head of the Administration to make that statement? This is conceding that even the people who have registered for employment have no confidence in the Employment

Exchange which you have. Do you believe that there are less people who are looking for employment in 1958 than those who looked for employment in 1957? People have become so disgusted with registering their names at the Employment Exchange that they will ask you to help them with jobs as against putting down their names there. It all goes to show that there is no confidence in the Employment Exchange as regards getting employment. In an island where you have unemployment growing and you speak about population growth, you are telling us that you have no reliable information as to unemployment available! I remember that when Mr. Cumper was coming here the present Minister of Communications, who was then the Minister of Labour, made a statement to this House that they could not proceed with any planning until they got that information from Mr. Cumper. We know how long Mr. Cumper left here. Why is the Government not able to indicate the amount of unemployment there is in Barbados? You have this statement that you cannot release the numbers to the public, but you can tell us that no reliable information is available. By what means are you going to get reliable information? If the Government cannot get any reliable information, who then can get it? I do not know if the members of the Government realise the seriousness of the situation which is taking place in Barbados as regards this same unemployment problem.

This Report states that it is proposed to spend money on the creation of the Deep Water Harbour and not one word is said as to what it is proposed to do about unemployment in Barbados that you have now; and if you do not have a bold and imaginative policy to grapple with the situation, what are you going to do in order to find employment for the people of this island? I have just seen a remarkable article written from a facetious angle, an article about Barbados receiving babies. That happened in 1921 when some of our relatives went to the United States of America and had to work for a living; they had children and many of them had to be sent back here, but the situation in 1921 in New York was better than the situation is in the United Kingdom in 1958. 3.35 p.m.

What has the Government said in this to show that they are taking care of industrial development on a broad scale?

The hon. member spoke about education. Education is axiomatic; it is an essential ingredient. You cannot talk about development unless you talk about education, and I will cross here to say, without paying any tribute to the people in the days that have gone, Mr. Speaker, that if you make a careful analysis you will find, whether or not you want to admit it, that more has been done by those people who were not socialists for education than has been done in our time, because the things we boast about now in education are the things handed to us by the people who did not care about education. With the money available today, one wonders whether there should not be free education, because free education was on the Statute Book somewhere in 1925, and since then we have not had compulsory education for the people within the conservative context, and all these years have passed and we have not yet made any positive change towards that. I am not talking about scholarships, but about the greater concept of education by making it easier for people at all levels. You still have to pay the same fees of ten years ago and people have to struggle the same way, but more people are going to these schools, and maybe people believe it is quite right. More people are willing to pay the sacrifice than those who were willing in days gone by; more people will pay the sacrifice to send a boy or a girl to school. The average postman will send his son to Harrison College or Combermere, or his daughter to Queens College or St. Michael's when 20 years ago he felt that was not the place for them. The concept has changed, but his financial position is the same; he is not so much better off than his counterpart; but he is willing to pay the sacrifice for something of which he has a better understanding.

If you look around Barbados you will see an 18' x 9' house going up which costs \$1,000 as compared with an 18' x 9' house costing \$200 twenty years ago. If you go

around the country you will see the number of chattel houses that are going up, and they are the same type as in the past. The income of these people is no better than before and those who have something can be counted on your fingers. These are things which we have to analyse and keep in our minds. We know of cases in the old days and even of today where parents have a lot of money in the Bank and would not give their children a proper education, because they believe that having money and land is a good idea while it is not necessary to give a child education. It does not matter how you budget; it is of greater benefit to the people who live here to give them employment. If you have 5,000 people unemployed and you say you have \$2 million in the Treasury, it is not of advantage to the community; it is better to have more people at work and less money in the Treasury, because you know that your social services would not be depressed.

In England and in other countries in the world, you do not boast about money in the Treasury; you aim at full employment. If this is an impossible task for us, it is still an ideal towards which we have to look. What is wrong with going after that?

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition made mention of single-member constituencies. I do not believe that the Government intend to have single-member constituencies; otherwise they would have worked on it. This is April, 1959 and we have to run to 1961; so that if it were the intention of Government to have single-member constituencies, they would have started so that the boundaries could be made, and not continue to have this nonsense which is a sort of plurality of representation, and something of the past.

The Government in power talks about conventions, but a most shameful thing has been drawn to my attention under this Local Government. They have decided to put Ministers of the Government on Boards of Guardians. This is the Fidel Castro sort of thing. You had better execute people. You are going to put two Ministers of the Government with the type of Local Government constitution which gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to do this, that and the other on these Boards. Why not let the Premier go on everything?

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I can wait long enough, because if you give certain people enough rope, you are bound to find them in Glendairy Prison. If you give them enough rope, they are anxious to get rich quickly and do not want to wait on time. It is a rapacious Government, if it is true that they want to put two Ministers under this present context on Boards of Guardians. This would not happen in Trinidad; they have their own constitution, but I understand that normally a man cannot be a member of the Legislature and a member of the County Councils also. That is as it should be because I feel that just as a man cannot be a member of this Assembly and be a member of the Federal Parliament, the same relationship should exist between the Local Government and the Central Government. I feel that it is an attempt to debase this by making a member a Minister and at the same time a member of the Board of Guardians. When you make a man a Minister and pay him a salary, his duties are regarded as so exacting that we regard his job as a whole-time office; yet you can find time for him to sit at the Almshouse gate to give somebody 3¢, an old plate, a cup of milk or something like that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if the hon. member would, instead of repeating generalisations, name the Ministers, the time they were put on these Boards, by which Government it was done and say whether the Government has authority to name members to the Board of Guardians. Let him give the facts.

Mr. WALCOTT: I wonder if the hon. member believes that I am afraid. For five long years, from 1954 to now, he should know that if I were afraid I would have to leave Barbados. I have grown in stature; so therefore you cannot ask me that. It has been drawn to my attention today by members of the Southern District Council that the Hon. Minister of Education and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture have been nominated to be members of the Southern District Council's Board of Guardians.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Did the Government do it?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it has been drawn to my attention that that has been done. Are you going to ask me if the Government did it? It has not yet been published. I do not belong to the D.L.P., the P.N.P. or the B.L.P.; so members do not have to worry. I only hear of Party caucuses in Parliamentary circles when I come to the House, because I am not interested in what takes place in Parties. I do not ask any member of the Labour Party what takes place. What I know takes place is what I see in the newspaper; but if members of the Southern District Council which form Parties can say that the Party in power is nominating paid members, you can conclude that the powers-that-be in the Party know of it, because you cannot get something like that happening unless the Government knows about it. What I want to say is that it would be a shameful thing to have any Minister of the Crown going and dabbling in Poor Law Guardian Boards. 3.45 p.m.

Do you think that in the United Kingdom you will get Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd leaving the heavy duties of State to attend to Local Government matters? (A VOICE: Not even if they were Mayors.) You talk of Mayors but I say not even studs. I am different from members of the Other Side. They are fighting for political power; all I am fighting for is a seat. Of course, a seat to them means food but I am a man who works; so a seat in here is not going to make me say "if you make me lose my seat, I am going to do this with you." If the Barbados Legislature did not have low standards of thinking, you will not get a situation in which a Cabinet Minister views a seat on the Local Government in the same way as that on the Central Government, nor would you get the situation of a Minister being suggested as a member of the Poor Law Guardians.

There is reference about the McKenzie Report in His Excellency's Speech and that is why I say that the moving of the passing of this Address is a sort of anticlimax in view of the fact that a Resolution dealing with the McKenzie Report is on the Order Paper and as I have to reply to that I will reserve all my energy to deal with that on that occasion and I will not deal with that now.

In His Excellency's Speech, he said that it is hoped that it will be possible to introduce legislation on the subject of Workmen's Compensation during the new Session and the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution made mention of that. Let it not be misunderstood that the Workers' Union made its position known on this years ago. I want to say now if there is any delay on this matter that the matter is in the Government's hands. People are being injured day after day and I would say to hon. members of this House that it is painful to know that in 1959 men have to carry home, if they are injured, a mere pittance. Imagine a man is only going to get \$6.00 a week as a result of injury which makes it impossible for him to work just because he is a man casually employed. Up to now the Government cannot get down to this question of amending the Workmen's Compensation Act to make provision for this legislation. I feel that in such matters as this we should not be called upon to endure these long delays.

You have the paragraph in His Excellency's Speech that the purchase of nine acres in the Emmerton area will enable the Authority to re-develop this congested district as drainage problems connected with the Deep Water Harbour can be overcome. I believe that the purchase of this area was obtained by money from the Labour Welfare Fund. Again, I will say that money accruing to the Labour Welfare Fund and spent on purchases such as this should be devoted to the rural area. It is true that you have slums in places such as the Emmerton area and Nelson Street and something should be done about it. As a matter of fact, you should build nice flats in those areas as is done in Trinidad. But when you do those things, that is something which you should budget for out of your General Revenue. When you purchase this nine acres of land in the Emmerton area out of the Labour Welfare Fund, it is not something which you are doing because sugar workers happen to be living in this area; it is not agricultural land as such, nor is it a project which you are carrying on for the benefit of people in the rural areas.

