THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd August, 1960.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, *(Speaker)*; Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition)*; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier)*; Hon. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour)*; His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker)*; Hon. F.E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services)*; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education)*.

Prayers were read.

Hon. R. G. MAPP and Mr. H. A. DOWDING entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting of the 26th July, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. *(After a pause.)* There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present Message No.6/1960 from His Excellency the Governor, regarding the further constitutional changes in Barbados. There are some copies of the Message which I hope to circulate to hon. members later in the day.

The Message is as follows:-

MESSAGE No.6/1960

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

TO

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to forward for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly copies of the Secretary of State's despatch No. 267 of the 22nd July, 1960, on the subject of further constitutional changes in Barbados discussed during his recent visit.

J. M. STOW
GOVERNOR.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
BARBADOS.
2nd August, 1960.

WIS. 64/2/01

BARBADOS

No. 267

Colonial Office,
Church House,
Great Smith Street,
London, S. W. 1.

22nd July, 1960.

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to Mr. Lennox Boyd's despatch No.379 dated the 15th September, 1959, addressed to you on the subject of further constitutional changes in Barbados.

2. I was happy to be able to take advantage of my visit to The West Indies in June, 1960, to spend a short time in Barbados and have personal discussions with yourself, members of the political parties, representatives of the Legislative Council and other persons representative of opinion there. I have subsequently given very careful consideration to the views expressed on that occasion and in previous correspondence, and I think it may be useful if I set out my conclusions on the more important matters that were raised.

3. The constitutional changes proposed in my predecessor's despatch under reference have commanded general support, though it is appreciated that they do not go so far in some directions as the Democratic Labour Party and other groups might wish. As these proposed changes have been non-controversial, and are conducive to the introduction in Barbados of a stage of full internal self-government on a par with that reached in Jamaica and recently agreed in Trinidad, I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by delaying their introduction. The agreed changes should therefore be made as soon as the necessary legal instruments can be drawn up and brought into operation.

4. I have also decided that it is consonant with the introduction of full internal self-government to amend the provision in the Letters Patent relating to the disallowance of laws in such a way that it will relate only to the provisions of the Colonial Stock Act, 1900. The Ministers represented to me that this, like the arrangements referred to in the previous paragraph, would place Barbados on a similar footing with Jamaica and what has recently been agreed in Trinidad. Provided there is general agreement, I propose to advise Her Majesty accordingly.

5. It was represented to me by the Democratic Labour Party, and the view had some support from members of the Barbados National Party and certain members of the Legislative Council, that it was desirable that there should be some representation for the Opposition in the Legislative Council. This body had traditionally been of a non-party nature and represents, as I am satisfied it should continue to represent, general interests rather than political affiliations. Since its membership must however include the Minister without Portfolio who is in a position to represent Government policy, I was impressed by the argument that the views of the official opposition should also be made available in debate in the Upper Chamber by the presence of a recognised representative of the Official Opposition there. I am aware, however, that feeling on this point is by no means unanimous, and the Legislative Council has

ancient traditions which I would not wish hastily to disturb. I have therefore decided to defer consideration of the proposal that there should be a representative of the Official Opposition in the Council until after the next General Election. A contributory reason for this decision is that, in the absence of general agreement, I would not wish to make a change of a somewhat controversial nature in Barbados when a General Election is due in a relatively short time.

6. It was also represented to me by the Democratic Labour Party and by others that the present electoral system was antiquated and unsuitable. The delimitation of parishes on which the present representation is based dates back to the earliest days of the settlement, and the distribution of population now among the various constituencies is manifestly unbalanced. Furthermore, there seems to be considerable force in the argument that with the growth of Party government it would be more appropriate to conform with the general practice in democratic countries to elect candidates to the representative institutions of the country on the basis of single member constituencies. I am aware that this question has been much in the minds of Ministers and it will be recalled that in the Speech from the Throne delivered by the then Governor, Sir Robert Arundell, in 1958 it was said that consideration would be given to the question of electoral reform including the abolition of double member constituencies. In all these circumstances I suggest that there is now a case for the early establishment of a Commission charged with the task of investigating this question, and of making recommendations.

7. I shall be glad if you will acquaint all concerned with my views as set out in this despatch.

8. I am sending a copy of this despatch to the Governor General of the West Indies.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient,
humble servant.
(Sgd.) IAN MACLEOD

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report on the audit of the accounts of the Higher Education Loan Fund for the financial year ended 31st March, 1960.

PETITION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I beg to present a Petition from the Barbados Union Oil Company Ltd. praying the House to pass a Bill amending the provisions of Section 12 of the British Union Oil Company Oil Station Act, 1919-12.

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took her seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of $7,972 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61, No. 12, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to give notice of a Bill to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform hon. members that this Bill takes effect as from today's date.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On behalf of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the British Union Oil Company Oil Station Act, 1919-12.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, a Bill to amend the British Union Oil Company Oil Station Act, 1919-12, was read a first time.

Mr. TUDOR entered the House and took his seat.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

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

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

12.25 p.m.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mrs. BOURNE being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 10

Hon. M. E. COX: Madam Chairman, as hon. members will see, this Resolution is for the sum of $1,150 to supplement Head XXXI, Item 26 - Barbados Immigrants Liaison Service. Members will remember that some time ago — I think it was by a Resolution of 11th November, 1955 — this House provided a service to look after Barbadians going to the United Kingdom. That service was more or less complementary to the British Caribbean Labour Welfare Service which was then situated at the Colonial Office under the headship of Mr. De Souza, but for obvious reasons, the Government realised the necessity for having an independent service because of the ever increasing population and the difficulty which is experienced from time to time by persons seeking gainful employment in Barbados.

I should like to say, Madam, that the Liaison Officer is doing a first-class job. You will see from the figures which I will quote later on that the service is expanding, employers accept and appreciate the service rendered, and the workers in general have the highest regard for the service. You will see from the Addendum to the Resolution that we have reached the stage when it is decided to have a permanent office and the persons employed therein established in their various offices. On three occasions on which I have had the privilege of visiting the United Kingdom, 1957, 1958 and 1959, I held discussions with the Secretary to the British Caribbean Welfare Service to which we subscribe, and I made our position quite clear on each occasion that as far as we were concerned, we had absolutely no intention of merging this service, or in other words, having the Barbados service integrated into the British Caribbean Service, because, I repeat, Madam, this island is not expanding so to speak, with our limited area and limited economy, and it is absolutely essential and necessary for us to seek avenues of employment for Barbadians.

We intend, Madam, as you will see from the Addendum, to establish a Liaison Officer at a salary of $5,760 rising by $240 per annum to $6,240, a House Allowance of $1,920, a Representation Allowance of $2,400, and, as the Addendum now reads, an Entertainment Allowance of $960. I am going to ask leave, Madam Chairman, to strike out the word "Entertainment" and to insert in its place the word "Overseas", and that part of the Addendum will also be amended to read "Overseas Allowance" instead of "Entertainment Allowance". I will give my reasons for that at a later stage.

With these changes, the Assistant Liaison Officer will be established at $4,560 to $5,520, he will receive a House Allowance of $480, a Representation Allowance of $1,200 and an Overseas Allowance of $240. An Administrative Assistant will also be employed for the first time — this is a new post — at $3,000 to $4,392, with a House Allowance of $480. The Secretary/Welfare Officer will receive a salary of $2,640 to $3,360 and a House Allowance of $480; then a Stenographer/Typist who will be paid at the normal rates existing in London of £10 per week.

12.35 p.m.

Let us see the justification for these increases. The office has expanded considerably since it was established in 1956. In 1956, the number of persons sponsored by the Government was 835. In 1957, 658; in 1958, 355. This was the year when hon. members will remember that there was the London Bus Strike and as a result of that, no recruitment was done that year. Recruitment was suspended by the British Railways and because of that the figures fell to 355. In 1959 the figures were increased to 462 and that gave us a total of 2,310. Today, in 1960, the number of sponsored emigrants in 520.

Before 1958, small remittances by way of repayment of loans were passed to this service. The Minutes show that $480 or something like that was handled. In 1958, this office handled something like $10,398 by way of repayment of loans and in 1959 the amount was $15,065.

As regards persons using the service for one thing or another, the figures are: In January of 1959 there were 49; in February, 42; in March, 30; in April, 33; in May, 30; in June, 35; in July, 36; in August, 34; in September, 49; in October 48; in November, 28; in December, 148; That gives us a total of 562 in 1959 calling on that service.

As far as non-sponsored immigrants are concerned, in 1956, there were 2,933; in 1957, 2,622; in 1958, 2535; in 1959 2,700 and up to today in 1960, 1,296.

The total amount advanced by way of loans from the time we started in 1954 was $1,498,029.20. The number of persons to whom the loans were granted is 4,711. The amount repaid is $1,016,653.21. The amount outstanding $481,377.99. The proportional amount in arrears is $189,189.49. That is the position as regards these loans which were advanced to the emigrants who left this island since 1954.

Now, as far as our training scheme is concerned, hon. members will remember that that scheme was instituted in November, last year. We have trained a total of 354 persons and with the exception of 42, all have already left the island for employment in the London Transport Executive.

I would like to make this point although I may say at the outset that I pay little or no attention to what is written in the newspapers because you get so much distortions at times. Someone wrote a letter quite recently in the Daily Newspaper complaining that persons were betrayed in that after they were trained, persons who were not trained were selected in their places. That is not correct at all. The position is that as far as the scheme is concerned you will only train persons who fail to measure up to the requirements in the first place. In other words, an individual will express his or her willingness to be recruited in the London Transport Executive Scheme. That individual is given a test - a sort of examination. If that individual proves satisfactory there is no question of the individual going to any class to be trained. As a matter of fact, we do not have the time for that. We cannot get a sufficient number to meet the requirements for the London Transport Executive, let alone keeping somebody six or eight weeks to be trained in what the individual already knows.

I think the House will remember when I came back from England last year that I told the House I had discussed this question with representatives of the London Transport Executive and that they were of the opinion that we were scraping the bottom of the barrel because the quality which we were sending at the time was below that which we were accustomed sending to the United Kingdom. I promised them then that I would find ways and means of improving that quality in order that they may be able to take more and more people when the time comes. That training scheme was instituted by the Department of Education as a result of that, and I must confess that they have done an arduous and very good job indeed. They were very co-operative and ready to assist in the problem. We had to institute this training scheme in order to provide the London Transport Executive with the number of persons of the required standard. Again, I repeat that there is absolutely no truth in the statement that one is compelled to be trained and then to find that untrained persons get the first pick. That is not true at all.

12.45 p.m.

I know of quite a few chaps who have had a secondary education but who did not get School Certificates, who have approached me from time to time on this question; I have told them that all they have to do is to sit an examination, and if they can pass that examination, then they are recruited. That is the position as it stands today. An individual may not be selected for more reasons than one because there is also the question of a medical test; and an individual has to get a surety for the money which the Government is going to advance to him. If he passes the various tests and is able to get this money, that individual is recruited and is sent out to England. I want to make it crystal clear that it is not a question of any individual being compelled to be trained only to find that he is not selected as against another individual who had not been given training. If the individual passes the examination, then it is unnecessary for him to go through any further training.

Madam Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more on this matter because I anticipate questions being asked from the other side; however, in arriving at these allowances, we looked up the allowances which are now granted to the Secretary of the British Caribbean Welfare Service. Of course, you will see that our allowances are a little more generous than those that are given to the Secretary of that Service. I feel that as far as they are concerned, ours is a case where we have to do everything which we consider reasonable and fair so as to assist that office in carrying out its work efficiently and well.

The Secretary of the Migrant Service gets a salary of $8,880 and, in addition to that salary, he gets a Representation Allowance of $1,920, a House Allowance of $480 and an Overseas Allowance of $1,960. In our proposals, we are making increases; we are giving a House Allowance of $1,920 and a Representation Allowance of $2,400. That is the difference between the Head of our Service and that of the Caribbean Welfare Liaison Service. It has to be borne in mind that the Caribbean Service has been integrated into the Commissioner's Service and that individual is no longer regarded as the Head of a Department, but is controlled by the Commissioner; whereas in the case of our Liaison Officer, he is solely responsible to this Ministry and to no one else. That is the reason which influenced our decision to offer, so far as allowances are concerned, more favourable terms.

Madam Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more at this stage. I am sure that hon. members on the other side of the House will willingly support this Resolution, and there can be no question of one referring to any point about duplication. As I mentioned earlier, while the Caribbean Welfare Service looks after the social side of the set-up, our service seeks primarily to place people in jobs; the Caribbean Welfare Service does not do that. Our Service has been primarily instituted to look for jobs wherever possible for Barbadians in the United Kingdom. In addition to that, it also performs social services; it looks after various grievances which arise from time to time. As a matter of fact, people who are in need of jobs regard this service as almost the only service which is provided for them. I have been present at the office on quite a few occasions when some of our people went to the Officer so as to get information on one thing or another.

As I have already said, there can be no question of saying that this is a duplication because the functions are different in the first place and, in the second place, some of them are the same. With those few remarks, Madam Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Madam Chairman, I am glad to read the full notes on this Resolution; but as comprehensive as they are, there are still some things which will have to be answered. The Hon. Minister said that he doubted very much whether anybody would be against this Resolution, but it just depends on how you phrase that. I am not against the Resolution in its totality but I am against it in some of its important details. I feel that the ties of colonialism must cease: and if these ties must cease, then all the trappings which go with colonialism, the Ministers, in 1960, must be prepared to let go. There is absolutely no reason in this Resolution for this fantastic provision which is known as a House Allowance. It is ludicrous to give a stenotypist whom you are recruiting in England, a House Allowance. For what reason are you giving this House Allowance? You recruit a man in Barbados but you do not give him any House Allowance.

12.55 p.m.

If I am wrong, I hope the Minister will tell me so; but what you are giving to the Liaison Officer is fantastic. Are you going to give a man a salary which represents an amount of £1,300 a year? Do you expect a man at a salary of £1,300 in London to pay £400 out of that salary for rent? Now you say that is an allowance. What kind of flat do you want a man who is drawing £1,300 to live in? If he is going to get £1,300, let us analyse it. Who is going to pay that percentage on his salary living in London? This is an amount of $160 a month or roughly £8 a week. Now if a man is given an allowance for rent of £8 a week, what does that allowance connote? It connotes that you are helping him to get a house or to pay his rent.

You have another thing here - and I want to know if I am right because I heard the Minister reading something - known as a Representation Allowance. This man must be an Ambassador! In addition to that, he gets an Entertainment Allowance; so his total emoluments are roughly $11,000 per annum which is more than the salary of the substantive holder of the post of Labour Commissioner in a community where you say you are recruiting people, and where the Labour Commissioner has a labour force of nearly 100,000 people in Barbados from whom to select people for work in the United Kingdom. There can be absolutely no justification for creating this post in England. If you establish this post and it becomes part of the establishment of the Barbados Civil Service, the only person who will be higher than this will be the Chief Justice or the Attorney General. You do not need a sledge hammer to crack a nut.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church last week quoted figures of men needed for the London Transport Service. I have in my possession a Bulletin from the International Transport Federation published on the 16th June, 1960, and in this publication dealing with the London Transport Executive it is stated in emphasising the problem in Britain in so far as conductors and drivers are concerned that the shortage of drivers and conductors on London buses, operated by the London Transport Executive, has induced this body to consider the introduction of an incentive scheme. The Executive has estimated that it needs at least another 4,000 men. The hon. senior member for Christ Church said 3,000 men. The London Transport Executive has introduced a bonus scheme as an incentive to men.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Madam, when did I mention anything about 3,000 men?

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. senior member cannot interrupt me if he is not listening. I said that the hon. senior member for Christ Church last week spoke about the shortage of people there and I said that it was 3,000 men, and I think I am right in saying that if tomorrow the London Transport Executive decided to lower its recruitment, we would have to revise our whole scheme because the main job in this scheme at present is the facilities which the London Transport Executive offer and the work which has to be done there. The work done elsewhere is infinitesimal. Now I have drawn that analysis to show that though the comparable situation can be made for a Welfare Officer to see about Barbadians employed out of Barbados, they are more or less on a migratory system out of Barbados apart from the people who are employed in London, and you do not want to be cheese-paring nor do you want to be so lavish in your treatment that you give people these salaries and allowances which put their salaries out of proportion of what you say you are at present paying people in your own establishment.

Let us look into the history of this service. Mr. Pickwoad who was former Labour Commissioner of Barbados was pushed into this post and for some given reason or other he was capable of getting the Minister at the time to see certain things favourable to himself, because the substantive post of Labour Commissioner did not appeal to that officer as much as other things did. Now, Madam, the salary of Labour Commissioner in the establishment of the Barbados Civil Service is $7,680. Now, if you want to bring this within the structure of your Civil Service, or if it is your intention to have this as an established post, you cannot so establish this post that it is a more important post than the substantive post of Labour Commissioner of the whole island of Barbados when it comes within the Head of Labour. For example, this item deals with Item 26 under the Labour Commissioner's Head. Are you going to say then, Madam, that the Government feels that the Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom as an established post is more important than the substantive post of Labour Commissioner? To say that is to say that the Ambassador to the United Kingdom of the United States of America or the United Soviet Republic is more important than the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

1.05 p.m.

Structurally that is madness. You have a Labour Commissioner and I am going to speak later on the Labour Commissioner so that the Public Service and the Ministers will know what is happening because Barbados is now becoming the laughing stock of the whole Caribbean. In all the Caribbean islands they can find a person suitable to be Labour Commissioner but Barbados has to find money to train a Labour Commissioner. Each time you want somebody as Labour Commissioner you send that person out. In Barbados it is like the Bahamas. You cannot find a substantive holder of the post of Labour Commissioner.

You create these posts in the United Kingdom giving the Liaison Officer a salary of $10,000 and the Labour Commissioner here is a post of $7,000. Let us see what the Minister condones! He is going to establish a post and is saying that the man who is to fill that post should get $6,240 as salary, $1,920 as House Allowance, $2,400 as Representation Allowance and $960 as Entertainment Allowance. He is saying that he must get House Allowance because Mr. De Souza gets a House Allowance. That is an aspect of Colonialism because a man who is recruited in the United States of America or the United Kingdom needs no House Allowance. The Englishmen carried this Colonialism to Africa and we are following this bogus colonial pattern so much so that in 1960 we are still perpetuating a system which gives a man a House Allowance when he is living outside his country and which connotes that you are not paying him sufficient for House Allowance.

Now the other thing which is ridiculous is this: you drop your House Allowance of $1,920 which you are giving to the Liaison Officer to $480 for your Assistant Liaison Officer, your Administrative Assistant and your Secretary / Welfare Officer. I may say that it looks as if there is a mistake in the salary structure of the Assistant Liaison Officer. He was getting $5,280 per annum according to what I see here, and now the salary as proposed is $4,560 to $5,520. Then the Administrative Assistant in now being put at a salary of $3,000 to $4,392 and the Secretary/ Welfare Officer at $2,640 to $3,360. You have this ridiculousness of saying you have dropped from $1,920 as House Allowance for your Liaison Officer to $480 as House Allowance for your Assistant Liaison Officer. There is no question of what is the ratio between the salary of $6,240 and the salaries of $5,520, $4,392, $3,360 that would justify the difference in House Allowance from $1,920 per year to $480 a year. What kind of house do you expect your Assistant Liaison Officer to live in as distinct from

your Liaison Officer? Let us bear in mind that it is not a question of houses; it is a question of one obtaining a flat; so it would be how many rooms you expect your Assistant Liaison Officer to be living in and what type of person your Liaison Officer is from your Assistant Liaison Officer in so far as sociability is concerned. I take it that the Liaison Officer and the Assistant must of necessity be people of the same social structure and stratum, but the difference in salary is one as regards the hierarchy of the post. It is not the case that one is the yard boy and one is the gentleman, and that therefore you cannot have the yard boy living alongside the master.

To anyone going to London it is ridiculous to say that you are giving a House Allowance to the Secretary of the Liaison Officer. What can be the justification for taking up our money and spending it in this fashion? I know the people who work in the Liaison Office in London. One of the ladies was seconded by the Barbados Government, not that she was seconded from over here and sent there, but the lady happened to be in London at the time and they asked her to come and do the job.

