
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4th August, 1960.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., C.M., M.D., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 2nd August, 1960, are not yet ready for confirmation.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank a Report and Accounts to the 30th June this year.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 10

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply.

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, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

The question is that this Resolution do now pass. (*Mr. WALCOTT rose.*) Hon. members in favour please say "aye," those against please say "no"; I think the "ayes" have it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can understand, Mr. Chairman, the anxiety with which you would like to have this matter done, but I think the Chairman should be aware of the procedure. When this Resolution was in Committee on the last occasion and it came to the time for Adjournment at 8.30 p.m., you reported to the Speaker, and at the time I was addressing the Chair, I think it is normal that you should call on the person who was speaking on the last occasion in Committee, as you are now resuming the debate on the motion that is now before us; so I cannot see how you can put the question before calling on me, in view of the fact

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I draw to the hon. member's attention that the first thing I said was that on the Adjournment the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: You may have said so in such low tones that I did not hear those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The other hon. members heard, and I waited a minute and as you did not move, I put the question.

Mr. WALCOTT: Before your voice died, I was standing because I could not dream that you would put the question before calling on me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member stood when the question was past half way. I said "on the Adjournment the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking."

Mr. WALCOTT: This bogus idea of wanting to rush things through is not going to work. You can hear me, and if you talk about the acoustics, let me say that if my voice can come through the microphone, yours should also come through, and I am not deaf. You mumbled something, but you did not call on me to address you; on the other side the whole concoction is to see how quickly you can get this through without anybody speaking on it. Maybe you thought I would not have come to the House today, but I have a duty to come here.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Resolution can be recommitted.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is not a question of my asking for anything to be recommitted.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must object to the remarks about concoctions. Absolutely nothing was said over here to the Chairman about anything, and I would like to make my position crystal clear; it is immaterial to me whether the hon. member talks from now to next year, and it is immaterial what he talks. I am not trying to rush anything through, because this is plain.

Mr. WALCOTT: What do I care? I do not care anything about you or any person personally. Do I ask you any favours?

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I must admit that your voice was very muffled, and whatever you intended to say was not audible on this side of the Table; so the hon. senior member for St. Peter is perfectly in order, because I myself did not hear. I do not think the acoustics of this Chamber are quite good at present, and anyone who wants to be heard must use the microphone system.

Mr. WALCOTT: Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I was standing when you attempted to put the question, but this is not the first time that you wanted to run this Chamber in this sort of hocus-pocus manner. When the Speaker is in the Chair he calls on a member to speak, not in a mumbled tone, but in a distinctive manner as if he were putting a question. I was sitting here and you did not call on me to address you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As I said before, the first thing I did was to say that on the Adjournment the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking. I waited and you did not make any attempt to speak and so I put the question. At the stage when you got up I was past half way putting the question. If you said you have not heard and the hon. senior member for Christ Church said he also has not heard, it is unfortunate because I was speaking through the microphone; but it is your privilege to move the recommitment of the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not begging for any recommitment in a matter like this. When the Speaker was in the Chair the Hon. Leader of the House in an audible tone moved that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee. I am not deaf. If there was something that you meant us to hear, it should be said in audible tones so that there is no mistake about what you say. You are speaking to the whole Chamber and therefore I have a right to hear. I am not a person suffering from any ear affliction nor is the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and if I got up during the time you were putting the question, what would have prevented me from getting up to address the Chair if you had called on me? I came here to address the Chair because the debate was postponed from last Tuesday. I have not come here for fun.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me inform the senior hon. member for St. Peter that I have no desire to prevent him from resuming his speech. I did say those words and had completed when the hon. senior member for St. Peter rose and began to speak. It is unfortunate that you did not hear me.

Mr. WALCOTT: If that were your intention, Mr. Chairman, you should be willing to hear me before you had finished putting the question if you thought that I did not hear you. It is not a question of my begging for a recommitment. I am not asking the hon. members on that side for a recommitment because I consider that it is not an error made by me. The least thing that you can do is if you are putting the questions and under the same circumstances, if an hon. member rises to speak, well then, you do not put the question and you hear the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It depends how far you were in putting the question. When you rose to speak I was in the last part of putting the question.