What is distressing is that you find when Government comes in the rural area to spend money out of the Labour Welfare Fund on a certain project, Government spends it in a certain way. They say that they cannot spend more than \$1.50 per head of the population of the district. Now, the re-developing of this congested district of Emmerton is not a Town Hall that you are putting up in the area for sugar workers and, as a matter of fact, Emmerton is not an area where you can say that a sugar worker can get something which is applicable to him. We agree to use money from the Labour Welfare Fund for the erection of the new Hospital and although you are building a Hospital for everybody and not one set of people, yet the majority of the money for the building of this Hospital is coming from this particular Fund.

I say that when it comes to money being used from the Labour Welfare Fund, it should not be spent by the Government on any new project without reference to the Legislature. Before that money is spent, members of the Legislature should have a general idea as to what is taking place. You have gone and bought nine acres of land in the Emmerton area. Everybody knows that nine acres of land in the City would cost a great deal more than nine acres of land somewhere else. You say when it comes to putting projects up in the rural areas out of the Labour Welfare Fund such as a playing field, that the sort of allocation you make is something like \$1.50 per head of the population. I can tell hon. members that in my own constituency we suffered because of that for very many years: and even now that there is a little light, yet you do not know how much land is going to be available for a similar project.

Reference in His Excellency's Speech was made to the question of salaries. This is what was said in his Speech:-

"My Government is aware that there has been some increase in the cost of living since the last salaries revision and have under consideration measures to grant some relief to the lower paid employees of the Government."

Mr. Speaker, when a Government which is a Socialist Government is going to give people in its lower branches of service an increase based on the cost of living, it must mean that that Government is perpetuating low standards, because it is looking at an increase in salary from the cost of living point of view. Sir, look at the anomalies with which we just dealt in another Resolution! Some of those anomalies gave some of the people affected \$20 a month more; some got \$40 a month more. Now, when that happened, it was not because something was basically wrong with the salary they were getting; something was wrong with the salary they were getting in relation to the salary which somebody else is getting.

Sir, I am sure that when Government deals with giving an increase to these people in the lower grades, not one of them will get an increase to \$40 a month. You talk of giving an increase based on the cost of living. Do you not think that the time has come when you should stop this nonsense of a Government deciding what should be given to them? What sort of redress will these employees have from you? You are perpetuating something of the old days when you talk of your giving them an increase, because in those days you had to please your employer without your having a Trade Union to look out for you. You had to take what your employer gave you without any redress. I believe one of the matters upon which we have been fighting the Government is that in many instances we have been pushing wages of workers higher up than what the Government is paying and Government feels that we should not push them up so far because we make it more expensive for the Government.

Sir, there is general dissatisfaction in the Public Service today and there is general deficiency in it. That needs proper investigation.

3.55 p.m.

I cannot put my hand on it and say that that is the case but I have been keeping it at heart. I see public works going up all over the world; it does not seem to be any-

body's business as to what is being done and there seems to be an air of *laissez-faire*; nobody seems to be worrying about what is going on. You often wonder what is taking place. Sometimes when you make a general comment as to what you see taking place, people ask; "What do you want me to do? I am getting this, but do you think this is fair?" Only this morning I had some complaints made to me, and I do not intend to say at this stage whence they came because in some of these things it is not good for discipline. But when people are openly going to tell you that there is open dissatisfaction in the Public Service and in quarters where it should not be, it is not that there is no justification for the dissatisfaction, but there does not seem to be the type of remedy which people can get to give them the satisfaction which they need. When you allow these things to go on for so long and you even make an adjustment, when you make that adjustment you are asked: "What is the point now? That should have taken place for a long time ago." Therefore you have people who are more ready for argument than for anything else.

The lowest wage paid in the Public Service is \$13.20 per week and do not let us fool ourselves that we will get the best out of the workers for that wage. I know that in some instances you will get more work out of people if you pay them a little more; you speak about the work which you get but what about the low wages which you pay? If any member of this House can say that a man can live on anything like this, which is but a subsistence wage, I will ask him to show me how it can be done. I know what some of the people who are working eat; you have a man who is 28 years of age looking as if he is 48 years of age; what sort of food can a man eat, who is working for \$13.20 a week? I say that that is anomalous; I do not mind giving a man a salary which is commensurate with the work which he has to do; I do not begrudge giving him a proper salary. I do not begrudge a man getting a \$48 a month increase, but we have to watch this disparity which exists in the island between the man who is at the lowest grade and compare it with a man at the head. If it is justifiable that you should pay a man in the higher category a salary which is commensurate with the status on which he can live, it is also justifiable for the man at the bottom to get a salary which is regarded as that which can promote a decent standard of living. The amount of \$13.20 per week cannot do that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to correct one statement made by the hon. member who has just sat down. He said that the Government has appointed two Ministers to the Guardians Committee in the Southern Area, but according to the Local Government Act, which has just been passed, the Local Government Councils appoint these people. The Government has no authority to appoint anybody.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think I corrected myself and I explained the matter. I am neither a member of the Government nor of the Local Government Councils; I told the House that it was drawn to my attention by two members of the Southern District Council that there was a proposal to nominate two Ministers to the Guardians Committee and the Hon. Premier has confirmed that.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of explanation. At the meeting of the Southern District Council yesterday the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Hon. Minister of Education were nominated and voted for by the Labour Party and put on the Guardians Committee. (MEMBERS: Shame.)

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to express my feelings in this House as to the appointment.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a pertinent point and the hon. member is out of order. The hon. member will continue to speak on the Address which is before the House, the Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that His Excellency the Governor has delivered an Address, and as a member of a Council, it has moved me to think that other members who are Ministers should be placed on the Guardians Committee. That is a shame.

Mr. SPEAKER: I again remind the hon. member that that is not the point in the Address. That point arose on a point of explanation; it is not really a pertinent point dealing with the Address which is before us.

Mr. CORBIN: His Excellency the Governor in his Speech said this: "Amending Bills relating to Public Health and Public Assistance will shortly be presented to you." It is on that point that I am speaking now. 4.05 p.m.

I do not think it is right for the Ministers to be on the Board of Guardians. They have a permanent position and should not be on that Board. Even the Councillors who have been elected by members of the Southern District have been pushed aside. They have brought in outsiders who have never faced the polls. (A VOICE: Shame.) These people have been put on the Board of Guardians, the Board of Health and various other important Boards, and we as Councillors who have all night and day faced the electorate and won the confidence of the people have been pushed aside by the Labour Party when the electorate expected that we should be on these important Boards. It is a shame.

I was a member of the Committee to select the members for the various Boards and we arranged to meet on the 8th of this month, but the Labour Party members met on the 5th without giving us time for consideration. I had no time to reason and when I got to the meeting I saw the lists already made out, not even written, but typed lists. When I went to the meeting on the date arranged, there was no space for me to reason with them; they had dealt the cards overnight and I had to take or leave what was left. They did what they felt like doing; they took the Aldermen who had been chosen by the Government and put them on these six Boards, and the Councillors were left out. It shocked my modesty to think of it. I refrain from being on any of the Boards without my previous knowledge. It is bad to think of that when the people expected that we should be on these important Boards to represent them, but they have brought in outsiders who know nothing about the affairs of Government at all to represent the people.

Mr. Speaker, if you are doing that to secure the favour of the people, I say that you are losing this time. You cannot secure the people this way. It is by good works and conduct that you win the affection of the people; this is the only possible means of your future existence. I am not here to preach any Biblical facts, but if you continue like that I am saying that the Most High God has the Kingdom in His hands and has power to give it to whom He will. He tries the heart of man and will give to each man according to his ways and according to the fruits of his doings. I do not know how long I have to stay here, but I say that the mighty hand is going to shake the Labour Party tree and the fruits are going to fall - in 1961. He has proved the Conservatives and he is proving you all now. Anyway, Sir, I hope that in future the people of this island will see what a mistake the Labour Party has made by choosing outsiders and not putting Councillors to represent them.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amendment of the Address in reply which amendment has been moved and spoken on by my colleague, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, Mr. Speaker, I have to agree that much of the force and purpose of the Speech from the Throne has been lost, and I am astonished to see that the Government thought so little of observing the constitutional and Parliamentary courtesies that they delayed nearly three months before they at least permitted one of their backbenchers to give notice of an Address in reply. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is the last occasion on which such a thing will happen and that next year when after Prorogation we are favoured with another Speech from the Throne read by a new Governor, it will be possible for the House to debate the Address in reply at least within a fortnight after. After all, the Speech from the Throne is a record of Government policy read by the Head of the State, and it represents or should represent the Government's up-to-date views

of the administration it is conducting at a particular moment; and if as I suspect each Minister has a hand in preparing some part of the Speech, because he best knows about his own Department, the Speech then as a composite whole represents the entire view of the Ministry of the day, a view which when spoken through the mouth of the Governor should be treated with seriousness and be debated almost immediately.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in the House of Commons it is the custom that backbenchers should move and second and therefore initiate the debate of the Address in reply; but unlike our custom, it is a fashion in the House of Commons to devote one or two Supply days so that the Speech in reply can be dealt with almost within a week or two of its being delivered at the opening of Parliament. Here we see things rather differently, and because of that Government has been slack enough to allow almost three months to pass, and therefore the whole House becomes involved in a breach of courtesy. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this debate continues, and can only continue under Private Members' time, since that is given only two hours every Tuesday, I can foresee that at least two Tuesdays must elapse before this Address is passed, and therefore there will be a greater delay in presenting it. I only mentioned that to let hon. members see that we really ought to tighten up our procedure on these matters, because there are certain Parliamentary priorities which ought always to be observed and should never be honoured in their breach.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment first of all on that part of the Speech which referred to the constitutional proposals. Now in June, I think it was, of 1957, the Democratic Labour Party wrote to the Governor asking him to put before the Secretary of State for the Colonies certain proposals which had been running through the Party's mind so to speak. 4.15 p.m.