I would say this: if I am setting up a Barbados Liaison Service in London, of course, if there are any Barbadians in London capable of holding the post, by all means I would give the Barbadians the first chance; but why should I give them a House Allowance when I recruit them from England? Of course, if there were anybody in the Government Service there I would get the permission from the Chief Secretary to have that person seconded so that that person would not lose their pensionable rights. What is just in giving some person in that post a House Allowance? Are there not Reporters in this House of Assembly structurally who are people of higher calibre than the person who would be recruited as Secretary/Welfare Officer because the standard of reporting debates of a *verbatim* nature in this Assembly has to be higher than that of a person who works as Secretary/Welfare Officer? I am sure if anyone comes in here with a Resolution to give the Reporters of this House of Assembly a House Allowance - and God knows that they need a House Allowance more because they work for low salaries for the type of work they do and some have to live in Barbados and undergo the high rates of House Allowance as some of us do - it would meet with some sort of protest. Is anyone of the Barbados Civil Servants living in Barbados entitled to a House Allowance?

I do not know if this is the thin edge of the wedge. I may say that the Hon. Premier should live in a house provided for him. When it comes to this ridiculousness that a Cabinet sat down as if it had nothing to do and took our money and dished it out in this stupid manner to people in the United Kingdom, what can you say? Are the Ministers getting crazy? Of course, this is no bait for me but the Hon. Minister says that they are recruiting people in the United Kingdom. I want the Minister to understand that it is more vital to recruit people from here because the economy of this country is in need of sending people out to find work; but when we are doing that we are maintaining the economy of the United Kingdom while it is the Barbadian economy which you want maintaining; therefore, full employment here is more important than emigration. All that you are doing now is lessening the population problem, but it does not add anything to the national economy of the country.

Now, Madam Chairman, so far as the officers are concerned, I am not suggesting that you might not need what you have here proposed because in Barbados as soon as you show a little success you can multiply the number by ten: therefore because you can show that more people are going up to the United Kingdom, it would mean that you would need more officers. I know the mentality of Civil Servants in the middle class group. They have not emerged to the standard where they think in terms that they have to build a country up. Their mentality is: "Let us see how much we can get now because this thing may come to an end." And on that basis you are going to multiply this office.

1.15 p.m.

You have here a Liaison Officer, an Assistant Liaison Officer, an Administrative Assistant, a Secretary/Welfare Officer and a Stenographer Typist at normal rates which are prevailing in London of £10 or $48 a week. You are going to recruit a Stenographer Typist in London at £10 a week which is £520 per annum. The salary structure between the Stenotypist and the Secretary/Welfare Officer is not much different from each other. He or she shows ability for secretarial work and they are graded in this other type of work; you do not need any particular degree for that. In this Resolution the Stenotypist is not entitled to any House Allowance; what is the justification for this House Allowance unless you can show that it is impossible for this officer who is working for the salary which you are giving, to have a house or that in order for this officer to be able to do this job he must live in certain quarters. Mr. Brewster was recruited in Barbados; he was sent to London by air to take up this job. An Assistant Liaison Officer is not a Trade Commissioner of the West Indies; he has not got to live in the flat in which Mr. Gordon lives; he is not called upon to entertain the emigrants. He is dealing with poor people who are in search of employment. He is not dealing with any ambassadors; his main function is to meet employers who are in need of labour and to meet them at their level. He has not got to meet them at home. In England you do not have to meet a man in your home, neither is that the case in New York. You have a luncheon for him and therefore there is the question of a Representation Allowance which includes that sort of thing.

We are not suggesting that you should not give an Entertainment Allowance, although this is nothing at which to smile. I want hon. members to bear in mind that Representation Allowance in this context is part of a man's salary. It is eligible for income tax purposes so that the Income Tax Commissioner can call upon you to pay income tax on this Representation Allowance, because this is an amount of money which the Officer can draw every month. It is not a question that he draws it on the principle that he entertains somebody; therefore the salary here has been increased by the amount of Representation Allowance. My objection, my serious objection, to this matter is this: what is the justification for a House Allowance on a salary of £1,300? A man who is working for £1,300 has not got to pay £400 out of that for House Allowance. I cannot see the Government providing £400 for a House Allowance to this Officer and providing £100 to others as a House Allowance. Even if these people are recruited in Barbados, what would be the justification of recruiting an assistant in this way? If you second the Labour Officer and you send him to England, the most you can think of asking him to get would be a House Allowance which would not make his position worse off than it was before. If he owns a house in Barbados and he goes to another territory, he rents out that house.

The Minister said that he wants to establish things, but where does he want to establish them? If you establish this post at $10,000 a year - the Labour Commissioner's post would have to go to $12,000 and the salary of the Governor and that of the Chief Justice would have to go up and we will soon have these fantastic amounts. I would not agree with these allowances which are being given at all; I feel that they are out of proportion with commonsense and reality. Moreover, if this Government is looking for employment, they have been to Dominica and they say that they are looking for emigration facilities. If you have to do this thing in Dominica, it looks to me as if you are looking for an expensive affair. This Resolution is not one which is only confined to the Liaison Service in the United Kingdom; it deals with a Barbadian Immigrants Liaison Service. I would like the Minister to state if there is any truth in the alleged statement about workers in the United States of America in which he has a Liaison Service - I would like to know from the Minister if, at this time, he has embarked on a mission to Dominica, he can tell this House about this scheme, if he can make a report and let us know something about it. Also, I would like to know if he can tell this House if the arrangement to send cane-cutters to St. Kitts was with the knowledge of the St.

Kitts Trade Union and why was it that the Minister felt that cane-cutters should leave Barbados to go to St. Kitts to cut canes at a rate which is lower than the prevailing rate in Barbados. In the interest of employment, does the Minister think that it helps the economy of Barbados for Barbadian workers to be used in another territory where the wage level is lower than it is in Barbados?
1.25 p.m.
My comment on that is that it is a very serious state of affairs that the Barbados employment situation and the Barbados Government in 1960 has to seek employment for Barbadians not in markets higher than the Barbados market, but Barbadians are now recruited in a market where the labour market is cheaper than the level of the market in Barbados. That is to say, Barbadians are cutting canes for non-Barbadians at a lower rate than Barbadians are cutting canes for Barbadians.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Madam, that is totally irrelevant to the Item under discussion. If the hon. member wants to deal with that question, he can deal with it on a subsequent occasion. This is the establishment of officers; as a matter of fact, the establishment is not even before us. This is a Supplementary Resolution to carry out the work of that office, and has absolutely nothing to do with St. Kitts, Dominica or anywhere else.

Mr. WALCOTT: Madam Chairman, I agree with the hon. member, but you would always think that if a sensible Minister is dealing with questions of such vastness and has spoken about getting work for Barbadians he could not consider it as irrelevant. The service is more than a Liaison Service; it is a service of looking after employment opportunities, and as I said, I only took the opportunity of bringing this to the Minister's attention. It does not matter to me if it is irrelevant to Barbados because all I have asked are things that occur in Barbados and the Minister of Labour happens to be the person engaged in it. The Minister went to Dominica, and I thought in an issue like this, even if he did it *en passant*, it would not be anything improper; but if he regards it as irrelevant to his own Ministry, then I accept that. Some other occasion will arise in which it will be more properly dealt with. At the same time however, I think in the interest of Barbados whenever an occasion arises for a Minister to answer such questions, not by a Statement to which I cannot get up and reply, I will let you know. That is the only opportunity I have to make a statement where an issue comes within the member's portfolio, and I feel that as the Hon. Minister has appealed that he does not want to answer these questions because they are irrelevant, I have made the point as to how I consider that Barbados has gravitated gradually to be regarded in the eyes of the West Indies as the place where you can look for cheap labour as distinct from a country where the employment forces are so virile that you have to think twice before you ask people from Barbados to come and work for wages in a market that is lower than that in which their colleagues are getting more in doing the same job in Barbados.

As I said, Madam, it is most unlikely to find it occurring in most of the other places. It may be possible to get people from Montserrat to go to St. Kitts to cut canes at $1.15, but it would be difficult to get people from Trinidad though the rates there are not as high as the rates in Barbados.

I think, Madam, that I have dealt with this matter as I see it. The scheme in itself is one in which I agree that the Barbados Government should have its own Liaison Office. There is nothing wrong with that and it is as it should be. I believe that Barbados should have its own Liaison service within the context of West Indianism. Barbados is neither big nor small, but is regarded by Jamaica and Trinidad as a small territory, and in anything in which it can show its importance and show that it is not hanging on, it should do so because invariably if we have a West Indian Liaison Service, the Officer may be a Jamaican or a Trinidadian with a Barbadian bringing up the rear, may be as a messenger; but in a service that is Barbadian — at least they did not start with a Barbadian and Barbadians always like to start with expatriates first to show that we are so liberal — I would like to ask the Minister if it is his intention or the intention of the Government that such persons who are recruited for these posts will be recruited in Barbados as distinct from someone living in England and being recruited in England. I want to know the basis of recruitment.

The reason why I want to know that is because I do not think the Minister can justify the allowances. His justification cannot be on the basis of what Mr. De Souza gets. The justification is that with the salary you are paying it will be impossible to get a man at this salary as a Liaison Officer and rent his own house. My view is that if the salary cannot afford him to pay rent, therefore something is wrong with the salary. Do not let us get this idea that we are going to pay people money and then add on something for housing. That is for when you are dealing with Doctors and school masters who have to live in a certain type of house, but not for a man who can go anywhere in London and rent a house. Nobody is compelled when he is living in London to go into Mayfair to rent. Nobody can restrict you to where you have to live. A man has to get a decent flat where he can get one in England. I do not think he has to go where the Ministers and those high executives live, because some of them live in Surrey and have to get a train in the morning; but we do not expect a Liaison Officer to live in Surrey; therefore he must live within the salary which he is being paid.

Moreover if we are going to pay a total amount of $10,000, I want to say this to the Minister if he does not know it: the $10,000 which is being paid here as salary can attract apart from the Chief Justice the whole Civil Service of Barbados. A Permanent Secretary gets $8,160, and that is the hierarchy of the Service now; the Director of Agriculture gets something like $9,000 and the Attorney General $10,000. You are creating a $10,000 post in England, but it does not take a sledge hammer to crack a nut. If you establish these posts at these salaries and allowances, you are creating a serious precedent and a vicious circle for Barbados in that the Civil Service is going to pounce down on this, and bring all the analyses - because all these boys are very good at analysing things, as their whole education is based on analysing one post with other posts within the structure of the Civil Service. If you can justify a salary with the total emoluments of $10,000 to the Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom which is a post under the Labour Commissioner of Barbados, then you have to give serious thought and consideration to the post of Chief Justice which is a supreme post as compared with that of an Assistant Labour Officer.

Mr. TALMA: Madam Chairman, I rise to support the passing of this Resolution and I should also at this stage like to commend the Minister for the manner in which he presented the various details of this Resolution together with a resumé of the history of the manner in which the post was created and matters connected therewith.

I would say, Madam, that having had the privilege of residing in England for eleven months within the last year, and having been able to view at first hand the work of this Department - the Barbados Liaison Immigrants Service - and having had numerous consultaions and discussions with Barbadian workers in England, I think I am qualified to some extent to make some sort of contribution here today.
1.35 p.m.
More especially, it is a matter on which I would be able to make some sort of proper assessment. I say that for the ones who may not know of my past activities. I refer to my activities of a similar nature and my experience as an organiser in the labour movement and things of that sort.

I would say that the proposals as contained in this Resolution, whereas they may appear enormous or too high to certain members of this Committee, whereas they may appear fantastic, if I may use the word of the hon. member who has just sat down, in my humble opinion if you are going to expect Barbadians to leave their comfortable homes here to go and stand up to the climate

in England - and I am not trying to scare prospective emigrants - that is to say, to face a climate in a cold country with all the complications attached thereto and to establish residence there, you cannot expect the suggestion that, let us say, $11,000 in England would be too high as compared with a salary of $9,000 here. Although I agree with you in part, yet at the very outside you would hardly find anyone who is getting a salary of $6,000 or $7,000 per annum over here leaving that to work for $8,000 in England. If you want them to take up residence there, the salary you give them will have to be sufficiently attractive and the differential would have to be substantial. I think that is some sort of answer to the point which was raised by the last hon. member who spoke.

I feel that the proposals in this Resolution are entirely in order; I do not consider them as going too far. I must say that an attempt is being made to remedy the situation and to relieve the ones who are carrying on under that pressure since the vacancy in the post of Liaison Officer has occurred. It is true to say that the present staff owing to that vacancy is working under great strain. The Liaison Officer has been gone for a few months and they are experiencing great difficulty in coping with the work. There are thousands of Barbadians scattered all over England in all the cities and some in small districts, and even the new structure of the staff is not sufficient to expect them to cope with the work. To expect that of them is expecting too much. That is my view. Even with the new structure, as it is proposed in this Resolution, when you consider the thousands of Barbadians who are scattered all over England, and the amount of travelling entailed to solve the grievances of those people, and then the amount of travelling entailed to see them when they first land, in my view the time has come when this Government should consider the advisability of appointing not one Assistant but two more Field Secretaries or whatever you call them to this Service, whether they are called Field Secretaries or Administrative Assistants. What you want there is a competent man to help the people, to relieve the Liaison Officer and his Assistant of this volume of travelling which they are now called upon to do. It is well known that Mr. Brewster who was the Assistant Liaison Officer, and Mr. Pickwoad had to devote much of their time in travelling to one city and another in order to see new emigrants coming into the country. They had to travel day and night intermittently and throughout the week with the result that other important administrative work would have to be left undone or held up, certainly the time which has to be devoted to their securing employment opportunities for Barbadian workers who are here and who want employment. The more important part of their work is to secure more employment opportunities: but they now find themselves bogged down and tied down in travelling from one state to another, whether it be from Plymouth to Southampton, in receiving recent arrivals and placing them in accommodation and putting them on their feet when they arrive.

I am pleased to see that an additional assistant is tacked on to this service and I am hoping that the right type of individual will be recruited, one who has the interest of the workers at heart and who will go out of his way to try and assist them, especially the ones who have recently arrived.

In my view, this service is performing in a way just as useful service as the Labour Department of Barbados, and I think the emphasis should be placed on this service because, in any case with our redundant population, with our thousands of unemployed and with mere seasonal employment for three or four months, if we have an avenue for employment abroad, we should pursue it with all our vigour: and if we set up this service in England and put it on a firmer footing we would be doing the workers of Barbados a great good. I do not regard the structure as proposed in this Resolution as being extravagant. I do not regard the salaries as being extravagant either.

1.45 p.m.

The hon. member who has just sat down is more conversant with labour problems than I, as he happens to be the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and he has a wealth of experience in labour matters in big countries, in CADORIT, etc. and he is therefore competent to make his observations on this matter. However, I fear that, on this occasion, although I respect his views in matters of this nature, speaking from my own experience, the question of giving a House Allowance is perfectly in order. When we consider the heavy rates which are charged for room rent and when it is realised that these officers would be living in England, we have to make their lives as comfortable as possible so as to encourage them so that they, in turn, will encourage the immigrants. You cannot expect any Liaison Officer or Assistant Liaison Officer to live in a room from week to week or from year to year; you must subsidise his house, room or flat rent — and the hon. member would know that, in order to secure the rental of a flat in England, according to the prevailing rates, the least you can pay for a flat — I speak authoritatively on this matter — is seven guineas; and if you want a comfortable flat you have to pay ten guineas for it. If you assist the Liaison Officer with the sum of $1,920 as a House Allowance and the Assistant Liaison Officer with $480 as a House Allowance, it is a question of subsidising the rent because rentals are high, and comfortable flats are not easily obtainable.

Madam Chairman, I am in agreement with the provision of this House Allowance, but I think the time has come when this emigration to England must be placed on a firmer and stronger footing. This is nothing of a temporary nature; this emigration is something which will go on for years and years unless it is affected by the atom bomb. If anybody thinks that emigrants will soon be coming back from England, he is living in a fool's paradise. We should therefore attempt to make the Liaison Officer comfortable so that he can do his work properly; we should grant similar facilities to the Assistant Liaison Officer as we are granting the Liaison Officer so as to encourage him to do his work and, indeed, to encourage both of them to do their work under the difficult conditions under which they have to work. The Minister should consider the acquisition or the purchase of a suitable house where the Liaison Officer can have his flat and the Assistant Officer can also have his flat; the Minister should acquire a house in England where the office can be on the ground floor. (Hon. M. E. COX: We are doing that now.) The Minister certainly did anticipate the question which might have been put to him; this is the first time that I have ever heard a Minister present a Resolution with such thoroughness. *(Laughter)*. I am glad to hear the Minister say that they are now doing what I am suggesting; that shows that I am on solid ground and I know what I am talking about. Apart from the acquisition of a house for the Liaison Officer and his Assistant, let the Minister make it his duty also to acquire at least one other house in each large town in England and call it the Barbados Centre to which Barbadians can have access, whether it is in Birmingham or in Liverpool where the coloured population lives. I refer now to Shepherd's Bush and Brixton, two places which occur to my mind. Not only should the Government acquire suitable houses for the Liaison Officer and his Assistant and suitable offices attached thereto, but at least there should be one house acquired in the important places where you have thousands of Barbadians at present, and where they are employed on a permanent basis.

If you have the welfare, happiness and interest of the Barbadian workers at heart, no better contribution can be made by any Government than in putting into effect the suggestion which I am making. The houses acquired should be under the control of the same Liaison Officer, with a housekeeper and so on. I am not suggesting that there should be a house of refuge, but a place to which Barbadians, on their arrival in England, would have access; I am suggesting the establishment of a Barbados Centre in the big cities in England where Barbadians will feel that they will be assisted in every way possible until they get a footing. We want to encourage Barbadians, when they leave their homes here to go to England, to regard that country as their home and do not think of rushing back here as soon as they get a few pounds. We must assist Barbadians in establishing themselves and in what better way can you assist Barbadians in establishing themselves in a foreign country than in finding accommodation for the new-comers? I am not suggesting

that these places would be places where Barbadians would be living permanently, but only for the first month or six weeks until they can get a footing. When that is done, I feel that the Minister would be making a big contribution towards the success of Barbadian emigrants going to England.

1.55 p.m.

I do not care to elaborate on several other points which I should like to draw to the Minister's attention, because if I give him too big a dose at one time, nothing will be done. It is probably better to give him in small doses; but what I would like to see the Minister do now that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has read from his files, records and reports relative to the vacancies in the London Transport Service — and the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that there are 4,000 odd jobs and not 3,000 which I mentioned — is to take one of his regular runs to London, and with his personal presence there together with experts and whatever assistance he can get, he will be able to press a case for a bigger quota of Barbadian workers, and try and get 1,000 of those 4,000 vacancies. At the time when I heard about these vacancies, and I got it from the inside, there were 3,000, but since then the number has increased to 4,000.

If I were a Minister, Madam Chairman, I would get the consent of the Cabinet and the Premier in particular and let them see that this is the move to make at this stage. It is a question of sending a Minister or a delegation, but unless some prompt action is taken or unless results are attained, you will be opening yourself to an attack. It is well known that there are 4,000 vacancies and unless you have an increased quota you will be opening yourself to an attack. There were many points which I made, but before I sit down I want to stress this point:

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m. this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On Resumption,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the bell.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move the first reading of a Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave after presenting a Petition to move the first reading of a Bill. He is now asking that it be read a first time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, you did refer to a Bill following a Petition, but what I am really after is a Government Bill. This is a Bill, Sir, to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

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

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

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

QUESTIONS

Mr. BARROW: To enquire of the Minister of Labour:-

Whether he can say how many unemployed carpenters there are presently in this Island?

2. Is it true that there is a number of non-English speaking foreign carpenters or other workers instantly employed with the Sandy Lane Scheme in the parish of St. James?

3. If the answer to Query 3 above is "Yes", will the Minister state -

(a) how many of such carpenters are there?

(b) what is the remuneration of such carpenters as compared with that of Barbadian-born carpenters employed on the same project?

(c) whether these foreign artisans were granted permission by the local Immigration Authorities to land in this island for the purpose of working here, and for what period of time in each case, and under what conditions?