Mr. WALCOTT: No other person would have spoken on this debate. If I had heard you, I would have risen in time. You should have realised that I must not have heard you.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make my position clear. I happen to be one whose sight may be affected, but I hear very well. I want to make it clear that Mr. Chairman did not speak in audible tones and none of us heard. It is not a question that it was put and not heard. It was a question that a mumble did take place. I presume that you said and did what you should have done, but that is a presumption and that is all. I say that I did not hear

you say "on the postponement, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking." That would be a deliberate lie.

I am supporting the hon. senior member for St. Peter on democratic principle. I would say that it would be democratic if you are to proceed with this matter although I have no intention of prolonging this debate; but to deny the hon. senior member for St. Peter the right to continue his speech, particularly as he rose long before the question had been resolved, I think it would be very undemocratic. If this Chamber is to be conducted on democratic principles, or whether it is becoming some dictatorship, we shall wait and see.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have said two or three times in this House to hon. members the procedure which I adopt. It is unfortunate that the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for Christ Church did not hear me when I said that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking on the adjournment.

I have no personal desire to deny the hon. senior member for St. Peter from continuing, but at this stage I have no authority to rescind it. My hands are tied. I therefore suggest to the hon. member to ask for a recommitment of the question and I am sure that under the circumstances the request would be granted. You rose so late that I did not refrain from completing the putting of the question.

Mr. T. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, at times one hears but does not take heed; nevertheless, I move that this Resolution be recommitment.

Mr. CORBIN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on the adjournment, I was speaking more in reply to what the Hon. Minister had stated in reply to the speech I had made earlier on this Resolution. What the Hon. Minister concluded from what I said, I still repeat that in my opinion it was grossly erroneous and could not give a fair construction of the speech I made.

I said at the beginning that so far as the Liaison Service is concerned in the United Kingdom, I am in favour of a Barbadian Service; so there would not be a question of my saying that I am against a Barbadian receiving the salary. It starts off that I am in favour of a Service even though there is the Caribbean Service which is a global Service and, like the hon. senior member for Christ Church I agree that a Barbadian Service should be there. But my objection is not to the Service; it is an objection to the Minister saying that this is the only way this Service can be run as if it is run on the basis that the Liaison Officer must receive a House Allowance of \$1,920 and the others a House Allowance of \$480.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. When did I make a statement like that? It is over five years that this Service was going on.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member seems not to be able to understand the English Language in its comprehensive sense. I would tell him even though some of the idiomatic sayings of the English Language would not worry a German, far less us, that you do not have to repeat a thing *verbatim* if you are propounding this. You are saying to us that for us to run this Service, these are the things you must have. I must conclude that to have the Service you must have these things. That is what you are proposing.

My objection is that you can have this Service with all the dignity you want without all of these things. I want hon. members of this Chamber to understand that I know the Assistant Liaison Officer personally. I would not say anything derogatory about him and there is no need because the person is not involved. I said that it was a third rate post, but the Hon. Minister took it to mean that this

is a third rate person. The Hon. Minister must realise that there are people in any part of the world who would be of comparable ability. Every teacher is not a Headmaster. When you say that the junior master is third in the hierarchy, that means that he is third in position although his qualifications would be of the first rate and not of the third rate.

The Hon. Minister also in his reply made the inference that when Mr. Pickwood who was the first Liaison Officer did the job, no objection was taken to this question of salary; but I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister and to the attention of this Committee a very important part of the Service. We have under Head XXI of the Estimates a vote which is known as Emigration and the amount of money involved there is \$400,000. The note says: "to meet part of the expense of emigration to the United Kingdom, U.S.A. and elsewhere."

Now, the hon. member knows that this \$400,000 was structurally part of the same scheme that set up this Liaison Service because this Service did not come here to the Legislature for us to get details; it was agreed by the Government to send Mr. Pickwood there. Why is it that you agreed to Mr. Pickwood getting these things and not these other people?