The fact, first of all, that a new extension of the Barbados Constitution was contemplated and, therefore, the Party felt that if the two-party system was to work properly it would have to work in both Chambers, and the fact secondly, also that the Barbados House of Assembly was soon to have the opportunity of discussing the new constitutional proposals - these two facts made our Party decide to approach the Governor on a single issue.

Now, before we addressed correspondence to the Governor, it is true that the constitutional proposals had been received by him from the Secretary of State for the Colonies - at least the approval of them - and the heads of the parties outside of the Government had been called in consultation on them; but such was the way in which things were being done that when the leader of our Party was called in consultation he was told that under no circumstances was he to treat these proposals put to him other than an official secret and, therefore, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (and my colleague reminds me that he was personally warned by the Governor) was in that position that he could not discuss with his Party colleagues matters which were put to him. He honoured the undertaking scrupulously and made it known to us that he could not divulge to us what was divulged to him. The Hon. Leader of the Barbados National Party, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, disclosed the same thing - that he was summoned to Government House to attend a meeting of the Executive Committee at which these matters were being discussed, but he was also told that he could not divulge to members of his Party what these constitutional proposals were. So scrupulously my colleague honoured the undertaking that he seemed fit to correct me and tell me that it was not even a meeting of the Executive Committee but that the only people present were the Governor and the Chief Secretary. I was under the impression that it was at a meeting of the Executive Committee.

While all this was going on and the Leaders of the Opposition Parties were asked to hide from their own Party colleagues the proposals put to them, the then Premier of Barbados was giving word for word in detail at a public meeting in Trinidad the constitutional proposals

which had not yet come before the House and which were not known to hon. members apart from the members of the Executive Committee and the Leaders of the two other Parties in the House and they were subjected to secrecy. We were under this disadvantage, that we did not know exactly what had been proposed and it was agreed that if an undertaking had been sought from our leader not to tell us what were the proposals, he was in duty bound to honour that undertaking. However, a few weeks after the then Premier had disclosed in detail what the constitutional proposals were, my colleague represented to the Governor through the Chief Secretary that in view of the fact that the Premier of Barbados had told the Trinidad people what extensions they were to the Barbados constitution there would be no harm in his telling his colleagues what they were. The letter which we received in reply to that is now in our Party files. His Excellency the Governor said in reply to him that in the present circumstances, he may disclose to his colleagues the proposals. That is to say, after the then Premier had told the Trinidad people what the next step in the constitutional advancement was for Barbados, the details of which were withheld from Barbadians but disclosed in another island, the Governor gave permission for my colleague to discuss it with us: but by the time we had formulated other proposals of our own. We had agreed with our colleague in the stand he took. As a matter of fact, we had full confidence in him to express our views whether he was able to give us a report or not and that was the background against which we decided to approach the Governor for representation of the Opposition parties in the Legislative Council.

Now, I have seen it said somewhere in the newspapers that the reason why we wanted representation in the Legislative Council was to find somewhere to put Mr. "T. T." Lewis. I neither confirm nor deny that for I am yet to know of a person, who is a son of the soil, who deserves being a member of that or any other Chamber more than that person. So even if it were he whom we would have elevated, he would be an honour to the Legislative Council. But it so happened that matters had not yet reached that point. Unlike the Government we think differently. We do not find persons and then create positions for them; we decide whether such a thing is good; and if our proposals are good, we then look around for persons to fill them.

It was a question of giving proper representation in a two-party system in a two-chamber Legislature to all the political parties of this island. We wrote the Governor and asked him to pass on our proposals to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and we pointed out to him that the Legislative Council as it stood was not representative of the entire island. This is an old story because it is well known that the majority of persons in it were merchants or planters. All that was pointed out in the letter. We further said that in recent years there had been a departure in the choice of members to that Chamber in that the Government in power had nominated a few of their own Party supporters, whether they are members or not, for vacancies as they arose and we quoted the names of Dr. Cato and Mr. Ward who, I think, were then members of that Chamber. I do not know who else was there as a supporter of theirs at the time. However, the point which we stated in the letter was that we were asking for representation in that Chamber for the Opposition Party on the basis of working of the two-party system. If the extension of the constitution is to be followed, well then, the party system must work in both Houses of the Legislature.

Sir, we drew attention to the fact that the Minister without Portfolio was himself a member of the Legislative Council and an ex-candidate of the Government Party, and being such he represented not only the Government but was the spokesman of the Government Party policy in that Chamber. We pointed out that if the Government was entitled to a spokesman, the Opposition as an opposition was also entitled to one. We have no other axe to grind but that we particularly stated to the Governor to pass that letter on to the Secretary of State for the Colonies because we did not want it to be decided on at Barbados Cabinet level.
4.25 p.m.

We questioned the competence of the Cabinet of Barbados to pronounce finally on a matter like that and that is why we wanted the judgment of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We were much surprised and astonished that a motion which we directed in the normal, recognised channels - we were much surprised that on a matter like that we should receive a response in a Speech from the Throne read to the Legislature when we did not raise the matter at all as a legislative concern. It is ironical that now, in recent weeks, the Governor is being lambasted from a certain political platform for doing what was right, when our Opposition Party, which is more against his actions than the Labour Party is, has refused to hold him up to public ridicule although this Party has a greater grievance than the Labour Party has. The Governor is right in this instance and they are doing just the opposite to what we did. Before we received a reply from the Governor, a Message came to this Legislature to the effect that the constitutional proposals which had been agreed to by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and which were submitted to the Cabinet and the party leaders would be laid before the House and the Legislature would have an opportunity of discussing them in some detail and pronouncing upon them. Since that Message came to the House the Executive of our Party met and decided that until we had the constitutional proposals before the House in black and white we would ask the Governor to suspend any action in so far as the request we made was concerned. All along while the proposals were being debated in this House, we made no mention whatever of our request although in the course of the debate the then Premier, who obviously knew that we had written to the Governor, was at pains to try to draw us out by attempting to quote part of the despatches from the Governor and which could only have come from the Governor. We were scrupulous enough not to answer him on the point because we had asked the Governor not to take any action on the matter. The Opposition, though small, had acted with more responsibility in the matter than the Government which carried the responsibility for the administration.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock it is now time for the resumption of Government Business.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 3) ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when Government Business was being considered, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was addressing the House.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, when the sitting of the House was suspended for lunch, I was commenting on the question of the proposed salary scale for the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk; I was attempting to point out to the House that his salary was entirely out of proportion to the nature of his duties. In the first instance, the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk is responsible for the refrigerating plant in the absence of the Refrigerator Clerk himself. We are now attempting to put our marketing system on a proper basis and we have actually established a Central Market at Fairchild Street which came into being after many years of delay and unavoidable postponement. We have the market at Fairchild Street functioning at present and this particular Officer will be required to hold on, not as an Assistant but in his own right as Refrigerator Clerk at the market - I hope the Minister will correct me if I am wrong; I am putting the matter to the House that, in the absence of any information to the contrary, it is within my knowledge that the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk will be called upon, owing to the construction of the Fairchild Street Market, to be doing not any assistant's work but that of the substantive holder of the post.

In view of that, it would be highly unfair to regard this Officer as an Assistant Refrigerator Clerk when in truth and in fact he is a Refrigerator Clerk in his own right. I am putting forward some points which, I hope, will be attended to by the appropriate Minister who is the Minister of Fisheries; I hope he will see that this whole matter is revised in the light of present arrangements. Very soon you will have the other market functioning and you will have that plant functioning at the old

market; you will have the new market in Cheapside and the Central Market in Fairchild Street. You will probably have three other markets but at the present time you have two. I say that the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk should draw a salary which is more in keeping with that of the Refrigerator Clerk. That is another instance of the Anomalies Committee not having the facts: because if they had them, they could not have made that blunder.