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Health and Social Services:-

How many patients in the General Hospital, for whom oxygen was part of their treatment, have died in the last five months, through the inadequate supply of this gas or of oxygen tents when required?

2. Will the Minister publish the facts of each case as soon as he has investigated them?

3. Will the Minister take whatever immediate action is necessary for a speedy investigation?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

"WHEREAS the necessity for establishment of Single Member Constituencies in this Island has become increasingly apparent, particularly in view of the imminence of the next General Election;

AND WHEREAS the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain has appointed an Electoral Boundaries Commission consisting of a Judge of the High Court of Justice as a single Commissioner to fix British Guiana's Boundaries;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government seek to avail itself of the services of this Commissioner - who is expected to arrive in the Caribbean area early next month for the purpose of de-limiting constituency boundaries - in time for the next General Election here."

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that no answers to Oral Questions are ready today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for eight weeks' leave of absence from my duties as a member of this Chamber commencing from next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for eight weeks' leave of absence from his duties as a member of this Chamber as from next Tuesday and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re NO CONFIDENCE IN MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: to resume debate on the Resolution Re Lack of Confidence in the Ministry of Communications.

On the last occasion the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when we were discussing the motion moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy which I had seconded, I had reached the point at which I was adding my own criticisms to those already made by the mover of the motion for the way in

which the Government acting through the Minister of Communications and his department has brought unnecessary worry and anxiety to the owners and users of those vehicles known as "pick-ups", and when we were discussing the matter last Tuesday, we had reached in a way one stage of the old issue. At that time we were all looking forward to expecting that the decision which had been passed on to these people who are owners of pick-ups some months previously to the effect that their licences could not be used after 31st July, would stay, and it was, if I may say so, because of the hardship and injustice which that decision has spread upon the owners and users of pick-ups that this Opposition Party stood to challenge the policy and decision of the Minister of Communications on that and other points.

It is curious to note, Mr. Speaker, that since we met here discussing this issue last Tuesday, there has been a temporary change of heart by the Government. Within the last few days - I believe on the 28th July, - that is, three days before the scheduled time for the decision to come into effect, the owners of these vehicles received communications from the Department concerned to the effect that they can have until the 31st October to operate. What the letter actually suggested was that whatever decision it was to come into operation on the 31st July would certainly not now come into operation before the 31st October.

Mr. Speaker, that is significant, to say the least, and there are certain aspects of it which it will do well to recall. First of all, these people were told that because they did not comply with the Regulations Government was forced to cancel their licences; at any rate, not to allow them to renew them. Some of them asked to be told in writing, in what way, if at all, they had offended against the Regulations. They have not been told. No replies have been given to them on that particular question yet, but the same Government Department under the charge of the same Minister of Communications which has accused the people of not complying with the Regulations and therefore warning them that their licences could not be renewed after the 31st July, that same Government Department, at least the same officers of it have changed their minds and given an extension of three months.

Now, between these two outstanding landmarks in the whole controversy something intervened. It was the notice given and the starting and communication of the motion of "no confidence' which was moved in this House by the Leader of the Opposition; and our Party was not only contemplating Parliamentary methods of protest but we were also contemplating methods of protest which though perfectly constitutional and legal would be entirely outside the range and scope of Parliament.

We feel, therefore, that we are entitled to take full credit for this respite which has been granted to the owners of these vehicles, for we are convinced that if we did not make and announce the moves that we made and announced, the Department of Highways and Transport and the Minister of Communications would not feel it incumbent upon them to start in the direction of doing the right thing.

I wish to say here right now on behalf of my Party - and I know my Party will support me in this - that glad as we are in the first instance to learn that the pickups would not be disturbed for the next three months, we do not consider that that is entirely satisfactory. We wish these people to have the assurance that so long as they are playing their part in the economy of the island and doing their bit in that form of public transport in which they have been engaged and that as long as other forms of transport are not yet up to the standard which we should all like to see, the pickups must not be disturbed. Therefore, if the Minister has taken fright or if the Department of Highways and Transport of which he is the Head has got at least the understanding that we were really serious about our protest, let them understand that we are still serious about it and we still feel that to hang a threat over the heads of these people for three months' respite is not good enough and is not doing justice to them. If you can let them stay for another three months you can let them stay for six months, and if you let them stay for six months you can let them stay for a year or two. We have said through the mouth of our Parliamentary leader that this matter can be left over entirely as far as they are concerned for a year, because if it is argued, as Government seems to argue, that the very existence of the pickups operating in the form in which they operate was a deterrent to the proper running of the Transport Board, well then, it would take at least a year before we see the benefits of these new economy units which are now taking the place of the old ones among the Board. It would be a foolhardy attempt on the part of the Minister to disturb the pick-ups before the Transport Board was really giving satisfaction.

Therefore, however you look at it, there is no reason to disturb the pick-up owners at all; but if there are reasons for disturbing them, at least those reasons could not become apparent for a year, and I say this in this connection. If Government has changed its mind and is extending the time for this, it is largely due to the rantings, grumblings, and the anger which were manifested by the people against whom this particular measure has worked, and it is an object lesson to the people in this country not to sit on their rights and to allow them to be taken away from them. I go further and say that the pick-up owners should not regard this respite as being something that has dropped down out of the clouds or the munificence of the Government. They are experienced enough to know that if they had never been a protest and if the Opposition Party had said not a word about it, there is no question but that the order would have come into force, and they should not wait until the 25th October to wonder or ask whether an extension of time would be given or whether Government means business on the 31st October.

2.45 p.m.

They should feel that so long as the Government has admittedly seen that its policy needed some overhauling, the same reasons which would prompt the Government to give an extension of three months, should be the same reasons urged upon the Government to go further and give a more indefinite extension; they should not feel that they have anything for which to thank the Government. It is because we were prepared to fight for their rights - and they had, luckily for them, an Opposition Party to champion their cause - that the Government has had to eat its words in this matter. The fact that the Government has had to rescind an order which it made, far from being a reason for us not to press the motion of "no confidence", is the very best reason for doing so. If the Government had really reached a decision where it could not retract, it would have said: "No matter what agitation is made or how much quarrel and resentment there is, these pick-ups are coming off the road on the 31st July."

We have seen from what is happening that the Government's reason for fixing 31st July was not a good and sufficient one, because they have extended the date. Even if with good reason the Government had changed a matter like that, it does not know its mind and it has forfeited the confidence of this House. As I say, the fact that they have extended the date is furnishing even more proof that the Department of Highways and Transport with the Minister who is Head of the Department, does not yet know its own mind. The Minister has not made any realistic assessment of all the issues which are involved; it is not good enough for him in the course of the debate in this House, to interrupt the Speaker as he did in the case of the Mover of this Motion, to point out something which we had already known. It is not enough for him to pretend that by merely interjecting a reply he has prevented the issue from being debated as fully and as pungently as it should be. The whole policy of the Government stands condemned in this matter. If you fix a date when something must happen, and then within three days of its happening you change your mind, you show that the date you fixed was not done in consequence of a real appraisal of the situation. In my opinion, the Minister deserves even more censure. In addition to the concern and anxiety which he caused these people to have, he has plainly shown to them and to the public that he does not know his own mind, and his Department has not yet made a proper assessment of

the Transport problems of this island; therefore he is not yet in a position to say which forms are allowable for what time and which forms are not. If you have this dilatory attitude which this Ministry and the Department show, you are bound in the end to reduce people to such a state of tension that they will not know from one month to another what the Government's policy is. Even this respite of three months, although it represents a moral victory for the forces opposing the Government, does not really help the people concerned. The man who owns a pickup and who was contemplating changing it for a newer or a better one, might find his plans somewhat awry because of the uncertainty hanging over the whole situation. He might find himself having to ask himself: "When may I get a new van? Suppose I do get a new van and the Government does not permit me to get back my licence in October; what guarantee have I got that having made further investment or re-investment I would be able to see my money through?" That is the uncertainty which arises out of that.

More important than that, Mr. Speaker, the Government should not put these people in a position where they cannot make their own plans or anything like that, or look forward reasonably to at least one year to go on working as they have been working. It is curious to know that, with all the talk and with all the alleged dissatisfaction about the pick-ups and their running, almost all of it comes from the official side. The people who use this means of transportation have nothing but praise for it. It only falls to the lot of the Government to find that they will find fault with this service, not because there is anything wrong with it, but because the existence of the service would not allow the service of the Transport Board to make the profit which they feel it should make. But, of all the reasons for tampering with a service such as that which the pick-ups render, that reason is the most objectionable. That is why I say that the reason for the ban, so to speak, for three months, does not solve any of these problems. Hon. members of this House should be in a position, as well as the Government, to reassure the pick-up owners that so much do we appreciate the service which is rendered by these people in difficult circumstances to such a wide cross-section of the community, we would be prepared to do anything which would assist them to render a more efficient service.
2.55 p.m.

That is the line which all sections of this House should take, but I am afraid it is a line which only one side of the House appears to want to take. On this side of the House we would be prepared to do whatever should be done to make the pickups more efficient, to enable them to continue giving the service they are giving, and our point of view is that taking everything into consideration they need at least one full year before the situation can be reviewed. On the Government side there is a wide difference, a vast difference of approach. They appear to regard the pickups as a nuisance and something which spoils in their view the tidy outlines of the Transport system, and without even weighing and assessing fully and realistically the contribution which this form of transport makes not only to transport but to the very economy of the island, they are prepared to lay down arbitrarily rules and say you shall go up to a certain date under certain circumstances and no further.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between their point of view and ours is vast; and the more the situation develops, the more we become convinced that whatever else Government may do, the one thing it should not do at this time or in any forseeable time is to interfere with this particular means of transport. At the moment, we all know that the Transport Board is not yet on its feet, and the era of sweetness and light prophesied by the Minister with the bringing of the new buses, turnstiles, new management and internal re-organisation - we are to see the benefits of that, we hope; but we cannot see them immediately. The very last thing we should do is to upset and overturn all the auxiliary services which in the days when the Transport Board was almost near chaos were still pulling their weight and contributing to the convenience and comfort of the people of this island.

In strengthening the points which have already been made and amplified by the Mover of the Motion, Mr. Speaker, I say that this Government is not entitled to take any comfort or any credit for the improvement which might have been given, because it was a change of front forced on them by the agitation of the pick-up owners themselves and by the protests which have been made and are still being made by the Official Opposition; and we wish to say that our view is that even the respite is sufficient argument why confidence should be withdrawn from the Minister of Communications by this House, because Mr. Speaker, the change even in consequence of public and parliamentary agitation is proof that his original intentions were not good and that his policy was hasty and ill-advised, and that he had acted without a due realistic appraisal and assessment of the matter under consideration. A Minister or a Department which acts like that does not deserve the confidence of a Legislative Assembly.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Resolution of censure on the Government or the Minister of Communications, I find myself somewhat in a quandary. I know that there are thousands of people island wide who are being misled by somebody. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy tabled this Resolution, and I am dealing with one aspect of the Resolution and that is relative to the pick-ups. Not only as a member of the Government Party but by my understanding I never understood that there was any intention, to the best of my knowledge, to have the pick-ups removed. Mr. Speaker, I am the type of person who at times is so head strong on anything that appears right to me that I would be one of the first to vote against the removal of the pick-ups, thereby finding myself maybe in hot water with my own Party. I say that merely to say that it was monotonous to me to sit down and hear the hon. junior member for St. Lucy speak at length on the removal of the pick-ups, and it is most surprising to me today to hear the hon. member now say that the Government is extending the time until the end of October, thereby giving them three months' grace.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was actually pleading that rather than remove the pick-ups altogether, we should allow them to remain at least a year longer. Again, I never understood or knew that they would be removing the pick-ups at all, let alone for him to ask that consideration be given to these people for the extension of a year further. I happen to know that it has actually become the knowledge of many people that the pick-ups would be removed even though I repeat it is not true.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago over Rediffusion we had a statement made by the Information Officer that no pick-ups would be removed. If he makes a statement like that to the general public, you can only take it that the pick-ups would not be removed, and that was before the motion of censure was tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. Hence, Mr. Speaker, you would realise that I would be within my rights if I came here and voted against my Government, so to speak, after hearing that information made publicly by the Information Officer.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and for the enlightenment of this Chamber, particularly the hon. member who is now speaking. The motion which is now before the House was tabled on the 24th May this year. The Minister's Statement was made on the 16th June this year and the Government's Information Officer's Statement was given over Rediffusion on the Friday after the laying of the Statement in this Chamber by the Hon. Minister of Communications.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy might have tabled his Resolution before, but to the best of my memory, before he actually spoke in this Chamber on that Resolution and spoke for the long hours which he did, the information came from the Government Information Officer over Rediffusion as I have

aforesaid - that is an indisputable fact - that no pick-ups would be removed and I was under that impression all the time. I would go this far now.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, is the hon. junior member for the City saying that the Government Information Officer's function is to issue statements of policy which have not been given on the floor of this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, in my opinion, has not said anything of the sort as to what are the functions or the misappropriation of the functions of the Government. He is speaking on this debate.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Sir, it is actually a matter of indifference to me as to what right the Government Information Officer has or has not. What matters is that a public statement by the Government Information Officer was made to the public of Barbados over Rediffusion to the effect that no pick-ups would be removed. That is what matters and the junior member for St. Lucy did not elaborate or speak at all on that Resolution until after that statement was made by the Government Information Officer. That is an indisputable fact. That in itself was enough to satisfy me that there was no intention to remove pick-ups. I go this far. I would be one of the first who would have the guts and the courage if I did not hear that statement to come here and take my seat and vote against the removal of pick-ups. What is said by the Opposition is said so that the general public who hears that it is Government's intention to remove the pick-ups would say that it was true; but that it was only because of the motion tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that it has sort of scotched the intention of the Government.

Sir, I am not the hon. Minister in Charge and I am not taking it upon myself to defend the Government or him as such. He is quite capable of doing that. I may be a young member of this Chamber but this is how it appears to me. If any member of this Chamber jumps to his feet and says anything to mislead the public, Minister or otherwise, and I have the facts, I am going to jump to my feet and deny that.

I do not think that this debate on pick-ups should have gone thus far when it is not the Government's intention to remove them. If I were the Hon Minister, I could not wait until so many members of the Opposition had spoken to say that it is some sinister notion of the Government to remove the pick-ups, and when they had rubbed it in, for me to come and say that it is not the intention of the Government to remove them. It is weeks now that I know it is not the intention of the Government to remove the pick-ups; there is some misconception going around by some people who do not understand party politics as such. There are some people who think that because every backbencher on every debate does not jump to his feet and add his quota he is a "yes" man and a man of limited mentality: but that is not true. What is true is that there is no point of their getting up one after the other and speaking; and rightly so, it is the duty of the Opposition, however right this Government may be, to make this Government appear as if it is wrong. That is the duty of the Opposition. I wanted to make that clear. If they think because we, the backbenchers, do not speak on everything that we are muzzled, if it were so in the past, it is not so now.

Mr. Speaker, like all other Parties, we of the Government hold discussions on any matter before we come to this House. If I am dubious on any matter, I put my point of view to the Party so as to let them know that I am not in agreement with what is proposed. I say to them that I do not know what decision you have reached at Cabinet level but these are my views and feelings and if I am not allowed to express them in the House, I had better not be there. We are put in the position to thresh out things together and then come to a decision one way or the other. In this case with the pick-ups, that is what I have done and it was at such a meeting that I got the understanding that the Government will not be removing the pick-ups. What may be the case is that in the issuing of licences to owners of pick-ups, it may be a little more stringent than it was in the past. I am not going that far; the Honourable Minister will deal with that at length. He is responsible; so it is not my intention to go into details of that matter. But I do not like the idea of member after member getting up in different phraseology and just repeating when the first one said and therefore misleading the public. There is not the slightest atom of truth that pick-ups would be removed.

Mr. STRAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion which has been moved by the Honourable leader of the Opposition, his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, said that he will make a few remarks on seconding the motion but he will leave a more detailed contribution to another colleague, the honourable junior member for St. John. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. John heard all that had been said by the mover and seconder, but it is just as well that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy did say that somebody else from among their Party would be making a more detailed contribution, because seldom have I heard a poor case more poorly argued than that presented by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. As a matter of fact, I think that it was more than ironical that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy should have been seconding this particular Resolution moved by his colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, inasmuch as it is on record in here that they themselves have rather divergent views as regards to the transport policy in this island. They themselves do have divergent views, and when the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was saying last Tuesday that one of the things which we need to take notice of is that nobody in this House knows what the policy of the Minister is as regards transport, I think actually he was showing a reflection of his own condition because nobody in Barbados knows yet what is the Official Opposition's policy as regards transport in this island. They do not know themselves and certainly nobody knows; because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that as far as he is concerned, Government should be owning all the buses and his colleague has actually said in this Chamber that Government should be giving back the buses to the former concessionaires.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I would like the hon. member to say where, in what debate, under what circumstances, the date, time, place and everything connected therewith that I made that statement.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, that is easy enough. It is on record and unless the records are changed or tampered with, when the debates are issued that will be seen. I do not know if the hon. member has forgotten, but he has said it.

Mr. TUDOR: If what the hon. member alleges is on record, then it should be easy for him to quote the records; that is what I am inviting him to do.

Mr. STRAUGHN: That is nonsensical. The records are there and everybody will see them when they come from the Printery.

Mr. TUDOR: The hon. member made a categorical charge that I advocated the Government giving back the buses to the private concessionaires. I would like to ask him to supply - as a matter of fact, I challenge him to supply - the facts to support his allegation.

Mr. STRAUGHN: As I said, Sir, when the debates on that particular occasion come back from the Printers the hon. member will see what he said. It was actually the occasion when we were debating the question of the Government underwriting any loans that the Transport Board may have entered upon. It was on that occasion that the hon. member made those remarks. If he wants the date, he can go back to it.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I do not usually lose my temper, and I would not like to tell the hon. member that he is lying.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member not to use any language which may seem to be offensive to another hon. member.

Mr. TUDOR: I challenge the hon. member again here and now to provide the proof of the allegation which he is making.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said that the proof is not yet ready; the debates are in the hands of the Printers.

Mr. TUDOR: How does he know that they are in the hands of the Printers?

Mr. STRAUGHN: They are records taken in this House and the Clerk would be able to tell us whether they are here or in the hands of the Printers. The records will prove what the hon. member said.

Mr. TUDOR: The hon. member not only made the allegation but he has said that support for him will be found in the records, that the records will prove it. I challenge him to produce the records.

Mr. SPEAKER: The records have been taken of the debate but this particular debate is not yet ready for circulation to hon. members. There is nothing more than that.

Mr. TUDOR: I would like to know from the hon. member if he has the records or a record of what was said. It is all very well for him to do this, but this is a serious matter. Any hon. member who make s such an allegation should have his allegation challenged.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is making reference to the records which are taken down and they are not in the printed form of the debates, what more can the House do? I do not think that we should further worry on this point.

Mr. TUDOR: I concede to the hon. member that the debate has not been printed, but he should say in what debate that statement appeared. That is the least he should do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given the House some sort of description. He has mentioned a particular debate and also described it. That should be enough to satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I do not know if the hon. member wants to get more legal advice from his legal adviser.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member address the chair.

Mr. STRAUGHN: What has amazed the hon. member and the hon. member in his more sober moments .....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, never in the nine years or so since I have been a member of this Chamber have I seen any hon. member, who had any respect for the Chair, address the Chair with his jacket open and with his hands in his pockets. If that is the kind of decorum which is going to be maintained, well, I know that Your Honour would be too embarrassed to draw it to the attention of the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Why did the hon. member say that I would be embarrassed?

Mr. BARROW: You Honour would rather talk to the hon. member outside than embarrass him in the Chamber. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: I should just like to say this: there are ways and means of doing things. I have seen occasions when hon. members wear their apparel not in the standard way, but I have not yet openly tried to show up anybody by getting on my feet and drawing any hon. member's attention to his disorderly appearance. I do not know that any hon. member would welcome that. I would just send the Marshal around to an hon. member hinting his appearance to him.