12.35 p.m.

As regards what Mr. Pickwood was given, the hon. member could not come back and say that he agreed with it in the case of Mr. Pickwood, but he did not agree with it in the case of this other man. This thing was done for Mr. Pickwood on the ground that you had an emigration vote. When you mentioned Mr. Leslie about loans...

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I mentioned that Mr. Leslie was one of the persons who was assisting in providing housing in England.

Mr. WALCOTT: You agreed with Mr. Leslie a landlord...

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. We never entered any negotiations with Mr. Leslie. I mentioned his name by way of his being one of the people who assisted in providing housing. I mentioned Mr. Eytel...

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. As the person who raised this matter I think it is only fitting that I should confirm or deny or assist in it. What the Hon. Minister has said is correct. Mr. Leslie has not assisted with any loans but in providing housing out of the Government's money.

Mr. WALCOTT: I withdraw that statement about Mr. Leslie if it is wrong. But who is Mr. Eytel? Does he work for the Barbados Government? Is he a member of the Barbados Civil Service and is entitled to a loan? This has occurred to me now; is it not proper that such things should be made known to the Barbados Legislature? As far as I know, Mr. Eytel was connected to the West Indian Service and used to broadcast on the B.B.C. I did not know that he was a servant of the Barbados Government.

On this question of this \$400,000 under the Emigration vote, the Minister could not have told us the details in connection with Mr. Pickwood. The hon. member was the Minister for Communications at the time when Mr. Pickwood went to England and I challenged his going there. When the hon. member said that the officer did Trade Commissioner Service and was receiving a House Allowance - the hon. member said that he was reading for the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City who made a speech quite different from the one I made. The hon. senior member for the City got mixed with Travelling Allowance, Representation Allowance and Entertainment Allowance, not knowing that in this vote an Entertainment Allowance of \$960 is provided, a Representation Allowance of \$240 and a House Allowance of \$1,920 is provided and each of these officers will be entitled to Travelling Allowance which has not got to be put down here, because travelling is a part of the conditions of employment. You put down such things as the normal conditions of employment would not involve. The hon. member must be prepared to analyse each Resolu-

tion which he brings down to the House and he must not expect us to agree with a Resolution because the Trade Commissioner Service agreed to it. The hon. member's conclusion was completely different from mine; my conclusion was that the Assistant Liaison Officer rises to a maximum of \$5,520 but the Assistant Liaison Officer and the Liaison Officer cannot be on different classes socially. You cannot say that a man who is working for over \$5,000 per annum requires \$480 as House Allowance but a man who is receiving \$6,000 per annum requires an allowance of \$1,920 which is four times as much.

I ask: What is the justification for any allowance at all? And if there is justification for the allowance, on what sort of basis do you compute these allowances so that you are giving the Secretary/Welfare Officer \$480, the Administrative Assistant \$480 and the Assistant Liaison Officer the same amount? All three of them are on the same basis, whereas the Liaison Officer is given four times as much! Is there not a closer relationship between the Assistant Liaison Officer and the Liaison Officer than between the Assistant Liaison Officer and the Secretary/Welfare Officer? As to a person who is going to act at some time or other, you say that that person is entitled to £100. The Secretary/Welfare Officer, being in the same category within this structure as the Assistant Liaison Officer, gets the same thing. I repeat; I do not think that they are entitled to this House Allowance. The only basis upon which they would be entitled to it is if you are seconding or recruiting them in Barbados and you say that to all of them, in addition to the salary, you will give an amount representing £100 as an allowance since they are going to live in England. The difference in your salary would make up for the difference in your own income. A man who is getting \$6,000 a year is quite different from one who is getting \$3,000 a year, but the \$6,000 a year man can afford to live in a better flat. The higher your income becomes, the better your standard of living will be. You do not expect the Mayor of the City of Bridgetown to live on the same basis as the ordinary poor citizen like myself. The reason why you give people these allowances is because they have to live in certain circumstances. A Minister is not going to live in ordinary circumstances like other people, but because a Minister must live in different circumstances from other people it does not mean that you will give him all the money out of the Treasury.