There should be two Refrigerator Plants instead of one, and the title of the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk should be "Refrigerator Clerk" and not "Assistant Refrigerator Clerk"; there should be two Refrigerator Clerks and two Assistant Refrigerator Clerks. In the case of the Assistants, well, let us assume that there will be two Refrigerator Clerks and two Assistant Refrigerator Clerks; I am trying to draw to the attention of the House that the salary of the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk is out of all proportion to that of the Refrigerator Clerk when you consider that, in the absence of the Refrigerator Clerk whether through illness or whatever the cause may be, the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk is called upon to perform those duties and the life of the community is at stake. You will see that the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk will get a maximum salary of \$116 and that is quite inadequate as a salary for a man who is technically trained and who has a working knowledge, being an electrical engineer and who, in some cases, is a competent mechanic and a fairly good electrician. To fix a salary scale such as is proposed here, is doing nothing for a post of this sort. I am speaking of this matter as having dealt with it some years ago when I was Minister of Agriculture. 4.35 p.m.

There are many people in the Government Service on this scale of \$912 x 48 - \$1,248. There are overseers at the Pine and at the Central Livestock Station who receive this salary and the Anomalies Committee were supposed to take care of these matters. It is a long time since 1956 when the Report was made and the Anomalies Committee was appointed, and it is really some of my work which I am trying to investigate. I am not occupying the position over there of a Minister, but I have some credit in bringing this before the Anomalies Committee; I want to see justice done to these people. I feel that the attempt made in remedying their grievance is far from being any attempt at all. If that is the way the Anomalies Committee think, you might as well have them removed altogether. They have granted increases to some members of the Education Department who are already receiving fairly good salaries. I am not suggesting that their increases are undesirable, but when dealing with cases which really merit consideration like the ones who are receiving \$100, \$120 or \$160, the underprivileged ones, the Committee has only increased the maximum from \$1,248 to \$1,392.

If the Anomalies Committee had put a qualifying bar at that stage, and continued to raise the salary by increments to say \$1,680 or \$1,920, then I could understand, because after waiting for a number of years the officers would be in receipt of something fairly reasonable. The proposed increase as set out here would only enable him to draw \$12 a month more than under the old set-up.

Again, Sir, I repeat, the Refrigerator Clerk or his Assistant is not a messenger; the Refrigerator Clerk is receiving a salary of \$220 or \$240 a month, and the disparity between the Refrigerator Clerk and the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk is too great, because whereas in one case the salary is \$220 or \$240, in the other case the maximum is \$116 a month after a long number of years' service. I have no brief for the particular officer, but this is a glaring instance of rank disadvantage. You are taking advantage of the ones who cannot say anything for themselves, and this is one of those cases. But there are many cases like this in the Agricultural Department; there are overseers at the Pine and Central Livestock Station and a few others at Doods and so on.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will see to it that a further review is made by the Anomalies Committee or by his Ministry in having these salaries adjusted properly, because the maximum of \$1,392 a year is certainly not good enough. I know that there is a prac-

tice in the Financial Department by the ones who are experts on finance - the supposed or alleged experts of finance at the Ministerial Buildings - to fix a salary scale as a matter of convenience to fit in with a scale which is already in existence and which bear no relation whatever to the wants of the officer or to what he strictly deserves. There is a tendency by the Minister of Finance and by some of his advisers to relegate in some cases certain officers who may be deserving of a higher salary by putting them on a scale because the scale exists and they do not want to create a new scale.

You have a scale for the Attendant, Law Library of \$912 x 48 - 1,248 which is now being changed to \$1,392; so you look at that scale and think that that is the scale to which the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk belongs, and he will be victimised because there is not that proper scale to which he should belong. You get that sort of thing happening and it is not good enough. In this case there is a case to be made out for the Assistant Refrigerator Clerk or for the overseers at the Central Livestock Station and at the Pine as well as Doods and a few others whom I cannot remember offhand; but the Anomalies Committee, in the case of the ones getting fairly adequate salaries, have granted an increase of \$40 a month, while in the case of the smallest and most deserving, the Committee has granted an increase of \$12 per month.

I am hoping that the Minister will make a note of that and see what can be done. I know that he is not a member of the Anomalies Committee, but he can use his influence on the Cabinet, being absolute masters, as has been alleged on platforms, in internal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Lecturer in Natural Sciences, I see that the salary scale has been changed from \$4,704 to \$6,000 as was recommended by the Salaries Commissioner, and now starts, as has been recommended by the Anomalies Committee, at \$4,896 x 192 - 5,280 x 240 - 6,000 with an efficiency bar at a maximum of \$6,240. I am not trying to compare the two, because I know that very often I am reported as saying something that I have not said. Although I welcome this proposed increase in salary and the new salary scale for this Lecturer in Natural Sciences, I believe we need to have attractive salaries and attractive salary scales in order to secure proper men especially in the scientific fields. I was wondering, Sir, why in the first place you put him on an incremental basis at all. If he is a Lecturer in Natural Sciences, I do not think that you should treat him as a Clerk in the Government Service. 4.45 p.m.

If you are going to pay him \$6,240, pay him \$6,240. This idea of treating a big man who is properly qualified as an office boy is wrong and is Barbadian mentality. He comes at \$4,896 and if he is good, he gets \$192 every year as an increment and you increase it all along until he gets \$5,280 and then you give him increments of \$240 per year until he gets to \$6,000 where there is a qualifying bar before you pay him \$6,240. I say that if you are going to pay him \$6,24, pay him that and do not insult the man by saying that he is on some salary scale with a qualifying bar and all of that. Who is going to test him? The Ministers? The Executive Committee? Who will know how qualified he is? The Ministers? The Executive Committee, the Public Service Commission, the Salaries Commissioner or the Anomalies Committee? In any case, I regard this as an insult and the wrong way of going about it. If you want a proper scientific officer, pay him a proper salary and let him draw a proper salary from the commencement of his taking office. To treat him as a Clerk is the wrong approach.

I see that he is attached to the Department of Science and Agriculture, and to my recollection of things, I thought he was no longer to be on the staff of the Department of Science of Agriculture because to my recollection of things I thought that this post was to be transferred to the staff of Harrison College. I would therefore like the Hon. Minister to check on that point. My recollection of the matter is that this post of Lecturer in Natural Sciences was abolished and the holder of that post was now to be a member of the staff of Harrison College. This is an old arrangement and it was like that when I was a pupil of Harrison College.

The Lecturer in Natural Sciences then was Mr. Robinson.

In keeping with the general proposals, I feel that the Anomalies Committee has done in part a fairly good job but mainly when dealing with the ones who need less assistance. In other words, the Anomalies Committee has done a good job but not in the case of the most deserving ones, the ones who find difficulty to buy essential commodities and the day-to-day things of living. The Anomalies Committee has not been particularly liberal towards that class of workers. It is an old story all over again. It is a question of the wrong approach when it comes to making increases in salaries. The Government will have to adopt a new method when they seek to revise salaries by starting from the bottom upwards. Government should start by paying a minimum wage to the casual employees and the ones who work in the Public Works Department and on the roads and so on. You should start on fixing a minimum wage suitable for such workers and do not start from the top down and then find that the greatest lot of Government employees have not been given any increase as such. You start from the top and then find out that the increases you have given cost \$2 million and then you have only \$500,000 to serve the big mass of Government employees. You make increases amounting to \$2 million to the ones in the upper brackets and you find out that when you come to deal with the ones who really need assistance that there is very little money there to pay them. As I have said, it is the old policy all over again. The ones who are already receiving fairly reasonable salaries are given fairly reasonable increases but those receiving pittance do not get sufficient consideration. I am asking that this old policy be revised. It is not good enough for the Hon. Premier and his Ministers who are now masters for everything internally to come and say to us: "We have nothing to do with salaries; we make no recommendations," and that there is a Salaries Commissioner and an Anomalies Committee to deal with that. You have to see to it that these people get proper wages and everything else.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is only one small point which I have to draw to the attention of the Government and I do not think I will be as long in doing so as the hon. member who has just sat down. I hope the Hon. Premier will listen to me intently. It is not going to be a difficult one. I just want to say that the Anomalies Committee itself creates anomalies and as this is an Order dealing with anomalies I am drawing it to the Hon. Premier's attention. I note that some of these anomalies have already been dealt with just as that dealing with the Superintendent of the Prison. That was dealt with previously when the Superintendent of Prison was put at a salary of \$6,240. What do you find, Mr. Speaker, is that the Godsall Report recommended for the Fire Officer a salary of \$6,720 and he is now drawing a salary of \$6,240 as against your giving the Superintendent of Prison the same salary. You are saying that this Anomalies Committee is dealing with anomalies arising out of the Godsall Report.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are now dealing with the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order No. 3, 1959 and nowhere in this Order do I see anything about Fire Officer. It is not on this Order which we are dealing with now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter is anticipating a particular Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir. Surely, Sir, you will expect the Hon. Premier would have more intelligence. If the Hon. Premier has no more intelligence, then he is governing a position for which he should have more intelligence.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not deal with personalities.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier crossed me. He has brought down a Resolution and he does not understand the nature of the Resolution. The Resolution which he has brought down is as a result of the Anomalies Committee amending salaries as a result of the Godsall Salaries Report. This Anomalies Committee is dealing with anomalies arising out of that report; so it is not a question that I must see in an Order which he has before the House of Assembly something about the Fire Officer. I have the

right to make reference to the fact that the Anomalies Committee has not dealt with things out of the Godsall Report which would be an anomaly. If you have in the Godsall Report a Recommendation that one person was to have a salary of \$6,720, but the Anomalies Committee dealt with one person who was to get a similar salary and not with the other person who was to get that same salary, is not that an anomaly? The Hon. Premier asked where do I see Fire Brigade in this.