Mr. BARROW: I should like to make this clear; I do not object to the hon. member's red tie. After an exposure of eight weeks in Jamaica he will learn more about Parliamentary appearance.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Well, Mr. Speaker, let us say that the hon. member has the dignity on this occasion to point such things out to the House. Again, Mr. Speaker, the seconder of this Resolution mentioned that perhaps the difficulty with this House and with the Chamber as far as understanding the Minister's transport policy is because the Minister and the Government have not been keeping people sufficiently informed about their transport policy or any changes, regulations or rules that might be issued about transport, and yet it is surprising to note that the Hon. Mover of the Resolution himself was attempting to castigate the Government for having made a statement through the Government Information Officer. Actually they were castigating the Government Information Officer for saying something about transport, and yet the other one of them is saying you are not giving the people enough information about the same transport.

I mentioned in the beginning that the mere fact that this Resolution was seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy made the whole thing a most ironic and burlesque show. Mr. Speaker, I do not myself possess the very latest bit of information which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy appears to have had about the recent bit of communication that came from the Director of Highways and Transport with regard to pickups, that is, that there would be some time given to the end of October, but I do know, and this is a statement which has just been emphasised by the hon. senior member for the City, that in the very last paragraph of the Minister's Statement it is stated that special permits will be issued for the operation of goods and other vehicles. If this is purely an administrative matter in which you are actually issuing these special permits for the operation of these goods and other vehicles, I see nothing myself to be alarmed about, because it does not in any way affect the Minister's policy. It is purely an administrative matter whether they get the permits ready by the end of July or by the end of October.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the most contradictory thing about it is that the Hon. Mover of the Resolution was saying not that he wanted the pickups to remain on the roads, but he is saying, "Take them off the roads but after a year". It is tantamount.....

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I never said anything of the kind about putting them off the roads altogether. I said that what we are urging and pressing for immediately, because I was speaking in the month of July, was that the directive notifying them that as from the 31st July, their permits would not be renewed should be withdrawn, and at least one year given the recipients of the directives in question to have the situation reconsidered and reviewed.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Again, Sir, that proves that all he wants is a year more for somebody to consider the situation, and not that they themselves have any policy on transport at all. They have no policy as far as transport is concerned; so all that happens is that they want the Director of Highways and Transport not to talk about the withdrawal of licences at the end of July or October, but to talk about them at the end of July next year, and that would give them a chance to make up their minds as to what their policy on transport would be.

I would like to make an observation, Mr. Speaker, because I would personally like to quote from some of the files of this Chamber, and the observation is that neither the Clerk not the Librarian could tell me where the transport file of this Chamber is. It does not seem to be available.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter that does not concern this House. Any information like that has to be brought to my attention in my private Chambers and not on the floor of this House.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless it is, I am certain, the privilege of members of this Chamber to have access to those files, and they were not available and apparently they might not even be in the precincts of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to tell the hon. member that there is no such thing as a Transport File kept by the House of Assembly. What happens is that in the way in which debates are indexed a considerable amount of information may be gleaned from contact with the Librarian who would be able after looking at the index to say what members spoke on the Transport Services, the hon. member for So-and-so, etc., but there are no such things as Transport files here.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, it is purely a matter of terminology; the Librarian himself referred to them as files on Transport, and I was only repeating the terminology quoted by the Librarian. I thought I would make the observation *en passant*.

I take it that by now this House would be quite clear that the Minister's statement on the policy of the future of the Transport service of the island was itself explanatory and quite elucidating. It did not say that it is the be-all and end-all; it gave a clear indication as to what efforts the Government is making with regard to the transport service of the island and that is known to every member of this Chamber and is being divulged perhaps all too gradually to the members of the general public; but there is nothing to say that the Government's policy on transport at this moment can in any way come in for any strong criticism by members of the Opposition, because they have not shown - certainly not by the arguments they have brought up to now - that there is anything they would want to criticise from the policy standpoint. The arguments that have been given by the Official Opposition on this particular Resolution of censure do not show that they were in any way pointing out that the Government policy as such on transport was wrong or that they were even advocating a better policy.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that sometimes statements are brought out or bits of evidence are brought into debates that could be quite questionable, and I wonder if the hon. Mover of this Resolution when he gets up to reply may be a little more specific in telling us the number or who are the owners who would have come to him during the Local Government bye-election in St. Peter to make their complaints, because he did make the statement that these gentlemen did come to him during the bye-election and said that somebody from the Transport Board did tell them not to pay any attention to this letter which they had received from the Director of Highways and Transport. He deduced that the reason was that they did not want the pick-up owners to be offended during the bye-election; but since the bye-election has ended, nobody from the Director's Office has told them anything, and therefore he is saying that this was just a matter of keeping the pickup owners quiet during the Local Government bye-election. Well, I do not know how many pickup owners might have gone to the hon. member with that particular kind of story. He did say that it happened and perhaps he could enlighten us as to how many there were. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy said that he knows that even I at times would use the pickup for transportation and that I was doing it some two weeks ago. I would like him to know that I was not only doing it just for the idea of transportation, even though if the pick-up comes before a bus I would use it as long as I am permitted to, but that I was also getting first hand information from the pickup owners as to the authenticity of some of the remarks of the pickup owners by the members in putting forward this Resolution.

3.35 p.m.

I would say that it would be very remarkable if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition could bring the evidence in to say that two or three pick-up owners would have given him any particular information of the ground to which he was referring in this debate. It would be a most remarkable thing if he could do it.

However, Sir, the Resolution also talks about Seawell Airport, and I think the presentation of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was very pathetic. I would certainly wish that in his reply in this House he would be able to strengthen his argument a little more.

I am quoting from the notes I made when he was speaking. He wanted the Minister to answer: "Is there or is there not the exclusiveness of a very few persons who would go on the tar-path." He wanted the Minister to confirm or deny that. Now that is like asking a question. It is like saying in a question: "Will the Minister confirm that there is the exclusiveness of a very few names of persons who can go?" In asking that question, he thinks that the Minister should be censured. Obviously, the Hon. member should be able to say if that was the case or not and then criticise it. Certainly, it should not be put in the form of a question.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition also said, as far as people accompanying passengers to the plane was concerned, that he is not in favour of any particular veto but he says this: "If there is going to be a veto" - I take it that he means a restriction on people going out to accompany passengers - "let it be the same for all." In other words, he means this. He is not in favour of everybody at any time accompanying passengers to the airplane. He also mentioned that the Manager of the airlines would tell a visitor that he can go and at times one visitor was allowed and not another. As far as I know, at no airport can any manager of any airlines give to anybody permission to go out with a passenger to the airplane. In a case like that, it is controlled by the Control Tower; and even if you can get permission to accompany somebodyelse, you are doing it with the sanction of the Director of Civil Aviation; and if anybody from the Control Tower deems it necessary to restrict you, you have to listen to that person. If you want to take a passenger to an airline, no manager or at least nobody like him can tell you that you can do so. You can only get that authority through the Control Tower itself. I believe that this House would not think seriously of entertaining a motion of censure on somebody asking a question like that. I do not think it is worthy of the attention which we are asked to pay.

There is another question about this Resolution and it concerns a matter of procedure. The Hon. Leader of the House tackled the seconder of the motion of this Resolution on it last Tuesday when that Hon. member was speaking and the seconder of the motion took shelter and avoided the issue. I was wondering if the Hon. Leader of the House would not incorporate it in his reply. Here it is that you are moving a Resolution of "no confidence" in a Minister, and the question is how technically correct you are because the only person who can withdraw confidence from a Minister would be the Premier himself if he considers that Minister is not carrying out the policy of the Cabinet.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has been said that if you talk enough long enough you will enjoy that contempt for your audience.

I am not really rising on that point, but I wonder if the Hon. member is in order to even query in his own bewildered mind the technical rightness of this Resolution of "no confidence" because the way it appears to me is that all Resolutions and questions must come to you first for scrutiny before they are put down on the Order Paper and Your Honour as Speaker endorses or rejects such questions or motions. I wonder if Your Honour should permit him even in his own bewildered mind to question the technical rightness of a motion of "no confidence" such as the one we are now discussing.

Mr. STRAUGHN: There are some peculiar points of order which come from Hon. members on that side. I am certain that Your Honour would take due notice of it. Sir,

the Honourable members of the Official Opposition are yet to show that this Resolution of "no confidence" in the Minister even has any precedent as such,, but perhaps, they may be able and it would be enlightening to us. You have a motion of "no confidence" against a Government. The whole Government stands condemned if the Minister stands condemned, as far as the transport policy is concerned. I just mentioned that as a matter of procedure and the fact that Your Honour allowed a Resolution which has nothing at all to do with the way in which members want to debate it because it was bandied by the members of the Opposition on last Tuesday and nothing was resolved.

I was saying that the records of the House would show that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy took flight when he was asked if there was ever a motion of "no confidence" in a Minister. Even May's was quoted. That hon. member took flight on that occasion because he could not answer the Hon. Leader of the House when he rose on a point of order in that respect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Almost any question thinkable is in the Resolution.
3.45 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: We all agree with that fully and that is why I thought the hon member was so much off the line when he was asking whether my comment on the motion itself was in any way a disregard of the ruling of the Chair. It is debatable and we debate it, but again I am saying .....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Nobody takes the hon. member seriously, but I definitely resent the patronising manner in which the hon. member is treating the Chair. I did not think he is so deficient in understanding that when he says no motion should be discussed, he wants to challenge Your Honour in allowing this debate to proceed, because he would have to do that on a substantive motion of "no confidence" in the Chair. If he says in answer to Your Honour that no motion should be discussed, that Your Honour had no right to allow this motion, he is challenging Your Honour's right to allow a Resolution like this to come forward for debate. I think that is quite improper and out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear all the implications from the hon. member. In fact, they did not register; but I do not think that they should be taken seriously.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Evidently, hon. members will find it rather difficult to justify their stand in this debate and they are trying to see if any hon. member can be accused of questioning the authority of the Chair. Certainly, that was not done in this debate except when the Hon. Mover of the Resolution was quoting from the newspaper and Your Honour ruled that he was out of order. Up to now, however, nobody has run counter to the authority of the Chair, but there has been the typical red herring drawn across the trail because there must be the question to be decided in this House as to where the Official Opposition stands in regard to this matter of the transport policy of this island. They have no policy and they have contradicted themselves in this Chamber on the same transport policy, not only on the floor of this House but in asides as well. If the hon. senior member for St. Lucy says that this is not true, I will withdraw it; but on the first day when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was moving the passing of this Resolution, when he made mention about the Transport Board and ownership of the buses, he said that he was of the opinion that the Government should own all the buses and his colleague said: "I am not in favour of such". If his colleague says he did not say that for me to hear and see - I say "see" from the motion of his mouth - I would withdraw it. But I wonder if he would really say he did not say so?

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. We know that the hon. member is indebted to his imagination for his facts. I have no recollection whatever of having said anything like that either in an aside or on my feet. I now therefore deny it.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Well, the hon. member denies it but he will say it again before long. He cannot change what he has said on his feet because it already exists in the record. When this motion is fully examined it will be seen not to be a motion of "no confidence" in the Government or in the Minister; but a clear examination of the facts which would have been before this Chamber and of the situation of the Transport service of this island, will prove that this is a motion of "no confidence" in the Official Opposition as to the transport policy of this island.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear so much wangling in this debate. I could not find out in which latitude the last speaker was. *(Laughter).* We are speaking relative to the removal of the pick-ups off the road. I would say that they are our godfathers; they have given a good name because they have picked up many of us when the buses have left us *(Laughter.)* I will tell you the value of a pick-up. I have seen big lorries go to freight canes and if they have six tons they would take up five and leave one; they failed to return for the one ton which they left and we have to depend on the freight carts and pick-ups to take up the remainder of the canes. We would really suffer without them. We have the pick-ups, the lorries and the buses. The buses have their own service to carry out. Let us say that the bus is the big man and the pick-up is the little man; both of them want bread. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that some of the pick-up owners have said they have not received any notice about the removal of the pick-ups off the road.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order. I certainly did not say that either in this debate or in any other. The hon. member must have misunderstood me completely.

Mr. CORBIN: I was at my home and the pick-up owners came and asked me: "What are we going to do? We have received a notice that we cannot run our pick-ups after the 31st July." The pick-up owners have come to me from various parishes; they have also met me in the streets and asked me to come to this Chamber and make a plea for them because the running of their pick-ups is the only possible means of their existence. The pick-up owners say they have received this notice from the Department of Highways and Transport: "Special permits will be issued for the operation of goods and other vehicles". It does seem to me that after the Opposition brought forward this motion it has caused the Transport Board, or whoever it is, to change their disposition. They have not changed to something else.
3.55 p.m.
I am saying, Sir, that it would be very hard for any man in this island to take up $66,000 and buy three buses to make a living and compete with the transport services of this island, and then to allow the pick-ups to go inside the stand or wait at the bus poles to collect passengers. That would be doubly wrong because any man can go and buy a motor car for $25 and take off the top, put in two or three seats and run around and collect passengers and bring to Bridgetown. We would not like to see these poor men invest all they have, then for the pickups to wait at the poles and in the bus stands to stop them from getting passengers; but I would say that the pickups have played one of the most important parts in this community for many years along with the buses.

At the present time, Sir, we want an adequate and up-to-date service, and we have to have proper rules and regulations for that. I noticed in times gone by that we had plenty of donkey carts all over the island bringing food from the country; but since we have changed up the system of our roads and have tarred them, the donkeys cannot grip the roads: so we have to depend on pickups to go into the parishes to bring the vegetables into the markets. The pick-ups take up sometimes six, ten or twelve women and take them to the fields, and I would not like to know that that privilege is taken away from them, because we would all suffer as we cannot ourselves go to the fields for our food. These people supply us with our food: so they must have the privilege of bringing our breadfruits, yams, eddoes and various products to the markets. If anyone tries to

stop that privilege, that would be trying to stop the wheel of progress in this island.

Now, Sir, when we look back to see that the pickups bring in the cows, sheep and pigs to the slaughterhouse, we would all suffer if we did not allow such things to continue. We are bringing down large buses, but these buses cannot carry the large baskets with the breadfruits, potatoes and yams; they refuse to take a few bundles of shingles and a few feet of lumber because they say these things will disturb the passengers. If a pickup owner picks up my lumber or the next man's lumber, potatoes, yams, rice or cornmeal to carry home, we would not like to know that the man was left behind while his luggage went by itself. I would like to see the man travelling with his luggage and I will give you my reason for saying that. I remember when I was a boy the railway train used to run and there was a van attached to the back of the carriage which carried the luggage while the passengers were inside the carriage; but whenever the people got home they would be crying out for their parcels. There was a van porter on that train - I used to hop the train myself - and that porter was a cooper and a saddler; he had his needles and cord and his hammer and he would open the people's luggage and take out what he wanted and mend them back, because the passengers were not there with their articles. It would therefore be hard for the pickups to come to Bridgetown and take up John's, Mary's or Solomon's baskets with his articles and take them home without their owner, because he would not have time to reckon the items with the pickup owner, and so he could not make any claim for anything that was missing. I would like to know when on Fridays and Saturdays these poor people are coming into town with their baskets that the owners can travel with their luggage. Anybody who tries to stop that would be stopping the wheel of progress although I would like to know that the buses are running properly. If the Government allows these things to continue, both the bus owners, the pickup owners and all of us would prosper, and we would be performing our duties to the whole community.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to criticise either side of the House. I am giving my own feeling on the matter, because the poor people are suffering up to now through lack of proper transportation in this island. I hope that in future we will have proper transport so that the people will be able to praise God and thank man.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this debate has been very long and tiring, more so for you because you have listened to so many interpretations of what it should be. We had an exercise in "can there be a motion of no confidence in a Minister" or "should there be a motion of no confidence in the Government as a whole?" I think you have set the records straight, because there can be a motion as long as there is a Minister in charge which comes within the ambit of Parliamentary rules.

I do not think that this debate is one of a vote of "no confidence" in the Minister *per se;* I regard it as an opportunity owing to the new rules to discuss certain things. I have expressed my view on the motion which is against the Minister of Transport. I think the Opposition would find themselves on happy ground there, because the Minister is struggling against a very difficult task within his own Government. It is an open secret that the Government as a whole is not clear on this matter owing to the composition of the Government; they are a collection of individuals without any serious philosophy about public life; so whenever there is a challenge in any serious matter, there must be conflict because some of them are miniature capitalists. I heard one Minister say on the floor of this House not so long ago that as a Minister he makes less than he would make in his own business, while on the other hand you get another Minister saying in another breath that they are poor people slaving and doing everything, and now everybody seems to envy them; so you get these two extremes making up a Government, so that when it comes to any matter which deals with trade or commerce or where money is involved you are going to get these conflicts.

4.05 p.m.

You get the capitalist, on one side having one view, the non-capitalist would have another and the emerging capitalist would have another view. That is the type of thing which the Minister finds himself in. That is an open secret. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy had said; but I think he would be more positive if he went on to say that they know as a fact that members of their Government were in favour of giving back the buses to the people also. That is no secret. If that is a secret, the sun which is shining is a secret also.

Sir, I spoke in here on the transport of this island in a debate, and I believe, coupled with what the Opposition was likely to say, if I had backed the side of the Opposition, may be all the buses would have been given back to the concessionaires by the Cabinet. It is well known that the Opposition was strong on this opinion and some of the elements of the Cabinet were also of a similar view. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew is a very courageous man. Of course, courage is not always couched in language which is likely to be eloquent. He was a very courageous man to say what he did say in relation to the evolution of the transport problem. There are two parallel systems growing up and you have to reach a conclusion as to how these two systems can operate together; that is to say, how what is regarded in Barbadian colloquialism as pick-ups are going to operate against the regualr buses. There is the undoubted fact that owing to the old system where there was a breakdown in your transport, you did not mind people using the pick-ups when you had your old buses. It is just like now that you have your slums. We do not like the slums, you cannot abolish them over-night but the situation is that you cannot smile on them.

The sooner the Minister and the Government be more positive about what they want to do as regards transport, the better; but I believe that they may not be ready to give their veiws on it. They are politicians and I was reading in one of my political magazines that the philosophy of a political party is that you wish to be elected. That is one of your first commandments, and it has to be because if you are not elected all the other commandments must go by the board. That is one of the things which makes it so that the Government cannot come down positively one way or another about transport. There is no point asking anybody to put $100,000 in a business and then to do something detrimental to that business. There is no doubt, anybody would say that the pick-up is a great competitor to the buses. You may have a heart of angels but there is a limit to that sort of thinking.

Sir, we have to get down to a system of regularising transport and knowing what is adequate. I do not subscribe to the idea that in whatever field a man wants to make a living - and what people regard as an honest living - you should allow him to do so, because Mr. Speaker, some people run brothels and in so far as making a living, they are making a living: but they are making a living on the immorality of people. Of course, some countries condone it because their concept is different from ours. They say that the people go in for it anyhow; therefore why not make it legal. It is a question of how you look at it. In this case I feel that there is no point your pleading with people on a basis which is unscientific and which does not add up to common sense. If you do not have any check on the pick-ups, you know as well as I do that you will have the whole of this country inundated with pick-ups.

This Government has to pay the legacy of what a former Prime Minister said. The former Prime Minister of this island made one of those statements which you can only make in Barbados and which as Minister he has a right to make on that basis that "thou shalt be elected." Therefore no busfares would be raised. They knew, when they were saying so, that it was political froth and that it had no substance in it; but what happened was that it was a very good statement to make at the time. A politician is not interested in the scientific aspect of his argument; he is interested in what happens at the poll; and if saying that would help him to be elected, it is just

like saying, as long as you get in or so long as you get the thing which you want, you do not mind if the devil brings it.