12.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see that there can be any justification for giving this man £400 a year, and my idea about it is that we must stop this extravagance. If you give him a salary which you regard as adequate, the argument used even by the hon. senior member for Christ Church with regard to the difficulty in procuring a house in the United Kingdom cannot be used. It cannot be difficult from the point of view of a House Allowance; it must be difficult from the point of view of salary. If you are going to put a man in the United Kingdom, my idea would be to give him a proper salary; but why should Government be encumbered with giving another £400 a year as a House Allowance to an officer in the range of £1,300? I would ask the Minister this: Why don't you give him £1,700 a year, because that is what it is going to cost Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister speaks about where the officer lives, but as it stands now the Minister has no control whatsoever over where his Permanent Secretary lives; that is none of his business. The Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom must find the most suitable flat to live in. Now some people talk about dignity; I like to use the word "dignity" in its right context; but dignity by trying to keep up with the Joneses is only making a fool of yourself, because you can be as dignified living next door to the richest man in the world, but you are living in accordance with the means which you have. If he has two Cadillacs and fourteen servants, it does not mean that because you are living next door to him you must have the same.

Barbados is a place that budgets for \$21 million, and I cannot see how you can compare this Liaison Officer with the Trade Commissioner for the whole of the Carib-

bean territory. If this man had been part of the Trade Commissioner's office, you know what place he would take along with the other people within the hierarchy of those things. Is it unreasonable to ask if you are going to give a House Allowance to people of an amount which cannot be justified? The Minister cannot justify the \$1,920 which is being paid. The Minister said that I drew this idea about a third rate hotel. The comparison I drew, Mr. Chairman, was about a flat. A flat is not as expensive in its normal setting; that is to say, if you went to a third rate flat as compared with a third rate hotel, the third rate flat would not be the same price as a third rate hotel, because he should know that when you pay a rate at a hotel, you do not pay for so many square feet of space in which to sleep, because in any case a man sleeps in a bed and can only cover the area which his body would take in a normal bed. Any double bed can get into a room of the size of the table which the Clerk uses; that is where he is going to sleep, but that is not all. He uses the common room to write letters, he uses the bars and other conveniences. Some people stay at a hotel and operate from there, so that all cable arrangements, post office business etc. take place from there, and those are the conveniences that create the price. I said that to show that you do not have to regard eight or ten guineas as a rate which of necessity you have to provide. What I do say is that because a man rents a flat in England for eight or ten guineas, it does not follow that the salary which you pay you have to pay and then put on this allowance for rent. You must work on the assumption that the salary which you are paying to this man is a salary to allow him to rent a flat, to buy clothes and to eat food. You cannot go on the assumption that you must give him a food allowance because he is staying at a hotel; you cannot work on the assumption that you must give him a shoe allowance because in the United Kingdom you walk out more shoes than you do in Barbados; you cannot say that you must give him a warm clothing allowance, although it is becoming very fashionable in the West Indies, because he has to wear long underwear in England which he would not have to wear in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, you have to work on the basis of the salary which you are paying, and that is where the question of dignity comes in. His salary must bear some relationship to the dignity of the office which he holds, and I make bold to say, Sir, that if you gave him a salary of £1,500, this officer could pay for rent or anything at all and we would not have to look for £400 to give him for rent. A salary of £1,500 to this officer would be adequate along with the other things which you are giving him, the Representation Allowance of \$2,400 and the Entertainment Allowance of \$960, because I take it that a man does not make money in those things. I realise that he must go out and meet people, have drinks and spend money out of his pocket. I am not one of those people who talk about cheese-paring, because I was one of those people who criticised the Government for sending out some of the Ministers at tourist class rates, because the former Premier had this parsimonious idea. I said that if you are sending out Ministers you should give them the best accommodation; so there is no question of parsimony in so far as making people live in conditions which uphold the dignity of their office. Far from that, which is not true, the Hon. Minister attempted in this House and outside to show that I was so lavish that he wrote to a newspaper to the effect that when I was a member of the Government I tried to get a chauffeur and fantastic allowances for drivers and for Ministers.