4.55 p.m.

What I am pointing out is that the Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows:-

"The Order provides for adjustments in the remuneration of certain posts as shown hereunder. The adjustments are proposed on the recommendations of the Anomalies Committee, which was appointed by the Executive Committee to examine representations arising out of the 1956 salaries revision."

What is the 1956 Salaries Revision? This is it; it is the Godsall Report.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. As to the Fire Officer, were any recommendations made? To follow the hon. member to the logical conclusion, you would have to go through the whole of the recommendations.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may make a reference to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Anomalies Committee has not dealt with other anomalies which I see; am I not in order to say that? Furthermore, I am pointing this out to the Hon. Premier: This is what Mr. Godsall said in relation to the Fire Officer:

"It is clear to me therefore that the post is at present seriously undergraded in relation to others and I have assigned to it my proposed salary point 1 or \$6,720...."

This adjustment which is now before us, is not the first adjustment which the Government has made either; apart from the Anomalies Committee, the Government has made adjustments to salaries. The Superintendent of the Prisons was recommended for a salary \$5,760 x 240 - 6,240 which was not the salary before and that was adjusted. This is not now an anomaly; this is a recommendation. When you go through the other recommendations you will find, even in this Report, that in respect of recommendations which Mr. Godsall has made, the Anomalies Committee are making adjustments to salaries which are higher than what Mr. Godsall recommended. I see that in relation to a salary which he has recommended for an Officer, no adjustment has been made and the Hon. Premier is asking what is that to do with it. If you come down here with proposals and you leave somebody out - what I am saying is that it is grossly unfair for the Hon. Premier to say that no recommendations has been made in respect of the Fire Officer. If the Premier had read the Report he would have seen that a recommendation was made for the Fire Officer. If recommendations are made for other people you should at least give the man this salary which Mr. Godsall recommended for him. The existence of the Anomalies Committee would be pointless if we are only going to be confined to one aspect of an anomaly. I am at liberty to discuss any anomaly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is not anticipating dealing with the whole Godsall Report.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have pointed out that I am taking the opportunity to deal with anomalies as such. When Mr. Godsall made that recommendation for the Fire Officer, the Fire Service was not even as expanded as it is today. You have expanded the Fire Service and you have not given the man the salary which was recommended for him; and now you have the Deputy Fire Officer at a salary which is approximately one half of the amount of the Chief whereas other people who are Deputies draw a salary which is equal to over 60% or 70% of the top salary. That is grossly unfair to the young man. You feel that you should chop the salary in half when you have a local man, but that would not be the case if the man was coming from abroad. That is not an anomaly it is an inequality. The trouble with

the Premier is that he will not read documents which he has to present to the House but he finds fault with people who have to deal with these matters in this House.

You have not carried out all the recommendations; you have carried out some of them and not others. You have not carried out the one in respect of the Fire Officer, but the Premier must have had the matter before him and he has turned it down. Even if he does not agree with what I say, I can read and I can understand these things. I deal with money every day. If the Premier does not see that this is a glaring anomaly, then I say he does not deserve to hold the position which he now holds.

Mr. DOWDING: I just want to ask one question in support of the hon. member on my right with regard to that last matter. The Lecturer in Natural Science is in the Department of Science and Agriculture. I am under the impression that some time ago he was removed from under that head. I would like to know if that is so or if this Officer is an active Officer of the Department of Science and Agriculture. The Director of Agriculture already has more work than he can do in being a professional Chairman of Committees; and for him to take over the responsibility of further staff, in my opinion, agriculture in this island will suffer even more than at present. I would like that question cleared; is the Director of Agriculture responsible for the Lecturer in Natural Science or not? And I must say with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that when one considers that the salary of the present Chief Fire Officer is \$6,240 and that of the Deputy Chief Fire Officer is \$3,528, the position is absolutely and utterly inequitable. It shows no reasoning; and when you realise that in the absence of the Chief Officer, the Deputy Chief has to carry on, that matter would take a certain amount of investigation. I would like to find out about this matter of the Lecturer in Natural Science; if the Director has to look after more staff, I think that he should be relieved. 5.05 p.m.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Director of Agriculture already has so much work to do as Chairman of so many Committees that I do not believe he has time to be Director of Agriculture; we have to look for more staff so that he can be relieved.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1959.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 4) ORDER, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. speaker, this Order does not deal with increased staff. It has the opposite effect in that I think this House will remember that it has been the policy of Government as and when vacancies arise in the staff of Overseer at the Industrial Schools that these vacancies should be replaced by members of the teaching staff. This Order provides, Sir, for the abolition of two vacant posts of Overseer at the Government Industrial Schools. The note points out that it is in continuation of the policy just mentioned, and the two posts of teachers will be created to fill those posts of Overseer. It is set out in the last paragraph of the Addendum that a consequential amendment will be made to the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1957.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 5 and to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to postpone Order No. 5 and to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Premier.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is another Resolution in connection with the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1959, and seeks to implement certain proposals by the Government in connection with the recommendations of the Anomalies Committee and deals with the salary scales of Grade V and Grade VI - Headteachers. As shown here the minimum for Grade V men remains the same but the maximum goes to \$5,040 instead of \$4,608. In the case of Grade V women the maximum goes to \$4,104 instead of \$3,744. In the case of Grade VI men the maximum is \$5,184 instead of \$4,800 and for Grade VI women the maximum is \$4,320 instead of \$3,936; in all cases the minimum remains the same. As I said, this is the recommendation of the Anomalies Committee.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, while not opposing this Resolution, if the Anomalies Committee did not bring it to the attention of Government, may we do so now from this side? There still exists considerable dissatisfaction and we support those who voice it. In fact we expressed dissatisfaction, before they felt they had the courage to do so, at the failure by Government to accept the principle of equal pay for equal work - equal pay for women teachers of the same standard and of the same size school as men teachers. Government should by now realise that people in this island appreciate that if a woman is doing the same job as a man as well as a man, she should be paid at the same rate; and Anomalies Committee or no Anomalies Committee, it is high time that Government should realise it and I commend it to the Minister of Education. Why should a Headmistress get less money for doing the same job as the Headmaster of St. John's Boys' School? There is no conceivable reason whatsoever. You are doing the same job as well as in the past; the same number of pupils is being taught, the same amount of work has to be done and the same number of interviews has to be given; and just because of a stupid, Victorian, old-fashioned principle, this Government refuses to concede equal pay for equal work.

The Ministry of Education, now Sir, has undergone a change for the better. Instead of the former Premier being Minister of Education we have the hon. member for St. John. The whole public of this island appreciates that there is a change for the better; but let us see the results of the change. We would not have got anything under the former Minister of Education, the first Premier, but at least the hon. member for St. John can see the force of this argument and the necessity to see that the principle of equal pay for equal work is brought into being.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, while supporting the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would also stress the point that I am glad to see that teachers' salaries are being regulated on such a basis whereby the teaching profession can be regarded in future as a career by itself. This has caused so much dissatisfaction in the past that members of the teaching profession are continually looking around for more lucrative employment in the Civil Service and are drafted from time to time into the actual Civil Service instead of remaining in the teaching service.

I am hoping, Sir, that further attractions will be given by the present Government so as to induce teachers to remain and not to be going after jobs and to be jumping here, there and everywhere in the Government Service to the detriment of the ones who have served in the Service for years and deserve promotion. Teaching is a profession; and the time has come when with the Minister of Education as an experienced retired teacher at the helm I feel certain he will go out of his way and do his best to make the teaching service a separate and distinct service with all the necessary inducements to teachers so as to have teachers of a high calibre developed, and not have them trained and then

go off looking for another job. Very few people have the art of teaching; but under the old system you get any amount of disgruntled teachers looking around for promotion in the regular Civil Service. This is a very bad thing for Barbados and for the future generations. If we are to benefit from the knowledge, experience and skill and the art of imparting knowledge by teachers, the teaching service should be made a service sufficiently attractive with all the amount of inducements as the regular Civil Service.