This Government is sending people to the London Transport Executive which is losing money, but the people there do not think what the people of Barbados think about the transport service. They say that it is a service which you must run for the people. If it were not so, Mr. Frank Cussons would not allow them to run. The British Railways lose money and they still increase the wages of the workers. The American Railways also lose money and they too still increase wages. The rolling stock of transport all over the world is a difficult problem to handle and I must say that the present Minister of Communications had a bad legacy in that he took over the transport system of this island and when it started, they wanted to look for political stooges to put on the Transport Board who knew nothing of the operation of transport.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will not sit and allow that statement to go unchallenged. I strongly object to it. I would like the hon. member to say who were those stooges. I am definitely sure that from the inception of the Transport Board, there were people appointed to that Board who had no connection, politically or otherwise, with the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister sits, let me ask him this. Does the hon. member wish to indulge this House in a revelation of what he knows?
4.15 p.m.
It is all very well for the hon. member to deny it and the House to accept his denial; but the hon. member should not indulge in any revelation of personalities.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept that, but I would like here and now categorically to deny that statement which is false, misleading and has no foundation of fact whatsoever.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank you for your guidance, Mr. Speaker, but I never intended to be caught in that trap. The expression "political stooge" needs no definition now. A "political stooge" is not a person who is necessarily a member of a political party, but he will do what the political party wants him to do. I said that the legacy that the Minister has.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I would like to make this position quite clear. That Board was established by the Government and all Boards which are established by the Government have to carry out the policy of the Government.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will still make the point that a political stooge is someone who is not possessed of any particular ability, or he can be possessed of ability, but he is still, though not a member of the Party, willing and has to carry out the wishes of the Party. There is a distinction between the Government and a political party. In the United States of America they run their affairs differently from how we run ours. If Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Nixon wins the election, what are regarded as political stooges of the parties will be brought into power; but in the British system it is not so. It is a question of the administration starting where it is. I believe that the Minister objected to my statement because he is an arch-protagonist of the political stooge who, in their appointments, can only go on Boards of which he has control.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I really did not catch it; will the hon. member repeat that?

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that the hon. member is an arch-protagonist of the type which will put a political stooge on any Board over which he has control. He is an arch-protagonist of that type of stooge.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, it is not unparliamentary. It is couched in very parliamentary language, but the hon. member can make his point.

Hon. M. E. COX: We have been appointing to Boards people whom the hon. member has recommended from the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: That still does not say that he is not an arch-protagonist of that type of political stooge. What the hon. member says is true in cases where other people like the Trade Union have been asked. From the hon. member's very statement he regards it as part of the Government's policy to appoint people who will carry out the Government's policy. In his enthusiasm to see that the people carry out his policy.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member is twisting what I said. I did not say that we appoint people to the Boards to carry out our policy; I said that any Board which we appoint has to carry out the policy of the Government, which is something completely different. It does not mean that because an individual is opposed to your policy, you will not appoint that individual. As to the Gas Board on which the hon. member said that a member of the Union should be placed - well, the hon. member knows nothing about what is going on. The Gas Board is composed of all Conservatives, but the policy of the Government has to be carried out. Why then should the hon. member make it appear that these people are our friends and we appoint them because they subscribe to our view? That is absolutely different from what we do.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am on holiday and I am very fresh, having had some sea baths. The hon. member is wrong; it was not a question of the Gas Board, it was the Industiral Board; but for the hon. member's information I would like to tell him that Sir Alfred Roberts who is a Trade Unionist is a member of the Bank of England. In the United Kingdom you will find that a Trade Unionist is appointed on every Board in which the public is involved. There is no partisanship as was the case before. The hon. member said that the members of a Government Board must carry out the policy of the Government. I am not suggesting that the hon. member should appoint to, or should select for Boards people who are opposed to the Government; what I did say was something which is more positive, that is, that the hon. member is an arch-protagonist of the political stooge philosophy in which he sees to it that appointments are made to these Boards of people who will do what the Party wants done. (Hon. M. E. COX: Name them.) The hon. member wants me to name the persons but I will leave them unnamed; I will deal with that as an issue. When we speak of these things, we do not speak about them in any personal sense. Which of us would not like to see the Transport Board succeed? But we must be courageous. I have suggested if it comes to that point, that turnstiles be put in buses and that you pay conductors to sit down - I said that. I was not afraid of any driver or any conductor or anything like that.
4.25 p.m.
I say if it pays you better to make a change, you can do it. I should like to tell the hon. member that he should not take the word "arch" to mean something vulgar. You are a strong believer in putting people whom you feel you can trust on Boards, because you know they are your men, but they let you down and that is what has been happening. I am saying that this is a legacy that has been handed over to you because the Minister was an arch-believer of that philosophy that he could not see people other than those who come within that purview. (Hon. M. E. COX: Namely!) The whole set. The hon. member would like me to go in for something which would not be in my province, because he knows that it is for the Minister to approve even of names that are put to him; that is to say even if it does not stem from the Minister, it is for the Minister to approve of them, and I am going so far in this Constitution to say that I do not want the Minister or

any Minister to say that this was put up to him and he had advice. That is the reason, Sir, why I want full self-Government to the maximum. When advice is put to you and you accept it, it becomes your policy or philosophy and not that of the other person; so the hon. member will see that if there is full internal self-Government he must accept it with all the errors his Departments make, and must be prepared to go down with them.

When it comes to the question of "no confidence", it is not based on the assumption that you do not like the person; it is a question that a public error has been committed and therefore the Minister responsible must pay the penalty.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock p.m., this House will now revert to Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 10

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on the Suspension, we were discussing this question of the re-organisation of the Barbados immigrants' service in the United Kingdom, and I had reached a point where I was making certain additional proposals and suggestions to the Hon. Minister in connection with certain innovations which I thought should be considered by the Minister; and I had also reached the point when I had suggested that suitable houses should be bought for providing accommodation for the Liaison Officer himself and the Assistant Liaison Officer. I went further and suggested that houses should be bought in each of the different Cities, and I referred to London, Birmingham, and Liverpool where there are thousands of Barbadians at present employed and residing. Anyone who has been to this place will know that no better contribution could be made in assisting in settling Barbadians there and finding employment for them than by providing a Centre in each of these large Cities where on arrival the average Barbadian will be able to find a resting spot for the first few weeks - which is more or less the most important period - until he should have found his footing and until he has learnt his way around sufficiently to secure alternative accommodation on his own.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to know that a good job of work is being performed by the Barbados Liaison Service, and Mr. Brewster in particular, and all the encouragement should be given to them both by way of the House Allowance and the Representaion Allowance; and to suggest that the Liaison Officer or the Assistant Liaison Officer would hardly need proper housing accommodation and to suggest that he can live in a room from year to year and be in a position to carry out his duties creditably is not doing that in the proper light, because the Liaison Officer will be required to meet employers on a proper footing. For instance, if an employer had an occasion to visit not only the office but the home of the Liaison Officer, he could not go to a worker's room or flat; you must have proper accommodation to meet the employer on an equal footing. It is all right to adopt a cheese-paring policy down here and suggest that our Liaison Officer or Assistant Officer does not need a proper flat in which to live or proper accommodation, but I am doing it in the light that not only will the Liaison Officer be called on at his residence or flat by the average Barbadian worker, but also by the employer in England who will have occasion to visit his flat or residence or office from time to time, and we should not put our Liaison Officer or Assistant Liaison Officer in a degrading position. We should have him established in such a way that he has a certain amount of dignity attached to his office and home.

Mr. Chairman, it is on that ground that I argue that the House Allowance is adequate and necessary not only to the Liaison Officer of $1,920 and to the Assistant Liaison Officer of $480. The Representation Allowance is necessary in that a certain amount of entertaining will have to be done. The Overseas Allowance is also necessary. If you wanted to carry this matter further, you could probably have included a travelling allowance. (Mr. WALCOTT: That is a condition of employment.) In any case, I am saying that if you wanted to carry this matter further, you could have put in travelling allowance, because day and night these officers have to travel. Anyhow I would like to hear the Minister on that point. I was a Minister when this service was set up in 1955, and I happen to know something of what I am talking. Recently I have checked a lot of things, and I want to know if the Liaison Officer and the Assistant Liaison Officer receive travelling, because I know that half of their time is spent in travelling in trains from one city to another, going to boats to meet various people who are coming in. Unless this office is strengthened here and now and additional staff is put on, and unless the vacancies are filled, it means that the Liaison Officer and the Assistant Liaison Officer will probably spend most of their time in travelling, and their higher duties of securing employment opportunities for the thousands of Barbadian workers who are waiting for opportunities for work will be disappointing, because the Liaison Officer and the Assistant Liaison Officer should devote the greater part of their time in securing employment for the thousands who are sitting idly by and waiting their chance.

4.35 p.m.

I am glad to see that additional administrative staff is tacked on to the present service and I think that the time has come when this service should have at least another Field Secretary or two to do the travelling. They should be leaving free the Liaison Officer and his Assistant to pursue avenues of employment and to find work for the unemployed here. What better contribution for the people of Barbados at this stage than for these two officers to secure employment for the thousands who cannot find employment of their own in that no employment is available locally? Even when the crop season is in, you still have low employment: and when the crop is over, some will receive employment two or three days a week, but for thousands there will be no employment. The money spent in training some of these people is money well spent and nothing too much can be done in making these officers of this service happy and to give them the drive and incentive to pursue their tasks for the benefit of workers.

What I would like to see is that persons of the proper calibre are enlisted. Mr. Brewster who is now carrying on the service is of the proper calibre and I would like to see more like him enlisted. I would like to see enlisted men who would take a genuine interest in their work and who would spend their working hours devoted to that service because it will be no point in creating these posts and improving the working conditions and increasing the remuneration and allowances of the staff unless you have men of the highest calibre appointed - men who are genuinely interested in Barbadian workers. When I say that, you can hardly find men who are more interested in the plight of the Barbadian workers than a Barbadian himself and it is for that reason that I would like to see the top post filled by someone from Barbados who has the interest of the working class people at heart. I would also like to see all the other posts in that office filled by Barbadians who have the interest of the working people of Barbados at heart.

The West Indian Welfare Service, as far as I can gather, although it embodies the entire West Indies and is on a federal basis, yet, when you compare the hundreds of thousands of Jamaicans who are in England with the few Barbadians that are there, you can very well see where the emphasis would lie. The emphasis is on Jamaicans. In other words, the Jamaican workers are taken care of to the exclusion of the Barbadian workers; therefore I would like to see this Barbados Liaison Service con-

tinuing and being put on a proper and bigger scale in that it is serving a proper purpose. It is all right to talk about colonialsim and things of that sort, but Barbadians in England welcome this Service: and it is a good thing to have Barbadians who are interested in the plight of their own Barbadians in a far country employed in that office. You will not have to rely on Jamaicans, and, as you know, some Jamaicans are very hard to rely on sometimes. It is a good thing that Barbados has its own independent service to seek the interest of Barbadian workers; therefore I do hope that Mr. Brewster and the other assistants who are appointed with him would co-operate and make the Barbadian workers there as happy as they can be, and take that interest in them and the other multifarious duties of the Liaison Office. By virtue of the work of that office and the service and assistance rendered generally in the United Kingdom, the Barbadians there would come to regard the United Kingdom or England or which ever part they happen to be as their second home and Barbadians are known wherever they go abroad as persons who never forget their relatives in their island home, Barbados. Therefore, when one speaks and thinks of the benefits, he has only to go to the Registered Letters Department of the Post Office and the Government Savings Bank and one will see the remittances which are coming through those Departments from the emigrants who are settled abroad. Let us hope that their stay there will be long and they regard England as their second home.

I agree with the Resolution, and speaking for myself I commend the Hon. Minister for the action he has taken in attempting to put the Barbados Liaison Service on a proper footing and to serve as an incentive and inducement to Barbadians abroad and who are fighting to keep the good name of Barbados up. There is no doubt these Barbadians have been admired as some of the best workers from the West Indies.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is no wonder in South America when a Government has fallen from office, as it so frequently happens, that they have been able to produce men who can come to Parliament, and before they come to Parliament, agree to what they are going to say before they discuss it. Fortunately for me, I go to the United Kingdom about four times a year and I do not promise anybody to support anything. What I say today I can say to any officer. I was not old enough to be put on these Boards in the old days where nepotism used to flourish. The hon. member wants to say that this is an ambassadorial office which you are setting up. You do not believe in the hierachy of things. This is a third rate office. Go back and look at the Resolution and you will see that what I am talking is correct. I happen to go many places. I know a man who used to be in the Ambassador's office, Sir Oliver Franks. When he left that American embassy, he went back to England and held a post which was considered as one of the top flight posts in that country and he was counted as one of the top flight people there. That was after the war. I met the Labour Attaché in Washington and that post is a higher post than anything we are sending out from here. The hon. senior member for Christ Church is backing the Hon. Minister for Trade for explaining. If he does not explain the Resolution, he is incompetent. Now, what the Hon. Minister cannot explain and what the hon. senior member for Christ Church tried to explain and could not explain is that £400 per annum in England is a moderate allowance to be given a man for house allowance. 4.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have not yet had the opportunity of replying to the hon. member. When I have that opportunity I will reply to him.

Mr. WALCOTT: What point of order is that? If you are going to reply you should reply.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. The last speaker challenged me about the house allowance. The average flat in England is rented at ten guineas a week and I suggested that the Government should utilise that money in the purchase of a property so as to avoid having to pay rent.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the rent of an average flat is ten guineas a week, why do you pay this allowance of $480 if you are paying a man a salary? What justification is there to pay rent for a man if you are paying him an adequate salary? Even on the hon. member's argument, of a flat at ten guineas a week, if you are paying a man a salary of £1,300 a year, why should you pay his rent? Is it not on the hypothesis that you are not paying the man an adequate salary? Are you saying that you will introduce that into the whole structure of your Civil Service? It means that the provisions of this Resolution will become part of our Civil Service structure. When you add up this salary it will amount to $11,000 a year and the only person who is above that is the Chief Justice. This office cannot come near to that of the Chief Justice and other offices like that. You cannot work on the hypothesis that if a man can read and write you will pay him, but if he cannot read and write you will not pay him; or that because a man has a first class degree you must pay him something in addition. You will work on the assumption that a man can spell, but if you find that he cannot spell, then you have made an error. The hon. member's premise is wrong. I do not know if the hon. senior member for Christ Church was living in a ten-guinea-a-week flat. I was in a flat in London and it was not a ten-guinea-a-week flat; it was a very decent flat with four rooms and I do not know what the hon. member in a poor community like ours is telling us about meeting employers on an equal footing, as if you have to meet them in your bed-room or drawing-room. In England or in America you do not meet anybody in your private home as a general rule; anybody who has been to a big country will know that a man will meet you at a luncheon. In the heart of Piccadilly, at Strand Palace Hotel, you only pay 37/6 a night and that is a hotel with all the services of a hotel. I am talking about the West End, not the East End or Notting Hill. You are telling me that for an officer to work as Liaison Officer you must pay him a salary of £700 and nearly one third of that as a house allowance. I always like to sit down and think. Let us take the Minister in Barbados; do you think he would be wise in paying nearly one-third of his salary as house rent? Only mad people do that. When a man is working for £1,300 do you suggest that he should have another £400.....

Mr. TALMA: Rents in England are expensive. For one room which has a toilet and bath and kitchenette, the charge is seven guineas.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, the hon. member has come down to seven guineas. Why should the Government pay an Officer's rent for him? If you say that such and such is the salary on which a man should live, what then is the justification for paying his rent for him? I pay rent too because nobody wants to live in the Almshouse, and whether you own a house or not you still have to pay because you have to pay taxes. If a man in Barbados is working for £1,300 and you send him to England for the same £1,300, I say that that is not fair; but here the Government is creating a post. Quickly after the hon. member's return to Barbados he said in a debate that things in Barbados are so expensive that it is more expensive for a man to live here than for him to live in England. Now the hon. member does not realise that it is the same England.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I never said that; that is an untruth.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well I can quote him; I can give him chapter and verse. We were talking about pioneer status about socks and stockings coming duty free.....

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I have always said how high rents are. It is an absolute untruth for anybody to say that I said that rents are not excessive.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member said that when it comes to these things in Barbados, you can buy socks and ties at one-half the price you pay for them in Barbados. (Mr. TALMA: We were talking about rents.) Are rents the

only part of a man's cost of living? You eat food every day and the rent is not higher than the food. Do you know how the cost of living is computed?

Mr. TALMA: I am not discussing the cost of living; I am talking about rent. I am not the Minister to defend it, anyhow.

Mr. WALCOTT: What benefit would come to me by twisting the hon. member's statement? Far from that, the hon. member has my fullest sympathy. I have known him for years and therefore he has my fullest sympathy in anything which he says and does. I have not got to twist his statements; the hon. member talks about colonialism and if it does not mean anything to him it means something to me. You are giving a man a house allowance in the United Kingdom at £400 per annum on the basis that rents in England are high; therefore the allowance on his basis should be the difference between what the man's normal salary would be and what he receives.

4.55 p.m.

For argument's sake, if you have a man in Barbados getting this salary and the rent he would have been called upon to pay would be £200 per annum, you cannot get a house in the United Kingdom for £200; therefore you would give him the difference between what he would normally have to pay as rent as an allowance. That would connote an allowance just as you give a man a motor car allowance, because you do not give him a car, and that is the sort of thing that would put him back. The idea of giving a motor car allowance is because he would not be out of pocket in using the car, but a man cannot be out of pocket by paying rent; he gets a salary on the assumption that he has to look for somewhere to live.

Mr. Chairman, the Governor comes here and lives in a house, and therefore he does not pay rent, but the other officers do. What percentage would an officer coming into the Service in Barbados at £1,300 pay as rent? I challenge the Minister to say what rent is taken out of the salary of the Director of Education for Codrington big house. I am sure you are not taking out £400 per annum. Ask the Minister how much is paid in rent by the Director of Agriculture, by Doctors and by other people in that grade. The Labour Adviser to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Foggen who was Labour Commissioner in Nigeria gets a salary in England of something like £2,700 per annum. This salary is now £2,500.

Now Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not get his facts right. He may have been in England and seen these things; I go to England frequently, but I am a busy man and I do not go to interfere in Barbadians' business; but normally when you go and see these people they want you to take up something or get something done back home. When I see them I say "hello" and go and "fire" a drink around the pubs and that is that. When the hon. member talks about these people having to travel and asks the Minister to answer that, the Minister cannot answer it any more than to say that it is a fact that these people get a travelling allowance. Mr. Brewster, Mr. Pickwoad and anybody else is entitled to a travelling allowance, because that is a normal condition of employment in the Government Service. If the Government asked me to go up to some place, I am entitled to a travelling allowance; but what I pointed out and the hon. member does not seem to get clear is this Representation Allowance. This Representation Allowance is not an Entertainment Allowance, because as you will see next to it is "Entertainment", and that is the sort of thing given when you are away from home. When it comes to these posts you do not have to pad them up because this is enough money. Does it mean that because we have agreed to this service, you are proposing to add all these things to his salary? When you add up all these allowances you will see that they amount to something like $11,500 and the Premier's salary is about $12,000 per annum. Can you have anything more ridiculous? We are running a bogus Government where a third rate Officer in England is getting $11,000 while the Premier of Barbados is getting $12,000. The Government forms policy, and this is just like paying the British Ambassador in the United States more money than the Prime Minister. Can you have that sort of madness and a structure like that? You have padded out the salary with these things, and no matter by what name you call them, when you pay a man in the United Kingdom Entertainment Allowance, he draws it; similarly he draws the Representation Allowance and the Housing Allowance; therefore the amount which you are paying is fantastic; but the hon. member says it is not fantastic because he is out there seeking employment for workers.

Do you realise, Mr. Chairman, if there is any slump at all in Britain, where the West Indians stand in any of these jobs they hold? Being in the Trade Union Movement I know what I am talking about; we have to be prodding the Trade Unionists in England all the time to allow West Indians to remain there, because what you read in the newspaper is not there by chance. There is a move on foot, and any Minister who has been to England and met any Englishman will admit that they ask what we are doing in the West Indies to keep West Indians here. No matter what his philosophy is, the average Englishman, whether he is a man in the House of Commons or outside, does not welcome these large numbers of West Indians coming there. The hon. member may not know that there are more West Indians in the United Kingdom than have been recruited. I do not tell people to rush off to England, but as I have said, there are 4,000 vacancies in the Transport Service.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this service is not only for the ones who have been recruited by the Barbados Government; this service is available to all Barbadians no matter how they get there, even if they stow away.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing within the context of the hon. member's speech when he spoke about this service being there to supply work, because when we talk about a service like this, no Government in the world can set up a service which can take care of everybody who leaves the country. I am not even taking the hon. member's suggestion that in a place like England you should have a Barbadian house in every industrial city and at the same time ask the Barbados Government to subscribe to a West Indian house in London, subscribe to the Federal Government and at the same time ask us out of our own pockets to tell the Barbadians in England not to be West Indians but to be Barbadians by setting up a Barbadian house in Birmingham, Sheffield, Liverpool, Yorkshire and in Cardiff, if you care to.