I am very pleased to see that the Anomalies Committee has done something for Grade V and Grade VI teachers. 5.15 p.m.

Like my colleague, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I feel that the time is fast approaching, with the average woman having the right to vote and to stand for election and having adult suffrage and woman suffrage and equal status and equal footing with men in most respects, that the salary of a woman teacher should be on the same footing as that of a male teacher. What is more, whether you are male or female, whether you are an Assistant Secretary in the Ministerial Office Building - and that reminds me that I said a few days ago that this is one of the few offices in which you are under the "judge's eye", and if you are not in an office like that you do not get the promotion you deserve and that irritated some of them. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, to get back to what I was saying, if you are a woman in the regular Civil Service, you receive equal salary and equal perquisites and amenities such as Leave Passages as your male counterpart. In other words, you are granted equal footing as that of your male counterpart in the regular Civil Service whereas in the Teaching Service you get this distinction between male and female. This is an old bogey and this should be amended because it does not represent present day needs or present day requirements. The time has come when you must change this and have it regulated along modern lines, because a woman's service is just as beneficial in the teaching service as that of her male counterpart and in most cases, a woman is the better teacher. I am asking that you put it on an equal footing.

Sir, in this Chamber, there is no difference between the male and female representative and there is no difference made in salaries; therefore, if there is no difference in most other respects as well as this, I do not see why you should perpetuate this old system of paying women teachers less than male teachers. I am hoping that the present Government will look into this matter further and that the present Hon. Minister of Education will see to it that he does something lasting in this respect. He has a golden opportunity of doing something which would go down in history, if he thinks fit to adjust the salaries of women teachers on the same footing as their male counterparts and to make it the most attractive profession for future Barbadian women.

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

start
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ORDER 1959"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, his Order follows the previous Order which deletes certain posts at the Government Industrial School. It is the continuation of the policy to introduce qualified teachers into the Service of the Government Industrial School as and when Overseers resign. Hon. members will note that in the previous Order we have abolished two posts of Overseers, and this Order provides for two posts of teachers at the Government Industrial School.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

LEAVE TO POSTPONE ORDER No.8

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking for leave to postpone Order No.8 and to take Order No.9 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to grant additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended thirty-first day of March, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury.....

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I cannot proceed with this Bill, as I understand that it has not been circulated.

BILL TO AMEND THE UNITED STATES (OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH STATION) ACT, 1956

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: Second reading of a Bill to amend the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1956.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, hon. members will see from the reasons the intention of the Bill.

Article XIV (1) (e) of the Agreement for the establishment of an Oceanographic Research Station in the Island allows the goods described in that paragraph (that is, goods (other than spirits or tobacco) for consumption and goods (other than personal belongings and household effects) acquired after first arrival, including gifts consigned to members of the United States Forces or civilian employees of the United States, being nationals of the United States, and employed in connection with the Station or members of their families residing with them and not engaged in any business or occupation in Barbados) to be imported free of customs duties, provided such goods are imported for the personal use of the recipient, and are of United States origin, if the Government of Barbados so requires. The corresponding section of the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1956 - Section 19(1)(e) has been so worded as to grant exemption from duty only for goods of United States origin. The effect of this has been to discourage United States personnel at the Station from purchasing goods, particularly motor vehicles, other than of United States manufacture. In this way, British manufacturers and the local traders have been penalised. This Bill, therefore, in clause 4, seeks to amend the Act so as to allow goods imported under section 19(1)(e) to be exempted from duty regardless of origin.

The opportunity has been taken to make certain minor amendments to the principle Act.

Perhaps, I should say at this stage that the reason for this amendment is principally to allow United States Nationals to be able to purchase foreign cars free of duty in this Island. When the original Bill was drafted, provision was made for the purchase free of duty of cars of United States origin only. But from experience we have discovered that some of these United States nationals who live and work at the Oceanographic Research Station have been purchasing British as well as German vehicles. 5.25 p.m.

In amending this Act, this Bill will more or less encourage U.S. nationals to purchase vehicles of British origin which will be beneficial to this country and so, Sir, we have decided that this Bill should be amended to grant such concessions in so far as British, and may be, foreign goods other than U.S. goods are concerned. The corresponding section of the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act Section 19 (1) (e) has been so worded as to grant exemption from duty only for goods of United States origin. The effect of this has been to discourage United States personnel at the Station from purchasing goods, particularly motor vehicles, other than of United States manufacture. In this way, British manufacturers and the local traders

have been penalised. This Bill, therefore, in clause 4, seeks to amend the Act so as to allow goods imported under Section 19 (1) (e) to be exempted from duty regardless of origin. That is, as I have mentioned, the crux of the Bill so to speak. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: According to the introducer of the Bill, he fondly hopes that by allowing cars of other than American manufacture to come in under the same conditions as those of U.S. manufacture, the U.S. Nationals at the Base will probably shift over to buying some of these other cars. I hope he bears in mind the fact that the price factor is bound to operate in the matter of motor cars as in many other things. It is an open secret that the British people have been taking advantage of the West Indian market because of the import restrictions laid down in consequence of the sterling situation vis-a-vis the American dollar. In other words, the Minister will be surprised to know that you can import an American car and pay duty on it and it would still be much cheaper than a similar quality car of British manufacture on which you pay no duty. Duty does not apply to cars only; it applies to several commodities which we have to import into this country. If it had not been for the dollar restriction, almost anything that we wanted in this colony we could import from the United States of America at the non-preferential duty rate and still get it cheaper than an article of a similar quality from British manufactured sources. This matter is of course tied up with the question of the dollar allocation to Barbados in respect of which you will recall I have raised my voice loud and long in this House. The entire question of the dollar allocation in this country needs revision. All the small West Indian Islands have comparatively larger dollar allocations than we have, and since they can buy more freely from American sources than we can, they can get things cheaper than we can get them and the cost of living has improved. Things like men's wearing apparel, building material, machinery and almost any essential commodity could be obtained more cheaply from dollar sources if the allocation was available. In Trinidad and Jamaica, to mention the names of only two West Indian Islands, there are not the same restrictions on the importation of American cars for individuals as there are here. I imagine that hon. members have been either to Trinidad or to Jamaica at some time or other and they must have been amazed at the number of American cars all over those places and the unrestricted manner in which the nationals of those places can get American cars with the advantage over people in Barbados to import American cars.

I want to tell the Hon. Minister that he is merely demonstrating the vanity of human hopes if he believes or deludes himself with the idea that merely by putting into effect what this Bill seeks to do today, we are going to make the American Nationals shift from importing American cars to importing British cars. That is absolutely nonsense. You will get a far better American car at a cheaper price than a British car. If you want an illustration of my contention, remove the restrictions from the importation of American cars into this colony and you will see how they will flood the market - in spite of the fact that the British manufactured cars are allowed to come in under the preferential duty rates.

Hon. members need to be reminded that while on the one hand, as part of the sterling area, we are willing to do our part in strengthening the sterling area, yet still the entire issue of sterling, in comparison with the value of the American dollar, has been exploited by the British manufacturers who realise to the fullest possible extent the advantages given to them by the devaluation of the pound and imposition of restrictions and controls with regard to the importation of American manufactured stuff, since in order to import stuff from America, we have got to work within the limits of our dollar allocation.
5.35 p.m.

I have repeatedly stressed that the Government of this country should take steps to see that two things take place; (1) that the allocation of dollars to Barbados is nearer to the level which our dollar earnings warrant and

(2) that all things being equal, the allocation of dollars to the other islands in the West Indies does not exceed the allocation of dollars to Barbados.

I am amazed from time to time to hear commission merchants who travel through the West Indian islands declare the ease with which little St. Kitts, whose dollar earnings are entirely out of proportion to ours or even St. Vincent to whom the same statement applies, can import American manufactured stuff, especially cheap foodstuff, and we cannot. It has been the policy of this Government for far too long to sacrifice the interests of the colony on the altar of imperial interests, and we get no *quid pro quo*; on the contrary we get exploitation because the British manufacturer knows that he is protected on this market, he knows that American stuff is excluded; and rather than lower his price and give some sort of *quid pro quo* for the special facilities which he enjoys in our market, he exploits the situation by making us pay more than normally we should pay. That is a matter of considerable regret because I see in too many instances where unfair and undue advantage has been taken of the West Indian Colonials in this particular matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter before us is not the question of dollar allocation; it is the permission to import cars of English manufacture duty free for the personnel at the Oceanographic Research Station.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You are perfectly correct, Mr. Speaker; but as I said, I feel so strongly on this matter and since there is a connection between the two, it is absolutely difficult to discuss one without more than a passing reference to the other. As I said from the beginning, it is merely wishful thinking for the Government to expect that the intelligent people at the United States Base at St. Lucy who can appreciate the difference in cars are going to stop importing cars of superior value merely because there is a false economy in operation. A lot of people feel that because the British manufactured car is supposed to be less hard on gasoline than the American car, the overall operational cost is less. That is sheer baloney. If you want to test the validity of my contention you should open the market for American cars and see what happens in this country.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that we have not got the necessary originals to which these amendments correspond so that one could really study them. I also regret that I have not had the opportunity, thinking that it might not arise today, to give particular study to this problem, but the decision to allow American nationals to import British goods free of duty into this island is something which I think we should reflect on carefully. One can quite understand in the first case why they were granted the privilege of importing U.S. goods into this island free of duty, but I happen to know that British cars have already been purchased by certain members at the base. Of course, it is impossible that this legislation could be retrospective.