5.05 p.m.

Now, I cannot subscribe to that. That is a matter I did not take seriously; but what I took seriously is the text of the Resolution. Do not tell me of the necessity of this service. This service is not in question. The Hon. Minister himself said that this was a service which was agreed to by a Resolution. We are not saying that you should not have the assistance. I am not saying that it should be reviewed; I am saying that there is no justification for giving a man £400 per annum as house allowance. I am not concerned with Mr. Brewster.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am not concerned with Mr. Brewster, but I know that the people there are doing a good job. I would like to see 200 or 300 more Barbadians settled there this year. You get a few people coming in but there are 4,000 vacancies there now and if you can get more of our people there now, I would be glad.

Mr. WALCOTT: This Hon. member seems to believe that the more we pay a man, the more you get out of him. What do you think you pay the Director of a firm for? We have the false idea that the more we pay a man and because you give this man this house allowance, it will bring you in a few more people. What do you mean? Do you mean that if a Director brings in a few more dollars to a firm, up goes the Director's salary? We have the false idea that all it means is that as soon as he does a good job you must put on all the padding. That is the old time Barbadian argument. Does Mr. Brewster have to invite an employer home at his flat to settle the pay of workers? That is not the place for that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want to bring to the attention of the Committee that Mr. Brewster is the assistant Liaison Officer. He is not the holder of the top post. The holder of the top post is appointed by the Colonial Office. Mr. Brewster is the No.2 man.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the hon. member could not be more wrong. Mr. Brewster at the present time is acting as Liaison Officer. That office has nothing to do with the Colonial Office. I have said many times in here that there is too much of this Colonial Office mentality operating here. There is too much Colonial talk. That is why I say that before the hon. member speaks he must be certain that his premise is right. The post of Liaison officer is not a Colonial Office appointment. The hon. member does not realise that this is something which is done by the Cabinet. This is a Resolution which gives the Government the authority to set these things up. What the hon. member fails to see is that this is the intention of the Minister or the policy of the Government because the Minister can have an intention to do something for the Government and then that may be something which the Government has already agreed upon. If it is the established structure, all that I am saying is that you are establishing a post at £1,300 per annum plus £400 as house allowance which makes it £1,700 plus another £500 as Representation Allowance making it £2,200 which is £180 per month. I want to ask, "Do you think that that is a salary which Barbados should create for the post of Liaison Officer?" The post of Liaison Officer is a position which is not higher than the post of Labour Commissioner of Barbados. The Labour Commissioner is getting $7,680 per annum and this post of Liaison Officer is at a salary of $11,520 which is $4,000 more than that of Labour Commissioner. The point which I was making was that we in Barbados were suffering from not being able to appoint a Labour Commissioner although we have sent so many people on Labour Commissioner courses.

I would like to see the Hon. Minister of Trade and the Cabinet grappling with these problems. Why tell me that the people in this office in England are doing a good service? If they were not doing a good service I would get up here and say so. The members of that office are entitled to Travelling Allowance now: but do not tell me because the rates are high that you must pay the full rate. The hon. member spoke of rent being at ten guineas a week. If you pay ten guineas a week, you are paying 520 guineas a year; therefore on the hon. member's basis we should be paying not £400 per year, but 520 guineas per year — that is to say, if you regard that now as the normal rate. I say that you cannot work on the hypothesis of paying a salary to a man and paying his rent too. You are not paying the Labour Commissioner of Barbados a Rent Allowance. At present, you deduct from their salary if you rent them a house. Mr. Adams condemned it and since then we do not offer Civil Servants rent-free houses; a deduction is made from their salary for rent.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church talks of rent in England. You appoint somebody who is a stenographer or secretary. Where is it that you gave a stenographer or secretary a House Allowance? The only way you give a secretary a House Allowance is if she is your public secretary and your private secretary. I would say this. If you tack on these House Allowances to the salaries of these people now, every time house rent goes up in England, up go your House Allowances also. Soon and very soon these House Allowances would be more than the salary.

Mr. Chairman, we have to be trustees on behalf of the Government's purse. Would you pay a man a salary of £1,300 and then give him £400 as House Allowance? I say that cannot be justified. If you want to raise his salary, do so. The hon. senior member for Christ Church knows that I have been about this place for a long time. All this is done to hide the amount of money the person is getting so that the hon. member can come here and make a speech at that. The reason why this is done in such a manner is to make you not see what is the true salary: but if you add all of these things up, the total amount would come to a salary which is very much more than what any Head of a Department gets in this Establishment and which will make you say: "Why pay this man so much salary?"

I challenge anybody in Barbados to say different from this. Unless a Head of a Department is suffering from arthritis, if you advertise that post at that salary of $11,520, you will get nearly every Head of Department applying for it. What is more, it is not a job which takes any extraordinary high academic ability which would preclude some people from applying for it. However, do not take that to mean that I am against giving these people Travelling Allowance and Representation Allowance. I am against giving all these people House Allowance. I feel when you give a man a salary that it must include what it will take if that man is renting a house.

5.15 p.m.

They recruit some people in the West Indies. I go to the West Indian Trade Commissioner and I see the Receptionist; the young lady shows where things are and so forth. They give you information, but I do not know why the Barbados Government must perpetuate the idea of giving a House Allowance to a man to whom they intend to pay a salary.

The Minister says that he will buy a house in London; Trinidad, Grenada and the others will buy houses and you have a West Indian Federation! This Government has pledged itself to be a member of the Federation; you do not want a referendum as to whether you should remain in the Federation as in Jamaica. I do not know if the Minister is clear in his mind as to the cost of the House Allowance in London and for what service he wants to buy a house in London; it looks to me as if Barbados is getting so wealthy that we can go to London and buy a house for these officers while there are certain needy things in Barbados which we do not have the money to carry out. You are putting an officer to live in a house in London, but he is not an ambassador. You are setting out to somebody that you are going to buy a house and the interest rates will be related to £400. I am glad to say that when the hon. senior member for Christ Church goes back to his home, he will find that there are quite a lot of people in Christ Church who look upon £400 for a man in England in a very different manner from how he looks at it. Barbadians are going to work as poor Barbadians and if we can spend that kind of money...

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. Is the hon. member trying to suggest that the voters in Christ Church will not support me because I think that this £400 is a mere bagatelle?

Mr. WALCOTT: Is that a point of order? I am saying that there are other people in Christ Church who regard £400 in a different way from how he regards it.

Mr. TALMA: I think that the hon. member should concentrate on his own constituency.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am telling the hon. member that there are other people in Christ Church who regard £400 in a different light from that in which he regards it. If he looks at it as something negligible in England.....

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. The hon. member is carrying this matter too far. I have explained my position. I am not the Minister, but the hon. member is pegging away at me all through this debate. If he wants to answer what I have said he can answer it, but now he is going to the people of Christ Church. Let me tell him that this £400 can be spent in the right way. I suggest that that amount of money be ploughed into the proportion of $6,000 and provide proper accommodation for these officers. When the hon. member says that the people in Christ Church will not regard this £400 as a bagatelle, I should like to say that I have been taking care of myself in Christ Church for all of this time and I do not need his assistance.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think that the hon. member should talk about my assisting him in Christ Church. What I am saying is that £400 in addition to a salary of £1,300 is not spending the £400 wisely. The Barbados Government is paying this £1,700; the taxpayers are paying out this £1,700 and what we have to ask ourselves is this: "Do we want to pay this £1,700.?" They have not put down this amount as a salary because it would look too high; but if

you add this House Allowance to the salary, everybody will see that this officer is living in England and he has to pay this money. If you give the average Civil Servant $50 a month and call it house rent and you give him $600 a year more and call it house allowance, he will thank you for it. This amount of $50 a month as an average will cover your whole Civil Service. I do not care who the officer is; he could be my brother; if he cannot work for £1,300 and if the Government is afraid, then that is the Government's business. I am not voting for a House Allowance of any $480 for any of these officers. I do not care what service the officer is rendering now.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this debate has had to go on for so long: Speaking of the Liaison Officer, I think he is in relation to an ambassador, especially the one whom we have in Great Britain today. When this emigration to Great Britain started, it was one of the best lights which had ever shone in favour of Barbadians and also of West Indians. In my view, the light in Barbados had just begun to go out and it was God's mercies to open that door for sending out these poor people to work for money and help their dying relatives in Barbados. I think that it is a very good solution. As to the officer we have there, I think that every possible facility which is needed should be granted to him. I do not know that there is any need to argue that point in this debate; this officer has to go all over England so as to solve the problems of the workers, and he has to travel night and day in order to try to solve the problems of the Barbadians; when we are asleep and resting, many people are spending, eating and drinking out of these Barbadians. This Government therefore has to select somebody to look after the welfare of Barbadian emigrants and to help solve their problems, and I think it is one of the best jobs which could ever have been done.
5.25 p.m.

Talking about accommodation, Sir, I know that he must have some one visiting his home; so I am in agreement with the Representation Allowance, the Entertainment Allowance and the Housing Allowance as set out in this Resolution. Everything is in my opinion correct because the Liaison Officer has to meet both the big and the small man in Great Britain, and he has to be a man qualified to meet all kinds of people, and I should like to know that when they call at his home, it is acceptable and he can meet them at all times. I do not see why there should be so much argument on this, and I hope that the debate would not go any further.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I should add my contribution to this. I am supporting the Resolution, but because I am doing so there is no gainsaying or denying that some of the points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter should be taken notice of. There is absolute necessity for this officer, but unlike him I do not agree that the amount to be voted as a Representation Allowance and the Entertainment Allowance should be taken as salary, because whatever officer you have here must of necessity do some entertaining. That entertainment is not necessarily for his personal benefit, because I believe that any Liaison Officer who must come in contact with people, fore-men and people who run shops in places like that must of necessity find themselves in a position to entertain people and he cannot do it out of his pocket. On the other hand, I do not clearly recall what was meant by the Representation Allowance.

Although the Hon. Minister seems to have been at pains to anticipate all that the Opposition would ask, I am not quite satisfied about what he calls an Overseas Allowance, and I would like that made abundantly clear. I would like to have some better explanation of that, because I have come to the conclusion that the salary you are paying this officer is £1,700 a year. I hope the Government has taken this into consideration very clearly and have not gone panicky, because if this Officer is going to be part of your Establishment, you must remember that you have a Civil Service Association, and if you place this Officer in a grade to cause a feeling in the general rank and file of the Service or the top-ranking officers of the Service that an officer has been pitchforked into this post without the necessary academic qualifications which you have set for the general service, it might cause some confusion.

I am supporting the Resolution, but I must say I hope the Government is not becoming panicky and have studied it from every angle, because you are offering this officer exclusive conditions, and what I have in mind is the allowance which is called an Overseas Allowance. If you are offering £1,700 to this officer, I hope he is going to be recruited from Barbados because I do not subscribe to this idea that this is a foreign country that people are going to. If that is the idea, let us start to draw the line here and now. I believe that you should recruit and train these people from your rank and file, because there are times when the interests of West Indians and Englishmen must clash, and an Englishman in such a job must of necessity take the side of Englishmen; so I agree that you must appoint a man well trained and suitable for this job. It is not an Ambassador's job nor is it a Consul's job; it is true we have a Federation, but those of us who know Barbadians well enough know - and I do not know if I would be bringing tales out of school, but even the Secretary of State for the Colonies would have to admit it - that in England at the Transport Workers' Board you can see a marked difference in the Barbadians you have been sending up. This is also true at the Hospitals, and I have been told this by top-ranking officials from England.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to hear the Minister in reply tell us something more about this $2,400 which he calls an Overseas Allowance, because if he is receiving £1,300 as salary, then you will realise what grade that officer is in; he must be in the category of a Magistrate. I do not question the travelling or entertainment allowances, because those are absolutely necessary. If you are going to give him $500 which is noted here as a Representation Allowance and which you have suggested should be called an Overseas Allowance, then one of the other two Allowances would have to come off because this officer would be receiving £1,300 plus £500 which would be £1,800. If you are going to pay him an Overseas Allowance and a Representation Allowance, then you should take off the Rent Allowance. If he were living in Barbados and receiving the salary of £1,300, he would normally rent a house at $75 or $80 a month; that is what a Magistrate would pay for rent from such a salary. I think that Barbados is the best place in the world to live, but when some people go to England and come back they say England is. If you are going to ask a man to go to England and live, you should give him an Overseas Allowance, but I want you to convince me if you give him an Overseas Allowance, on to £1,300, why you should also give him a House Allowance.
5.35 p.m.

I am supporting the Resolution but I want that clearly explained. You must have this within the ambit of your entire Civil Service. Naturally, you have your office there and you must pick the most suitable persons for the job. I do not subscribe to the view that if he is suitable for the job, he should not be getting £1,300 a year. Let me repeat for the Hon. Minister, if you give him that salary, then give him $1,920 for Rent Allowance, then $2,400 as Representation Allowance, you must explain one or the other to me. I feel that you are entitled to give him £1,300 a year. I do not believe you will put anybody in a category below that. Why pay him Rent Allowance plus Overseas Allowance? Call it something else. Otherwise, I support the Resolution. I said Entertainment and Travelling Allowances. I believe the hon. member said that one was Travelling Allowance.

Hon. M. E. COX: Overseas Allowance is substituted for Entertainment Allowance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think I have to make any apologies for Entertainment Allowance. I think a man in his position is entitled to Entertainment Allowance and there should not be any apologies made for that. Do you remember, Mr. Chairman, I think it was the late Governor, Sir William Savage, who told the leader of my Party on the occasion that he had gone to New York to look into

the question of emigrants for the U.S.A. that he was on his way back to Barbados in the typical way after discussing everything and he met an Englishman who lived in America for a long time. Talking about the subject to the Englishman, the Englishman told him that he would never get a real discussion unless he got it at a cocktail party. Taking the Englishman at his word, he held a cocktail party and there he clinched the whole thing.

I have some other observations to make. The Hon. Minister gave us chapter and verse of what they have done. I want to note this because I have observed he has not referred to it. He said that he does not pay newspaper reports much attention, and then on a matter on which he was speaking he went on to describe what the newspaper said and then categorically denied such things as were put in the newspaper. I want to say this. We on this side, at least my Party, are fully conscious of the contribution which we made in the initial stages to get Government to see the wisdom in assisting people to go to England. We subscribe to the view of these people being of a high standard and keeping the good name of Barbados up abroad. It was expressed to us that the feeling in England was such that the Barbadian workers were doing well and they appreciated it. You would agree with me that there must have been some deflection from that because at one time, Mr. Chairman, as you know, you would not have got to train one single soul here with our standard of education for the London Transport Executive. We are fully conscious of what we are doing but we are more than conscious what would be the position if we of this Party had waited until today to bring Government to the realisation of their senses that it was their duty to see that people go to England.

Now, Sir, there was a release in the Press a few days ago setting out how many people had gone to the hospitals, and that Press release by the Government went on to say that the Government had been encouraging hospitals in England not to take girls from here unless they came through the Government sponsored scheme. I do not know if the Minister saw this because he said that he pays little attention to what appears in the Press. I did hear the Hon. Minister pointing out that he did not agree with everything he saw in the newspaper. I want the hon. member to say on the floor of the House if it is true that that is the policy of the Government. I hope it is not so because you have no chance of doing it. There is only a small number of these people who go as student nurses for whom the Government has secured jobs; and if that statement which we saw in the Press is correct, I will just ask, why are you doing it? Is this typical of the Government of Barbados? You do not send one-sixth of the people who go there to find work.

Now, backing that up is the attitude of the Police supported by the Government as regards obtaining passports. Listen to this. If the daughter of the hon. member on my right wants to go to England, she is not subjected to the examination and indignities of the daughter of the hon. member on my left. This girl may be the mother of two or three children, and unless she can satisfy Miss Arne or whoever is the Social Welfare Officer now that she has already obtained a job in the United Kingdom, the Police Department on the instructions of the Government will deny her a passport; but they will not deny one to the daughter of the hon. member on my right. You cannot get around this. If everybody has to show you something that they have obtained a job you will get very few people going there. You know as well as I do that people leave here and when they get there they get a job. Now, this is something which I took up with the Police myself. I want to know whether this was done on your authority. I know if you have got a conviction, you can be denied a passport. That is something which the Governor-in-Executive Committee can give or withhold. But why should the average working girl, who can raise enough money to England, because she may have three or four children through no fault of her own - because it is purely economics which resulted in her having those children - even if she cannot show you that she has already got a job, be denied a passport? This is their normal freedom. Have you subjected people to this type of thing before they get a passport?

Now, this is also for the information of the Hon. Minister. The Police go a little further than that and they say to people coming to get passports: "Show me that you have the ticket."

5.45 p.m.

A lot of people are going and putting down money and they do not get any passport; money is taken out of the deposit and it is not given back to these people because they are told: "We have to get a commission out of it." This representation has been made to me in my office. I have taken the matter to the Police Department and they have said that they have to issue a passport form and if they do issue it, Miss Arne must sign it and you must satisfy her with a letter saying that you have got a job in England. They are helping these people in one way, and in another way they are not helping them. Do you have the idea that these girls would corrupt the morals of the British people? Well, this cannot even be acid and vinegar. This is not an accusation against the Minister; it is exactly what the Deputy Commissioner of Police told me and what the Sargeant told me. Are you going to withhold passports from the Minister's daughter or the Premier's daughter or your own daughter? Why are you doing it to other people?

Let us all face the facts, If at the time when people had to go to the United States of America everybody had said: "I cannot give you a passport unless you show me that you have a job," how many people would have got passports? I suggest to the Minister that he put his foot down on this matter now. There is no justifiable reason in the world why a girl of nineteen who wants to go to England should have to go to Miss Arne so as to get a passport. These things are done against people and they are done more against the women than against the men. I do not think that these things should be allowed to go on. There are other things which are being done in that Department about which I shall speak at a later date, but for now I will draw to the attention of the Minister that although they are helping people in one way they are not helping them in another way.

Another point is this. I understand that the Liaison Officer is usually kept in touch with the emigrants from the Emigration Department. I think that the Minister should do something about this. Nowadays batches of seventy-five to eighty people leave here by plane, which is nothing to do with the Government scheme. This may sound difficult to you, but you have three or four lines which carry people to England all the time; you should not only inform the Liaison Officer as to those who go to England through the Government scheme but also of those who go to England otherwise. According to the Government's policy, no information is given when these other people are at the London Airport. I should like to hear the hon. member's explanation on this matter. I support the Resolution because I feel we need a Liaison Officer. I do not think that this amount of £1,300 a year is too much; I think he should have entertainment and travelling allowance, but, speaking for myself, if you take £1,300 plus £400 and you have an overseas allowance, living outside Barbados you would be paying something more; however I cannot see that House Allowance and also this Overseas Allowance should be given. Nobody could question the Travelling Allowance and the Entertainment Allowance, nor do I think anybody could question the salary; but as to the House Allowance and also Overseas Allowance there does appear to be some clash there and I should like to hear the Hon. Minister on that. As regards the question about the passports, I hope the Minister has heard what I have said.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the points which have been made by hon. members. First of all, I would like to thank those hon. members who supported the Resolution, the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City who have made very valuable contributions towards this debate. Although it was not unexpected, I cannot see that anybody who has the interest of the people of this island at heart, could seriously oppose this Resolution. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I was very surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. As a matter of fact, if those remarks had come from the hon. junior member for Christ

Church I would not have been a bit surprised; but I am very surprised to hear them coming from the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

I hope that the hon. member will not take any offence at what I am saying because I do not mean any sarcasm, but I am speaking facts. The hon. member, like many of us, has sprung from very humble circumstances and I can assure him that as far as we are concerned, if he goes to the skies, we would appreciate it; we are glad to see that somebody like him can rise to the top and carry every thing with him, even his behaviour (Mr. WALCOTT: I did not quite catch what the hon. member said.) I said that I would like to see him rise to the top and carry with him even his good behaviour. *(Laughter)* Another thing is that the hon. member is the Secretary of the only Trade Union which represents the workers in this island and you would have expected, that he, rather than attempt to push down the salary and perquisites of an individual, would have commented the other way around; that is to say, that he would have.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I did not attempt to push down the salary; I did not say that the salary was too much. The hon. member must quote me correctly. I said that I did not agree with the House Allowance which you are giving to any of these officers. Do not let the hon. member misquote me.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member was not listening to me. If he had been listening to me, he would not have interrupted me. I was referring to the salary and perquisites.

5.55 p.m.

As soon as you calculated and added them together, you commented on the whole. I would have thought that coming from him he would have agitated and said we are not doing justice to this officer or we are not doing sufficient rather than to speak in the manner in which he spoke against this Resolution and against the persons concerned who are in charge of that Department.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would not have the hon. member say that I spoke against the person or persons in charge of the office. Throughout the whole debate I said nothing against the persons in charge of the office. I must repeat that I was against the Housing Allowance and in my closing remarks I said that even if it were my brother I would not vote for the House Allowance.

Hon. M. E. COX: The first thing the hon. member said, and he repeated in parrot-like form exactly what the hon. junior member for St. John said some weeks ago relative to Barbados *vis-a-vis* the West Indies, was that we were becoming the laughing stock of the West Indies, and he talked about following the bogus Colonial policy. What is bogus in this? I thought he would have lauded a policy such as this because it seeks to put our people in a similar footing with European people wherever they go. Mr. Pickwoad used to do this job and when the Resolution came before this House in 1955 no member got up and criticised Mr. Pickwoad getting $7,680 per annum plus a Representation Allowance of $2,400 and another allowance of $960 a year.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it was not only criticised but I said from the floor of this House that he had no right to be the person in England, and the hon. member knows that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the debates are here and I am sure that if the member reads what was said, he would take back those remarks. Again I repeat there was absolutely no criticism when the Resolution was before us on the last occasion for the establishment of this office. I cannot speak wildly like some people; I want to speak so that you can check me. Mr. Chairman, when the office was established and these allowances were given to Mr. Pickwoad, with the exception of the House Allowance, there was absolutely no criticism, and one of the reasons for not giving Mr. Pickwoad a House Allowance, was because of the fact that he was an Englishman going home.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, let me tell the hon. member that Mr. Pickwood was seconded. The House did not know under what conditions he was seconded; so it was something done at Cabinet level.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution that instituted the office which provided for the establishment of this Service carried with it the salary that would have been paid to Mr. Pickwoad as well as the Representation Allowance of $2,400 and the other Allowance of $960, and there was no question of a House Allowance because the Officer was going home. To bear out my argument, I will just quote a few cases which I hope will suffice the hon. member for the City as well, while I am on this. This is the position as it stands with the Oversea Offices as they are set up in Canada and the United Kingdom. The hon. senior member for St. Peter asked who would pay $13,000 and a House Allowance; let him listen to these salaries which are being paid now and the perquisites which follow:

The Commissioner gets $14,400 as salary, $7,200 Representation Allowance, Housing Allowance $4,800 and Overseas Allowance $1,200. His principal Secretary gets $10,800, Representation Allowance $2,400, House Allowance $4,800 and Overseas Allowance $960. The Commercial Secretary gets $8,800, Representation Allowance $2,400, House Allowance $1,920 and Overseas Allowance $960. The Administrative Secretary gets $4,080 by $240 to $5,520, House Allowance $480, Overseas Allowance $720. Now even the Secretary for Student Affairs gets a Representation Allowance of $720, a House Allowance of $480 and an Overseas Allowance of $960.

Now let us turn to Canada; the Canadian Commissioner gets $12,000, a Representation Allowance of $7,200, House Allowance $5,000 Overseas Allowance $1,680. The Deputy Commissioner gets $8,880, Representation Allowance $2,400, House Allowance $3,600 and Overseas Allowance $1,440. The Assistant Commissioner - and this is the Students part of it - gets $6,480X $240 - $7,440, Representation Allowance $720, House Allowance $600, and Overseas Allowance $1,200. The Assistant Commissioner, Public Relations and Tourism gets $6,480x$240 - $7,440, Representation Allowance $1,200, House Allowance $600 and Overseas Allowance $1,200.

6.05 p.m.

It goes down to Administrative Assistant. He gets a salary of $4,080 by 240 to $5,520, a House Allowance of $480, and an Overseas Allowance of $960. That is the position, Mr. Chairman, that exists at present in the United Kingdom and also in Canada in so far as the Commissioner's Office is concerned.

Now, the hon. senior member for St. Peter started off on the wrong leg saying that it was ludicrous to provide for a Stenographer-Typist. If you read the Addendum you will see that no such provision is made for the Stenographer-Typist.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. No, Sir, I never said that was so. The Hon. Minister pretends when I am speaking that he is paying no attention to what I am saying and subsequently wants to quote me. He must do both. I called out the name of the Secretary/Welfare Officer and then made comparison with the Stenographer-Typist. I said that if the Stenographer-Typist is being paid £10 a week, which is £520 per annum, what is the justification of giving the Secretary/Welfare Officer a House Allowance and you are not giving that to the Stenographer-Typist when the two are in the same category. I further said that the Secretary/Welfare Officer is the type of person whom you are going to recruit as a Stenographer and that person will migrate into that same job.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member referred sarcastically to the office of the Liaison Officer. He said that

he is not a Governor; he is not an ambassador. He said: "Who is he?" What am I to understand from that?

Mr. WALCOTT: If the language which I used is language which he cannot understand, well then, I do not know. I said something about arch-protagonist and he said that it was vulgar. I said that within the hierachy of this thing that the Liaison Officer is a third rater; that is to say, he is not Head of a Department and his structure will come down to a lower level. I did not say it in that vulgar sense as you hear in that Barbados sense when you say "who is he?"

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said: "Who is he?" All that he has to do is to look after a few poor people to find jobs for them. In other words he meant that these people in that office were of no consequence.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member was on a platform or out of the House, well then he could carry on there. Only a person with a warped mentality would from what I said conclude that which he says. Because you say that this man is not within the hierachy, would you conclude what the hon. member has concluded? When you compare, what you have to do? The conclusion he wants to make is a political thing of it. Only an eroded mind would come to that conclusion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Please try and avoid those personal remarks. Now that you have made the point - now that you have explained what you mean in relation to the salary of the Liason Officer, there is no need to carry it any further.

Mr. WALCOTT: You were in the Chair to hear him. I say that only an eroded mind would conclude that I was speaking in a derogatory manner of these people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Having made that point of order, would the hon. member listen to me?

Hon. M. E. COX: They will talk any old thing whenever they like, but when you reply they just cannot take it. I am not lying. I do not tell lies. This is what the hon. member said: "Whom is he meeting? He is only dealing with poor people who want jobs." What must I understand from that? I can only conclude - and reasonably so - that there are people who meet people on a higher stratum than he.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that he has to meet people and these employers on a level. But as I have said, only an eroded mind would come to that conclusion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister did not say you said so.

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh yes, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said that he can only conclude.

Mr. WALCOTT: "He " is a pronoun and a noun must go before that and that noun is the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said: "I can only conclude."

Mr. WALCOTT: He said: "I can only conclude from what he said." "He means the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The Hon. Minister talked about these poor people. He said that I said: "Who these people are? They are nobody." What I was referring to is when he made the statement that these people must have this House Allowance. I said: " Whom does the Liaison Officer have to meet?" I said that he does not have to meet these employers in his home. When you meet them, you do not meet them in your home; you meet them outside.

Hon. M. E. COX: I heard his speech. He went further that that. He said: "What social position is his?" "What justification is it for taking up the taxpayers' money to give him?"

Mr. WALCOTT: I said: "What social position is his *vis-a-vis* his assistant? His assistant is going to get $480 as House Allowance and he is going to get $1,920." I said: "What is his social position *vis-a-vis* his second?" I can remember my speech from chapter to verse. If the hon. members around him are advising him, let them advise him correctly.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, again I would repeat that I did not expect a speech like that from the hon. member because I am sure that the hon. member has had the opportunity of visiting England on several occasions, and that member has been taken around by the Liaison Officer and has been shown things, and he knows the callings which are made on this Officer from time to time not only dealing with poor people as he puts it.

This Officer has to deal with people on the highest level. He and I went to Sir Brian Robertson who is Chairman of the British Railways and discussed the question of getting more of our people to England. You have to meet people on the highest level. You are not only meeting poor people, the poor hard-working people, and trying to get jobs for them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Now that the Hon. Minister has paused, it is a good time for me to rise on a point of order. Is the Hon. Minister concluding that I said that the gentleman was only meeting people like that? Did I say that? I said that he had to meet these people but that it was not a matter of his meeting these people at the house in which he has to live. When he has to meet these people, it is a question of his entertaining them to lunch. In so far as Representation Allowance, I was not against their getting Representation Allowance. I said that he should get it but I did not agree with his getting £400 as House Allowance.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt the hon. member to that extent.

6.15 p.m.

The hon. member made one of the biggest mistakes which anybody could have made, when he said that we should not try to get these people out, because sending them out does not add to our income.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. This hon. member is going crazy or foolish; he does not understand what people say. I agreed with the travelling allowance but I said that sending out these people is not an answer to the problem because when they go out they are not building up the economy of Barbados, but the economy of the place to which they have gone.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept that, but I will show you, Mr. Chairman, how wrong he is. Whence do our hard-working people of African descent get money to establish themselves in this country? They went to Panama, Cuba, Curacao and they made and sent back money to their families to buy land, property and all that sort of thing. Owners were ready to cut them up and they were able to change the political face of this island. They got the vote, because they could not vote unless they had certain qualifications. These people were able to go outside and send back millions of dollars to this country for the purpose of buying land and property, educating their children and all that sort of thing. How could the hon. member get it into his head that it does not help the economy of this island when these people go abroad?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. If the hon. member does not understand what I said, I will repeat it. I made the statement within the context of saying that we have to do something in Barbados. I drew the instance of St. Kitts and Dominica and the hon. member rose on a point of order and said that that was not relevant. Now it is not irrelevant for him to say what he is saying or doing. I say that what we are doing here cannot increase the national income.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, one only has to look at the remittances at the Post Office and see that sub-

stantial sums are made which help to boost the economy of this country. If it had not been for the fact that the people ran from the despots of this island and the exploiters and went outside and worked for money, where would we be today? They are the people who have made a transformation politically, socially and economically of this island. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who are they running from now?) The hon. member says that you cannot compare this office with that of the Chief Justice and with other offices, but how does the Chief Justice come in here? Is it that only the Chief Justice can live in a big house or something like that? I have already said that this work is not given its due weight and consideration. This is the foundation of the future of our people; they are not only able to work for their livelihood, but they are able to improve their conditions and to fit themselves into bigger and better jobs as time goes on. This is something to which the strongest support should be given rather than anybody telling a man: "You are living in England and I will not give you any House Allowance."

The salary of this Liaison Officer has been fixed at $6,240 per annum and the hon. member asked at one time: "Suppose you get a slump and unemployment arises in England and these people are no longer employed, what would happen with this office?" I want to tell the hon. member that we thought that matter over too, because we have just as much intelligence and foresight as they have over there. If this office goes "bum" - as a matter of fact, I think it will grow bigger and bigger - the individual can be brought back here and be integrated into the service because this individual does not get the salary of the Head of a Department although he is the Head of a Department. I know that every word which the hon. senior member for Christ Church has spoken is true. Mr. Chairman, something went radically wrong with the hon. senior member for St. Peter today. Do you know what he did? He relegated the home of an important officer such as our Liaison Officer to Strand Palace Hotel; he said that you can get a room and breakfast for 37/6 a day. But what sort of accommodation do you get? You get a room 8 ft. by 8 ft. with a wash-basin and a bed. There is no sanitary convenience whatsoever in your room. All the other sanitary conveniences are communal; you meet two or three on the floor and so on. Everybody uses them; I wait on you and you wait on me. The hon. member is thus comparing an officer who has to attend to people these people take some time before they find their feet and you are asking the officer to live in circumstances similar to those of an individual who goes to a hotel with a toilet and bath in a room.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The Government of Barbados has had delegations going out. I have been sent out and have been accommodated in such places, having been sent by the Government of Barbados. Therefore, when the hon. member says that I relegate an officer, it is not a question of relegation; it is a comparison to show the rental value. Hotel charges are infinitely higher than any flat charges; there is no question of relegation.

6.25 p.m.

If some one says that you get a place at ten guineas a week, it means that the hotel charges are infinitely higher than flat charges.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, those are only interruptions. The hon. member is thinking about himself who goes up for a day, two weeks or six weeks as compared with a man, his wife and children to be housed. Is it not ridiculous? Do you want to push him in a room at 37/6?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with a man and his wife and children. This is an office, and if this man does not own a child this is going to be paid to him; so we cannot have this nonsense about a man and his wife and children.

Hon. M. E. COX: Surely, Mr. Chairman, if we go a step further he could have referred to a third rate hotel called Charing Cross. What do you pay there? The rate is £3. 17s. 6d., and you get sanitary conveniences; but the hon. member refers to the meanest, cheapest and most inadequate accommodation.

As the hon. member puts it, and as it will appear from his speech, he thinks this office should be treated in an offhand manner, but this is what was laid down at the time in a Supplementary Resolution in 1955. This is what is says:

"The functions of the Interim Organisation" - which is this organisation - "would include the provision of advice and assistance to and liaison with Government Organisations, Trade Unions, Welfare Organisations etc. or the employment and settlement of Barbadians in the United Kingdom; the supply of information on the employment situation etc. in the United Kingdom to this Government; the settlement of Barbadian workers in suitable employment; advice and assistance to them in matters of accommodation etc., and personal problems and public relations work."

Do you look at that as a mean job in dealing with a few poor people? I do not think there could be more important pronouncements and obligations in any organisation than in this. This deals with Trade Unions, and the hon. member just referred to Sir Alfred Roberts who was a T.U.C. man as far as I understand; (Mr. WALCOTT: He still is.) but the hon. member failed miserably to give this office the importance which it deserves. I know for myself, Mr. Chairman, and what the hon. member for Christ Church said is a fact, that this Liaison Officer has to go and meet workers whenever they are to arrive at the various train stations, he has to provide transportation for them to their homes; he has to look for people to cook meals for them until they find their feet, and everything connected with the welfare and well being of these immigrants he has to deal with when they get there. Some nights and until the early hours of the morning that officer is at one of these stations, Paddington, Victoria or somewhere else, sitting down inside waiting for these immigrants. It is a very important job and one which taxes the individual in the highest form.

Mr. Chairman, all we are asked to do today is to make that individual a little more comfortable than he is at present. I should like to say at this stage that I am glad the hon. senior member for Christ Church has touched on the point of providing quarters. If the House turns it down when it comes here, it is a matter for the House, but I can assure the hon. member that I was working on it for a few months; and explorations, in so far as finding a suitable place for this Officer and more of these officers, are going on so that the Government will be able to house him and the staff, with the exception maybe of the typist.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Minister, but I would like to hear him on the question of a Housing Loan scheme for the staff.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to provide permanent housing for this staff. I know that only recently that officer was given notice to leave where he is now living, and if you want this office to succeed you cannot allow your officer to be placed at the whims and fancies of the landlords who overnight can tell him that they do not want him any longer, so he has to go any old place to live where the immigrants find it difficult ot get in touch with him. We want to establish an office in the centre of London — a home rather — for this staff, and we intend doing that; so I would like the hon. member to know that early and he can come prepared because we intend to establish a home for this staff.

Now as regards housing for immigrants, I would like the hon. member to know, as perhaps he has forgotten, that we provide housing for accommodation for our workers in this way; we loan landlords money to purchase houses and these landlords have got to assure us that at least we will have so many places in each house for these workers. In other words, as I said just now, when you get to London for the first time, the Liaison Officer meets you there at the station or from the boats as the case may be, takes you to homes, finds people there to cook for you and everything until you are able to branch out on your own; so the ques-

tion of purchasing houses is taken care of. As a matter of fact, we referred to Brixton where I think we had two or three from that chap Leslie who is a Jamaican. Mr. Eytle and a few others have had loans with which to purchase houses so as to ensure that when our workers get to England they would have somewhere to live.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have replied to all the points that were raised.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I raised some points.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry. I answered the first one, but I will go back to the question of the House Allowance.
6.35 p.m.
I pointed out that these other people, when the Service is established, would get House Allowance.

Well now, the hon. senior member for the City referred to the question of getting passports signed but, perhaps, I better deal with the Information Service first. The hon. member said that the Government was doing everything to prevent as it were, or words to that effect, hospitals in England from recruiting persons who were not sponsored by the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It looks as if the Hon. Minister is relying on memory. I have not said so. I said that there was a release in the Press purporting to come from the Information Service to the effect that Government was encouraging hospitals in England not to take anyone to be trained in their hospitals unless such persons came through the Government. I also said that the hon. member said that he does not pay much attention to newspaper reports; therefore, I expected him to get up and say whether that has anything to do with Government policy. Therefore, I ask the Hon. Minister to make a statement as far as that is concerned. On the question of passports, I told him what I knew personally.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as the first part is concerned, it is beyond my knowledge. No doubt it is a question which does not fall under my portfolio; therefore, I would not be able to reply at this stage. I would have to find out if that is correct.

However, I would say that that is not our policy at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I just wanted him to say that this is not their policy. What is the position as regards those people saying to them: "Show me the paper for the job you expect to get," and if it is that you say that they must show that they have got a job before they go.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as that question is concerned, I have no knowledge of that. The hon. member will appreciate that that question falls under the portfolio of the Hon. Premier. I would say that could not be any policy of ours either. I have told Lord Lloyd when he came here in no uncertain manner and many other English people — Sir Thomas Miles and such people — that we will do absolutely nothing to prevent Barbadians from going to England. As a matter of fact, we go further. Instead of doing anything to prevent them, we will do everything possible to help them to get there. And that is what we are doing today. I want it to be recorded. That is what I say now and for all times.

As far as the issuing of passports is concerned, I will promise the hon. member that tomorrow I will have that matter investigated. There is one thing which I would like to make clear. I do know of cases of men and women who go and apply for loans and they are told that we cannot allow you to have a loan unless you can satisfy us that there is reasonable chance of your being employed in England. They do that because we still want to know where we can put our fingers on persons who are getting our money.

I would like for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to inform him that sometimes he is knowledgeable on some things, but he is not up-to-date all the time. The hon. member said that there were some 4,000 jobs vacant in the transport business.

Mr. WALCOTT: I read from a paper published by the International Transport Workers Federation.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member went on to say that the Transport Authorities were so badly off for workers that they were bringing into operation an incentive bonus to encourage people to come and join the staff. I would like to tell him that that is not strictly correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I made no comment of my own. It was an absolutely authoritative statement. I read the statement as it was sent to me and it was only a matter of coincidence that I had it here at the time. In order that I should make no mistake I will look for it and read it again.

Hon. M. E. COX: When the hon. member finds what he is looking for, he can rise again. I will give way to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The statement which I read was to the effect that they were doing everything to encourage workers. They were giving incentive bonus to the drivers and conductors in the London Transport Executive and one of the problems which they still have was a shortage of 4,000 people.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know that there is a shortage. I would take this opportunity to reply to the hon. senior member for Christ Church who suggested that I should press for a larger quota and that I should go to England and fight for a greater number. If we can find 4,000 or 5,000 people to fill the vacancies, the London Transport Executive would take them. We just cannot. (A VOICE: You cannot find them?) We must train people. That is why we have seven centres at which we train these people. (A VOICE: We have them.) If they will come forward. If you know where they are. I have spoken over radio. (A VOICE: Put a notice in the Press.) If you can get them to come forward I would be more than glad because the London Transport Executive would take them. There is a shortage of them.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that I asked this question since last week, I am glad to hear the Hon. Minister say what he did. I suggest that you engage the front page of the Advocate to advertise that you need people for this purpose and that you also put your Information Officer on the radio on Friday this week and every time possible to announce this until you get 4,000 people.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I would only like to make this last comment, and it is as regards the total emolument, and that includes perquisites, and so on, which Mr. Pickwoad got when he was Liaison Officer. His salary was $7,680 and his allowances — representation and otherwise — brought him a total of $11,040.
6.45 p.m.
The office, with this establishment will now be $11,520, a difference of $40 a month. (Mr. WALCOTT: It is expensive) The hon. member says that it is expensive. I have never thought that Trade Union people were so Conservative especially when they are becoming rich. I think that I have replied to all the points which have been raised and again, I repeat, I thank those hon. members who spoke in favour of this Resolution for their contribution. (Mr. WALCOTT: Be careful of the Greeks when they bring gifts.) If a man is like the Devil and he has a good point, I am not so mean as not to give him that good point. (Mr. WALCOTT: You must have got converted.) But not in your Church.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, hon. members are not considering this matter as seriously as they should. This is a matter which has been exercising the attention of the members of the Opposition Party for some time. Earlier this year the hon. junior member for St. John drew the attention of this House to the fact that there was this large vacancy on the London Transport Board, and the only thing the Minister did not call him was a liar; he said that it could not be true.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. When did I ever do that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: When the hon. junior member for St. John on the floor of this House said that there was this large vacancy on the London Transport Board the hon. senior member for St. Michael accused him of misleading the public and said that it was not the truth. As soon as the hon. member finds the debate I will quote from it. The hon. senior member for St. Michael made a most vitriolic attack on the hon. junior member for St. John on this matter. But this is only the beginning of the question.