I am also in a quandary to see the main reasons, and I hope the Minister will be able to assist me. In America, today, in spite of what the hon. senior member for St. Philip said, British motorcars are outselling the American motorcars in the small car market, and even the big American car firms are today turning out smaller cars to compete. Is there anything in the Act, Sir, which will prevent the disposal of these duty free cars locally? I would be grateful to be informed if there is anything in the present Act that will prevent a second-hand market in this island of duty free cars in competition with cars with paid duty of British origin. I would also be interested to know, Sir, if the same system operates in Trinidad. Is there any precedent for it in any of the American bases within the West Indies that both United States goods and goods from other parts of the world are allowed in duty free? I am wondering, Sir, whether there might not have been some further guidance on this matter.

The main point I am making is that Americans in America are buying English cars very happily. I take it that they buy and pay the American duty on them. In little Barbados we would be quite willing to sell them British cars too; but apart from that, is this not going to put out of work a certain amount of people who import cars into this island

of American origin? It is quite possible for persons from America to order American cars through their agents here. I know that there is a number of Americans that prefer a large American car, but I believe there is a number of them that have already bought small English cars.

I would like it to be understood that I am in no way against the American base personnel receiving their personal gifts and articles for their own use from the United States duty free, but I think that as soon as you extend it to British, German and all types of other goods you are creating competition with local persons. Is that correct? Is it possible for these goods which have been imported into this island free of duty to be distributed among persons in the island? I am casting no aspersions, but there are certain people of American nationality who might be willing to take advantage of this source of supply. Is there an outlet of goods coming in duty free from the base into the country as a whole? Is that outlet completely cut off?

5.45 p.m.

I should be grateful to the Hon. Minister if he can give me answers to these questions which I have asked, before I am called upon to vote.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, as to what the hon. senior member for St. George has said I think we should have no fear. I have not read the Bill entirely, but I think it is a matter of giving the American people the opportunity of purchasing cars duty free or bringing in anything duty free. I think all those people who served in the forces, such as the hon. junior member for St. John and even the hon. senior member for St. George know that if anyone happens to be living anywhere near the camps of the United States nationals or any of these people in the forces that they enjoy the privilege of these people being given the opportunity of bringing in goods duty free. That is one of the privileges for surrendering your home. I am not particularly worried about people being exploited as a result of this. All of the British embassies are given this privilege too. As a matter of fact, these places are given such a sort of freedom that I hope we will get it here too. For instance, if the Government of this country want to put any of us in exile and you can get into one of these foreign embassies, the Government cannot go for you there. All of us who travel and go to these places know the privileges which are given them and they do have the opportunity of handing out some to you. It is reciprocal. I know I had some drinks at an embassy in the United States of America. I remember there was a time when I was at Washington along with the delegation and it was felt that it would be cheaper for the delegation to have a party at the embassy than if we held it at a hotel because the price of whisky would be ten times as high. So we held the party at the embassy. You do not call that exploitation. What little exploitation there is, if there is any, is not the sort of exploitation to be afraid of.

As I have said, this is reciprocal. The U.S.A. grants the same privileges to British nationals and the British people grant it to American nationals. As I have said, it is not the sort of thing which we should worry much about unless you were to get mass exploitation. If it is a question of granting this privilege, it is not anything much which you can do about it.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of making a few observations on these amendments and I am also drawing to the attention of the Government some things which have come to my notice. Under Section 53 of the original Bill, the Governor-in-Executive Committee is given the power to make regulations for giving effect to the provisions of this Act. I have learnt that up to now no regulations to this original Act have been made and I have been given to understand that certain of our legal practitioners at times experience difficulty in bringing whatever charges may be against personnel of the United States Base because of the rigmarole in the original Bill with the absence of no regulations to deal with certain matters. All of that makes it difficult for legal practitioners to do their work properly. If I may give an example, if a civil offence is committed by one of the members of the U.S. base, the Act allows that there can be concurrent jurisdiction in one of the Courts of this island, but the problem to the matter is that by the time you may be able to get a case brought against that person, he has already left the island.

I would certainly like to draw it to the attention of the Government so that Government may look into this matter and make regulations to govern certain sections of the Act, so that they may be brought into operation and so that any person carrying out legal duties would have no undue hardship or any red tape in getting what he wants carried out.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, there are two points which were raised by the hon. senior member for St. George to which I should reply. He wants to know whether these concessions apply in other colonies. I can assure him that so far as Jamaica and Trinidad are concerned, there are concessions of a similar nature applicable to such people and, as a matter of fact, those countries have been more generous in granting concessions than Barbados has been.

Perhaps, I should have said in my opening remarks that the only reason why this Bill was drafted at the time as it was is because it was taken for granted that the United States Nationals would at all times import or rather prefer to purchase their own make of cars. It was not drafted in such a manner at that time with the intention of excluding those people importing or purchasing British or foreign goods. That, perhaps, is an oversight in the original draft.

As to the importation of these cars, the United States nationals would not be importing any cars; the firms in Barbados would be importing them. It is set out in the Objects and Reasons that local dealers are penalised because they are not permitted to sell these cars to them duty free and the American cars are allowed to them duty free to the exclusion of British or foreign make of cars.

What this Bill means is that if a car is imported for one of these nationals, no duty would be paid on it and if the duty is paid by the dealer on it already, as soon as the United States national purchases it, the duty would be refunded to the firm who paid duty on it.

I do not know in what numbers, but I do know for a fact that quite a few cars of English and German makes such as Mercedes Benz are sold to these U.S. nationals. As a matter of fact, there are two American nationals whom I know who used those cars here for a little time and after they returned to America, they asked that those cars be sent home to them. As I have said, I do not know how many such cars they have bought, but I do feel that when it comes to their purchasing English cars or cars of a foreign make they should be given the opportunity of purchasing them because it would be a benefit to us.

I would not attempt to reply to the hon. member's question about dollars because that has nothing to do with this Bill. Your Honour has already pointed out that that has nothing to do with it.

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

5.55 p.m.

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

Clauses 1 to 4 of the Bill inclusive were called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ORDER PAPER

The Order Paper under "Government Business" having been fixed,

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency of the matters standing in my name under Orders Nos. 11 and 12, I am asking that those Orders be made Nos. 1 and 2

under the Head "Private Members' Business". I would not have asked that these Orders be placed in that manner on the Order Paper if it had not been for their urgency.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry that I have to object to that. I am asking that Order No.1, which is the consideration of the Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech, be continued as Order No.1.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how it is in place for the Hon. Premier to ask for that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any hon. member can ask for that.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Hon. Premier ask that an Order which does not stand in his name on the Order Paper be moved up on the Order Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that is out of order this time. The Hon. Premier may ask that the matter which deals with the Reply to the Governor's Speech be continued as the first Order under this Head.

Mr. WALCOTT: Last week the Resolution standing in my name was under discussion. I was not here and it was demoted to Order No.4 without any prompting from me. I was hoping that that Resolution would be continued as Order No.1 because the Hon. Minister of Trade has more or less hinted that he was not dealing with certain proposals until this matter has been disposed of. I therefore want to deal with this Minister as quickly as possible and without any further delay.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can assure the hon. member that I, too, want to get rid of the matter. I want to appeal to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy; the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that it is to be regretted that the Reply to His Excellency's Speech was not dealt with before and I think that he was most anxious on this occasion to dispose of it. (Mr. WALCOTT: There is nothing in it now; it can wait.)
6.05 p.m.

However, Sir, I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the opposition not to press for his Orders to be placed as Nos.1 & 2 and allow us to dispose of the Resolution in reply to the Governor's Speech.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Reply to the Governor's Speech will take the whole of the next meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The majority of members have spoken already.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am still to speak.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I would not use the word "apprehensive", but I am optimistic that the speeches will take the whole of next Tuesday, and in view of the fact that it is already three months and two weeks late, it would hardly make much difference, and that is why I am not disposed to remove my Orders. Normally I would yield, but these two items are very urgent. I am wondering if the hon. member would care to complete it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules do not allow it.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if I may have an intimation of what may be regarded as a compromise. If it is a question of making Nos. 12 & 13 the second and third Orders, I take it that I will have the assurance implied that hon. members on that side will not associate themselves with any move to do anything other than these two Resolutions after the reply to the Governor's Speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Unless the hon. member is insisting on having both Orders together, I am wondering if he could not put one Order before mine because the Resolution about Sandy Lane could be put as No.3 and dealt with.