This is the position, Mr. Chairman; although the London Transport Board will take three thousand or four thousand Barbadians now to fill the vacancies there, the Minister can get there and boast that if they could get them they would be taken. Well, they cannot get them because they cannot fulfil the educational requirements. The Government has had to set up training centres all over the island to try to bring applicants to the required standard, and I am saying without the slightest fear of contradiction that the Barbados Labour Party Government is guilty of the most criminal neglect in the entire history of this colony, and of the greatest shock to the educational policy for entire generations in this colony. Twenty years ago it would have been an absolute impossibility not to find four thousand young men in this country who are capable of filling posts in the London Transport Board. But with the Government's age-grouping policy and the manner in which they have destroyed the whole educational system of this island, they have condemned the young people of this island to ignorance and unemployment all over the world. When the history of this island comes to be written, the greatest blot, indeed the greatest blight, on the entire administration of the Government for the last fifteen years in this island, will be what they have done to the educational standard of this country. I agree with the Minister; if the London Transport Executive wanted fourteen thousand people in spite of our traditions in education, we could not supply even one thousand tonight for the simple reason that the educational qualifications of our people are not up to the required standard.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I could allow the hon. member to get away with that. That is not correct; there are thousands of people . . . . .

Mr. CRAWFORD: He is not making any point of order; he can speak when I am finished.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot anticipate what the hon. member is going to say.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am in a position to say that there are thousands of young men and women in this island who can measure up to the qualifications required, but they do not want to go to England. They would go tomorrow morning if they were going to the United States of America or Canada.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you have so many thousands qualified, why did you have to set up these training centres? Does the hon. member expect that he is talking to a bunch of little children, that there are only four thousand qualified men and women in this island without the prospects of getting jobs, coming out of the schools with nothing to do and they are not willing to go to England? All over the island people are mortgaging their houses, they are selling their cattle and doing whatever they can so as to get money to go to England.

6.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, that could not be true either.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The Government lends up to $360 for passage and passages are between $320 and $340.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He probably thinks because, when he goes away, he goes at Government expense that when people are going away all they need is passage money. Do they go naked? You must remember, Mr. Chairman, that you are talking to people who, when we suggested that money should be lent to people to go to England, said that they were not taking up Government money and lending every Tom, Dick and Harry to go to England, and he said just now, Mr. Chairman, that the Government lends money when they are satisfied that the person is going to a job. It is not as easy as that. You have got to have a written statement from the firm that is going to employ you saying that when you get there you will be employed before they lend you money. But I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that it is the biggest blot on the entire educational history of this island that they could have done what they have done to the educational system of this island. Let there be no mistake about it; the educational standards of this island today are not what they should be. They have refused, Mr. Chairman, to provide .....

I do not expect certain people on the opposite side of the Table to understand anything I say, Mr. Chairman, but the trouble is that what people should realise is that because they themselves are suffering from lack of education they should not want to condemn future generations of the country to the same fate. After all, Mr. Chairman, it is true that a number of uninformed, semi-educated and less than educated people have found themselves in the position of prominence through sheer fortune, but we have passed those days.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 o'clock p.m.

On Resumption,

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 10

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension the hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am taking some time out to reply to some statements made during the course of this Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that I see a foot on the Table.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that that is a most stupid interruption to the debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, that is not fair, that is not a stupid interruption. When have we before interrupted the hon. member?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have seen the ex-Premier talk for an entire period with his foot on the Table and nobody said anything.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want to draw to Your Honour's attention that the hon. senior member for the City is sitting with his foot on the Table.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to say that you are lying. Do you see my foot on the Table? If you see it, come and move it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City .....

Mr. MOTTLEY: What!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot answer the Chairman like that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say you cannot sit and cross talk like that. I have sent for the Rules to see if I can find anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Where is my foot on the Table?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have instructed the Clerk to go for the Rules of the House, but I am saying that you cannot sit and shout across the Table like that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Sir, that some time has to be taken to reply to the statements made by the Hon. Minister during the course of this debate with reference to the impossibility of recruiting Barbadians for work on the London Transport Service, and the Minister came out with the ingenious distortion that there are thousands of people in Barbados who have the required qualification who will not apply for these jobs because they do not want to go to England, and if it were the States of America they would go. Mr. Chairman, that is a michievous piece of propaganda it is a canard to which the strongest exception has to be taken on this side of the Table. We would be only too delighted if this were true, because it would mean we would not have to hang our heads in shame when confronted with the deteriorating standards of education in the country, but this is mere mischievous propaganda and very far from the truth.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I must object to those remarks. I will tell this House and the world that that behaviour forms no part of my nature, and I would say that a million times. I have had and still have people coming to me daily with a secondary education or rather some form of secondary education who did not get school certificates who are seeking employment, and when I introduce England to them they all say "no, we do not want to go to England." They are willing to go on the farm labour scheme to the United States before they would go to England. That happens daily in my office, and I say again that I object to the words "misleading, mischievous propaganda".

Mr. CRAWFORD: Where did you get all those words from?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said "michievous propaganda" and I object to those remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now, Mr. Chairman, nobody in his right senses ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has objected to the words "mischievous propaganda". I think it is a somewhat personal reference and I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: A personal reference?

7.50 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You say it is a personal reference. Is it unparliamentary?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is a reference to a member of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that his statement is mischievous propaganda.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You accused the Leader of the House of making a statement which is mischievous propaganda. I am asking you to withdraw the remark.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The remark is not unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked you to withdraw the words.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You must have some sort of standard of debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The remark is not becoming.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Do you mean even though the statement which is made is an obvious distortion of the fact?

A VOICE: It is obvious to you.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Here and there you meet people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made it worse by the remark which you have just made. All I am asking you to do is to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is it unparliamentary? I was saying Mr. Chairman, that we, on this side of the Table, --

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to withdraw the remark.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On what ground?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is unbecoming to make personal references to hon. members in that manner.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not made any personal reference. I have said that the statement which he has made of the inability of the Government or of the country to obtain recruitment is mischievous propaganda because it is an absolute distortion of the facts of the case. And I further said, Mr. Chairman --

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still awaiting the withdrawal by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are you saying that I made a statement which constitutes a personal reference to the person making a statement?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In my opinion it is unbecoming and unparliamentary. The words which you used were 'mischievous propaganda' and then later you explained it by saying that it was an obvious distortion of the fact.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I wish I had a pound note for every-time I heard such a statement used.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I now rule that it is unparliamentary and unbecoming and that you withdraw the words.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Ho! Ho! There have been very strange rulings in my time but this beats the cake. Are you saying, Mr. Chairman, that it is unparliamentary? *(Laughter).* This is an important matter and they are making fun.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have made a ruling and you have not obeyed it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have asked you on what ground must I withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is unbecoming and unparliamentary.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is no Chamber in any part of the world which would rule in that manner. The Chairman should rule but he does not want to rule and make a fool of himself. There is nothing unparliamentary in those words. I respectfully submit that you are misguided and mistaken as stating that it is an unparliamentary reference.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a matter of opinion. All I ask you to do is to obey the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am prepared to face election on this issue at any time. They have destroyed the educational

system of this country with their stupidity. All that they are doing is pussy-footing in here. If they do not want to talk in here, we'll talk outside. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is much too important to make a football of it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. I having made a ruling that you should withdraw the remarks, that is a ruling of the Chair which you should obey.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Right or wrong, the Chair must be obeyed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you do not withdraw the remarks, I will call the Speaker. Are you going to withdraw the remarks?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On what ground?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already answered that. You are now disobeying the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have the greatest respect for the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now disobeying the Chair. Withdraw the remarks, and let us proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I could not in fairness to myself.
8.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rule 35 says this: I will read it for the benefit of the hon. member:

"The Speaker in the House or the Chairman in Committee shall be responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and Committee respectively, and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion. Notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 20 (Manner of giving Notices), such a motion shall not require more than two days' notice."

I have made a decision and I have asked the hon. member to withdraw the words which he has used; I cannot hear the hon. member until he withdraws the remarks. The Rule specifically says "and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion."

Mr. CRAWFORD: I submit that these Rules were made in the belief that the Chair would be held and occupied in a responsible manner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a matter of opinion. The Rule simply states what is the position of the Chair upon any point of order. I have made a decision and I have asked the hon. member to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Rules envisage that members of the House will obey the ruling of the Chair, but also that the rulings of the Chair would conform to certain required standards. They should be impartial, reasonable and issued in a responsible manner; and, Mr. Chairman, on your own you would not have found yourself in this position. You are being pushed into an unfortunate position.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is going a little too far. I called for order and you have added that there was an obvious distortion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is wrong with that? Even in Heaven the angels quarrel and if I could not say it was an obvious distortion, it would be of no use our coming in here. I have not gone on yet to substantiate my case.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are breaking one of the most important Rules of the House; you are disobeying the Chair. As to whether it is right or wrong, that does not apply now. I have made my ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Chair were to confess that its rulings are unimportant one way or the other....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Rule says that the decision of the Chair upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except on a substantive motion.

Mr. BRANCKER: The Rule says that the decision shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion, and it goes on to say "notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 20 (manner of giving Notices) such a motion shall not require more than two days' notice." I would advise the hon. member to withdraw the words if they were unparliamentary, but I happen to know that they are not unparliamentary and "May's' supports me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I having come to a decision and made a ruling, is the hon. junior member for St. Lucy telling me that the hon. member is right to disobey the Chair? I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw the words and continue his speech. Is it the intention of the hon. member to withdraw the words and continue his speech?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have made a ruling and spoken to the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. senior member for St. Philip a question; I have asked him if it is his intention to withdraw the words?

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you must hear me on a point of order. I want to know how many are ruling. Am I in order, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You having ruled, I am not questioning your ruling, but I want to get myself acquainted with the Rules of the House. Having allowed the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to speak are you still ruling? The hon. senior member for St. Philip was on his feet, you allowed some other hon. member to speak and having done that you called upon the senior member for St. Philip again. I want you to rule on that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy rose on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Having allowed him to speak, I insist that you should hear me as well. I would not have got on my feet when you were dealing with the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is an old parliamentarian in this House. As I was saying, Sir, having allowed the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to speak on a point of order, how are you going to deal with the hon. senior member for St. Philip now?
8.10 p.m.

Now having allowed him to speak on a point of order, I am wondering whether the Clerk can advise you now. How are you going to deal with me now? That is what I want to know for future reference. I maintain that you have forfeited the right to deal with the hon. senior member for St. Philip, but as far as I am concerned, I have such a high regard for you, that I would have withdrawn the words, although I would have come back in another way although the words might not have been unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I draw this to the hon. member's attention? I allowed the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to speak on a point of order because he was making reference to the ruling, but he did not speak on the motion. He spoke on a point of order and continued to read the Rule I was quoting which was an attempt to refer to my point.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And therefore you forfeited the right to enforce your ruling. There are no two ways about it. If

we are going to follow Parliamentary practice and procedure, you have forfeited that right. I would have withdrawn and come back a little harder, but I watched carefully because it might happen with me. Having allowed the hon. member to speak on a point of order, you have forfeited the right to deal with the hon. member; so I do not see how you can do it. I am not trying to get around you, but I would have withdrawn; so the time for enforcing that Rule has passed and gone. Although the Chairman finds himself in that corner, I would say that if it offends the Chair I would withdraw and go on to make my speech.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying to the hon. member now is that although you have forfeited the right to rule, the hon. member should not take advantage of the situation. One of the things which make it so difficult is that you said it does not matter whether the words are unparliamentary, but you cannot be so dogmatic from the Chair. I believe you show some partiality, but I would say to the hon. member that in as much as you have forfeited the right to rule, he should withdraw the words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see it in that light. The hon. senior member for the City has made his point of order and I do not wish any debate on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And you do not maintain that you have forfeited your right? Then we can go no where from here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have had discussions with the Clerk and on his advice that is the decision I have arrived at. The hon. senior member for St. Philip.....

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. Can the Chairman have no hearing?

Mr. TUDOR: I am willing to hear you, but as you have heard two hon. members on points of order, you have no good ground for refusing to hear a third.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. TUDOR: Having risen on a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again asking the hon. senior member for St. Philip if he is going to withdraw the words as requested by the Chair. If the hon. member refuses to withdraw the words, it is my intention to put the question if no one else desires to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have intentions of speaking on the Resolution, but I will give him a chance to see whether he is going to withdraw.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rose on a point of order and Your Honour refused even to countenance it, and I wish to know whether you are willing to hear me now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking on the Resolution?

Mr. TUDOR: I have risen on a point of order. My point of order is this. The Chair has drawn the attention of the Committee to Rule 35 in which it says that the Speaker in the House or the Chairman in Committee shall be responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the House and Committee respectively, and his decision upon any point of order shall not be open to appeal and shall not be reviewed by the House except upon a substantive motion. My point of view is that the rule which has been quoted here is not relevant to our particular situation at the moment, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you questioning the ruling?

Mr. TUDOR: I will not question the ruling because there is no relevance between the debate which is going on and the Rule which has been quoted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was my opinion that it was relevant and I quoted it. When you are going to argue it, you are questioning the ruling, and the ruling is not open to question.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is some confusion here. Your Honour is not even claiming that you made it a ruling; you are claiming that you made the decision and gave an opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I particularly said that was my ruling, that the hon. member for St. Philip should withdraw and continue to speak.

Mr. TUDOR: But, Mr. Chairman, a ruling must be based on the rules of the House and not Your Honour's own interpretation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again you are challenging the Chair.

Mr. TUDOR: The Chair itself has not made up its mind as to whether it made a ruling or gave an opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has given a ruling.

Mr. TUDOR: You are asking the hon. member to submit not to the Rules of the House but to an opinion of the Chair which may be right or wrong as the Chairman himself has stated.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: So what happens? Did I not say that I was speaking on the Resolution before him?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You intimated your willingness to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anyway, I will give way to him.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think I will take this opportunity to reply to some of the remarks made by the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour. It was unusual that the Minister should try, after I made the speech which I did, to say that I said something about these officers that I did not say. I want the hon. member to get this clear in his head. Mr. Brewster happens to be a personal friend of mine, but friendship does not come before my public duty. I would like the hon. member to know that when he says I am against a poor man getting money, that statement would have been all right if I were not in the House or if the hon. member was in his constituency campaigning; but I said it in this House and was able to hear the Hon. Minister when he replied. I am still saying, Mr. Chairman, that I am opposed to paying this House Allowance.

8.20 p.m.

What I would say is this. I am still opposed, Mr. Chairman, to the paying of a House Allowance of £400 to the Liaison Officer, and, as I have said, even though I am a personal friend of Mr. Brewster I want to let the hon. member understand that I am going to vote against this House Allowance because I am not voting Mr. Brewster's money or any person's money.

Is it not a distortion of the facts that we are here and the Hon. Minister was not good enough to put before this Chamber what were Mr. Pickwoad's Allowances? Just now he was searching the debates in order to find out what I said at the time that they set up this office. He found out that I was opposed to Mr. Pickwoad's going to the United Kingdom because I said at the time that the substantive post of Labour Commissioner was more important than Mr. Pickwoad's going to do the job of Liaison Officer. The emoluments and all that which have been paid to Mr. Pickwoad were paid by the decisions of the Cabinet and the Hon. Minister cannot show a Resolution for the money which he now states. The hon. senior member for Christ Church thought that these members were drawing Travelling Allowance. Do not let anybody believe that in addition to this $11,520 that this officer was entitled to a Travelling Allowance. Representation Allowance is not Travelling Allowance. What has happened now, what has been revealed now, is that we have heard for the first time the Hon. Minister saying that they are negotiating to buy a house in London. They gave landlords the right to look for one. From what source are they doing it?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am definitely sure that I have not said that we

were negotiating for any house. I said that we were exploring, making enquiries, about a house for one of these people. If I understand anything of the English Language, negotiating and exploring are two separate and distinct words.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to explode now. You said that you made loans to landlords and you named some person. Why has not this Legislature heard about it? Who is Mr. Eytle? Who is Mr. Leslie? How have they come to have loans from the Barbados Government, and this Legislature for the first time today is hearing about it? Look at this hocus-pocus which they are playing with the people's money. That is why I hope to see that somebody goes to jail for this sort of thing. If these lawyers about here were to get down to their business, they would see that somebody goes to jail. Has this money come from us? Who is Mr. Eytle? How comes it that Mr. Leslie is entitled to a loan? Why is it that Mr. Leslie can get a loan and people in Barbados cannot get a loan? Why is it that money is loaned in Great Britain? Why is it that we are knowing about this for the first time today?

It is just as with the case of Mr. Pickwoad. It was at that time when I raised that matter that they wanted to say that Mr. Pickwoad was getting this large sum of money which he was receiving. He was seconded from the Barbados Civil Service. He got his full salary and then they puffed it up with all these other things. That is why he would not come back. You can well remember my saying that at one stage the Barbados Government was employing two Labour Commissioners because Mr. Pickwoad was still Labour Commissioner and Mr. Frank Odle was appointed Labour Commissioner. They were lucky when Mr. Pickwoad went to North Borneo or the Seychelles.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I know that the Hon. member glossed over the fact that Mr. Pickwoad had gone and his salary was a good one. It was so handsome that he asked for a lot more, then when he did not get it he went off to the Seychelles! It was because his salary was not good enough that he went off to the Seychelles.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister cannot tell me that I glossed over that because I would not know the reasons why he left to go to the Seychelles. It was not vouchsafed to me that he asked for more. Well then, he was taking us for a ride. You gave him nearly $10,000 and the next thing he was asking you was to pay him at a salary which you are paying to the Governor.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, again I rise on a point of order. The hon. member must be more precise because he is a responsible member. He said that we gave him $10,000 as salary. He was paid $7,680. They have to entertain and do other things and you cannot expect them to lump all these things together and regard them as a substantive salary.

Mr. WALCOTT: I never suggested that you should not give them Entertainment Allowance. I do not know if Mr. Brewster is going to be the holder of the post of Liaison Officer. I said from the very beginning that you did not need a man of Mr. Pickwoad's stature to run that Service. I know that you need a man like that to run the Service so as to justify the money you were paying out, and because you have started it with that salary, you will have to continue paying that amount. You started it with favour and you are running it with favour. I still feel that the Government should review the Housing Allowance of £400 per annum.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It being 8.30 o'clock it is the moment of interruption of Government business. This debate being controversial, it would have to be discontinued.

Hon. M. E. COX: Allow me to ask, Mr. Speaker, does the same thing apply to the other Resolution? *(A pause).*

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday 4th August at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion I would like to say this. The Hon. Minister has asked whether the second Resolution was controversial and before we had the chance to answer him he moved the adjournment of the House. I say now, if he cares, he can withdraw his motion for the adjournment and let us proceed with the Resolution.
8.30 p.m.

The question was put and a division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mr. STRAUGHN, Mr. SMITH and Mr. WALCOTT - 10.

NOES: Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TALMA, Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, ten hon. members voting "Aye" and five hon. members voting "No". I declare that the "Ayes" have it.

This House now stands adjourned.
8.32 p.m.