What I would like to ask for Your Honour's guidance is if the Government finishes any day before the expiration of the statutory time, what is the position of the House in asking that any other item be reverted to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Rules will have to be amended.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is there nothing on that?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules have been agreed to.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know that there is nothing which guides us that if Government finishes its business as at this stage and does not intend to proceed, no more business can be done. But what I want to know is if the House can make a motion to the effect to suspend the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a definite Rule on the matter and it is Standing Order No.18 - Paragraph 6 "Arrangement of Business". It reads as follows:

"Private Members' Business shall commence immediately after the conclusion of questions, but shall not continue after 5 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think the Rules are saying that we can move the Suspension of the Rules to deal with it. I am not suggesting that you can move the suspension after we have started, but we should have the right, before we start, to move the suspension of any Standing Order in order to proceed with certain things. The Rules cannot be so rigid that you cannot suspend a Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will read the pertinent Rule on that. Standing Order No. 19 - "Notice of Motions" reads as follows:

"Unless the Standing Orders otherwise direct, notice shall be given of any motion which it is proposed to move with the exception of the following:-

(10) a motion for the suspension of a Standing Order put with leave of the Speaker."

Mr. WALCOTT: All it means is that it is a matter for the Speaker's discretion if he feels that the suspension of the Standing Order is one of which he approves.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to raise a point of privilege concerning the Order Paper.

On the 14th April, 1959, I gave notice of a Bill entitled "The Hire Purchase Act". I read out that motion, signed it and handed it to the Clerk of the House and I gave notice on the floor of the House at the proper time and Your Honour will remember that. I explained at that time to the Clerk of the House that I was going to move the first reading of the Bill on that day because there were two minor amendments which I had been discussing with one of my colleagues, and at the next sitting I would read....

Mr. SPEAKER: Did you say there were amendments to the Bill?

Mr. BARROW: By that I mean amendments to my draft; I did not mean an amendment of the Bill as a Legislative amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Was the draft Bill handed to the Clerk?

Mr. BARROW: The draft Bill was not handed in for the reason I explained. I did not want the Bill presented in that form and I informed the Clerk at that stage that I would do so on the next Sitting of the House and give the first reading of the Bill. Unfortunately I was called out of the island and I was not in the colony last Tuesday, 21st April, 1959, and when I arrived back and saw the Order Paper today, the notice of my Bill was not on the Order Paper, but I noticed that under Order No.11 of Government Business "Hon. M. E. COX: Second reading of a Bill to amend the law with respect to the hire-purchase and sale upon credit of goods."

My Bill does not appear on the Order Paper, and I want to make two observations. There is no statute on the Statute Book of Barbados relating to Hire-purchase and sale of Goods, and I do not see how the Hon. member can give notice of a Bill to amend an Act that does not exist. That is the first thing which I want to draw to Your Honour's attention. Now we have no Hire-purchase Act in Barbados and my Act was an Act providing for certain conditions of Hire-purchase. This to me seems a cheap attempt to undermine the privileges of members of this House. My conten-

tion is that as soon as a notice of a motion is given, that motion should go down on the Order Paper, and whether or not I elect to move the first reading of the Bill on the day on which I give notice is a matter of concern only for the individual.

Now, Sir, this is what I want to say; if two notices or motions are given to a measure relating to the same subject matter, the normal procedure is, and it has happened already here on the floor of the House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not like to forestall the hon. member, but I think I can put his mind and the House at ease by reminding the House of a similar thing happening some years ago. It is well within my memory and as soon as that notice was given I was refreshed, and I think I have discussed it with a member of the hon. member's Party already.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I think what actually happened was this. As soon as there was more than one motion, it is a question of balloting as to which of these two motions should be proceeded with.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have had experience of that already and I can give the hon. member the benefit of my experience

Mr. BARROW: Does Your Honour want to prevent me from making the point I am making?

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, no.

Mr. BARROW: I am saying what we understood the constitutional position to be. Of course, I am always open to enlightenment on these matters. I am surprised to hear that the Government's Bill is substantially of the same nature. I am saying that my Bill should be on the Order Paper because these two Bills may not be of exactly the same nature. Let me remind Your Honour that I was prepared to go on with my Bill until I saw the Order Paper and discovered that my notice of it was not on the Order Paper. I will only ask the Clerk for some explanation as to why my notice of it was not put down under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to make the explanation.

Mr. BARROW: You know about it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Quite a lot. Let me tell the hon. member that you need not worry yourself so much about it. At the last meeting of the House, the Hon. Minister of Trade Industry and Labour gave notice of a Bill with respect to Hire Purchase and Sale upon Credit of goods. Immediately, I remembered the hon. junior member for St. John had given notice of a similar Bill and I was under the impression that he had presented the Bill. I found out on investigation from the Clerk that he did not present the Bill; all that he had done was to give notice of it. On the other hand, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour not only had given notice of the Bill, but had made presentation of the Bill to the House and the presentation of the Bill is more than what the hon. junior member for St. John had done.

I remember years ago a similar thing happened. The then hon. senior member for St. James, Mr. E. K. Walcott, was in a similar position with the Government. The Government gave notice of a Bill to amend some Act - but just gave notice of it. That was all that the Government did about it. Subsequently, the hon. member not only gave notice of a similar Bill but he also produced the Bill to the House. After he had produced the Bill to the House the Government then brought down their Bill. When the Government brought down their Bill for presentation to the House, I ruled that although the Government had given notice of their intention to amend the Act first I could not act just by the giving of a notice. The House cannot act on a notice because a notice is just something of expectancy, whereas, the presentation of a Bill is something on which the House can work; it is something which can be enacted; so I ruled that the hon. junior member for St. James should proceed with his Bill and stopped the Government from presenting a similar Bill.

Hon. members who were in the House then can remember my ruling at that time. I ruled that Mr. Walcott be allowed to proceed with the Bill against the Government. I am glad that the hon. junior member for St. John has taken notice of it because I had occasion to speak to another hon. member in private about the same thing. I saw on the Order Paper notices of Bills and the Bills were not produced. When Bills are read for the first time, they must be produced. Let the House have the document then. Giving notice of a Bill does not mean anything without producing the Bill. If you do not produce the Bill, the House has nothing on which to act. A notice means only that one intends to do something.

On this occasion, the Government did not say that they were only giving notice of a Bill; they produced the Bill; therefore, the House has something to act on. When you give notice of your intention to do something on a particular matter, and you only just give notice, you can only preclude any hon. member from bringing in something which can meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I accept your ruling; but I also want to point out, in this particular instance which I have outlined, the steps which were taken. The Bill was not read a first time due to unforeseen circumstances. I did not want to present something with matters which would have to be checked and I promised the Clerk to produce the Bill at the next meeting of the House. I am not the first member to give notice of a Bill without producing the Bill. Unfortunately, on the next occasion of the meeting of the House I was not in the island. Only two weeks have elapsed during the period of my giving notice of the Bill and I am saying that the notice should have been put on the Order Paper by the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat, what is a notice? You cannot act on a notice.

Mr. BARROW: I am saying that I never had the opportunity of putting my intention into effect because of my absence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you ready with that Bill?

Mr. BARROW: I am ready with that Bill. What I want to say is this: Your Honour has admitted that hon. members just giving notice of their intention to present a Bill to the House - such notices have been put on the Order Paper. I am saying that the Clerk was in duty bound to put my notice on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Notices do not appear ordinarily on the Order Paper.

Mr. BARROW: It is a notice of a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If a Bill is read the first time, it is put on the Order Paper.

Mr. BARROW: This is something else which I want to point out to Your Honour. This particular Bill which the Government has brought in is to amend a law which does not exist; therefore, it only means that it is to amend the one which I was producing.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a typographical error; that is a mistake probably.

Mr. BARROW: That shows that they do not consider matters properly. The only law which was relating to Hire Purchase was the Bill of which I gave notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying that when you gave notice of a Bill and you brought in no Bill that the Bill which the Government has brought in has something in it to amend what was in your Bill?

Mr. BARROW: I have not seen their Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, I think the House has understood my point.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to say ---

Mr. SPEAKER: I have disposed of the question. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to point out that during my time in this House, I have seen on several occasions on the Order Paper the Notice of a Bill ---

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. If I have told the hon. member that I have disposed of that matter and I have given a ruling on such matter, I think that it is very inconsiderate of the hon. member to say the least of it, to re-introduce, in a very clever manner, the same question of privilege. I rule that the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am merely correcting a misstatement.

Mr. BRANCKER: I should like Order No. 12 under "Private Members' Business" be made Order No.2 under that Head.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 12 under "Private Members' Business" will be Order No.2; Order No.4 will be Order No.3 and Order No.13 will be Order No.4.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 5th May, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 5th May, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.