Mr. Chairman, this is one thing in which so far as I am concerned the question of parsimony does not arise; this is a question of analysis. Is it right to pay a salary and then pay a House Allowance too if you are satisfied that the salary which you are paying is adequate under the circumstances for this officer? If you paid £1,500 to this man in England, the question of giving him a House Allowance would not arise. A man can take £1,500 and live in England, find a decent flat to live in and still have money in his pocket; but the hon. senior member for Christ Church made too much of this idea that it is part of his duty to recruit workers for England. When you compare this amount with other officers in other parts of the world,

it must bear some relation to the territory they represent. The hon. senior member for Christ Church made a statement about this man *vis-a-vis* the Labour Commissioner in Barbados. Nothing could be further from the truth, and you had a classic example in Trinidad. You only have to have two or three disputes and then you will realise how important your own Labour Department is and how the economy can be disrupted. Barbados depends on sugar, and one serious disruption in the sugar industry would cost this country a lot more than all the remittances that come back from the United Kingdom from people who are recruited to the London Transport in a year.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is an expert on Labour matters; but I want to remind him that whenever there is a dispute in the sugar world, whenever sugar workers go on strike, you seldom see the Labour Department controlling this. It is more a political Party that will bring reason to bear and will settle the difference and have that fully resolved. A Labour Department as such does very little.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will not support that. A good Labour Department prevents a dispute from taking place.

I am familiar with the Liaison Service in England and the Labour Department Service here. I know the post of Liaison Officer could not be more important than Labour Commissioner of Barbados. That is not necessary to argue; but what I contend is that there cannot be any justification for a House Allowance, Representation Allowance, Entertainment Allowance and a salary of this nature for the post of Liaison Officer. There can be no justification to give House Allowance to the other small officers. What argument are you producing that the Liaison Officer is in need of this House Allowance as well as these other people?

The Hon. Minister says that he is going to build or buy a house for these people. Now, Sir, look at the difference. The Government own houses here for officers who are serving the Government. The officers of this Service who live in these houses are required by law to have a deduction out of their salary in order to pay rent for those houses. That is the situation with your doctors at the hospital. Of course it is not so with all the people who rent your houses. Others are at a sort of fixed rental, while there are some who are given a house free. What is the position? If you are going to build or buy a house for these people, are you still going to give them £100 House Allowance or would they be paying rent out of their salary? Or is it that they would be living in this house rent free? Do you say that it would be as it is in Barbados - a percentage which they would pay out of their salary? As I have said, there are few people here to whom you give a house. I think there are one or two exceptions - the Director of Agriculture and the Chief Justice. In this case I cannot see any real justification for giving these people a House Allowance.

The Hon. Minister says that it is the intention to put this Liaison Service in England on the Establishment. The money for this Service comes out of the Emigration Vote. If you want to put this Service as part of your structure, Mr. Chairman, you will have to give much more consideration to the demand which is now made. As I have said earlier, what would be the fairest thing to do is that if you see that your Liaison Officer would suffer a difficulty, instead of putting him on the incremental scale, then the best thing would be to put him in a position which would be comparable to the Assistant Labour Commissioner in London. You say that the position is comparable to the Assistant Labour Commissioner in London. If you put this post on the Establishment and if this Service collapses and the Liaison Officer comes back here it would not be an easy thing for him to be integrated into the Service. The Hon. Minister would know, when you have these other allowances, it is not so easy to get people integrated. He knows that it would be a big argument as to where you can integrate him at the right point.

Sir, it will be a rash thing at this stage to establish this post into the Barbados Civil Establishment List be-

cause there is not enough information available to this Chamber to make us say that it should be established as a permanent Service. It is the kind of Service in which the Government should be prepared to look carefully at the people whom it has to recruit and the people are such as those whom you have to call upon to dismiss when you are over-burdened. You must remember that these are people who are working overseas. They are not under the control of the Labour Commissioner, neither can you control a man so easily when he is in London. It requires a lot more experience before you can establish a post like this in your Civil Service, and on the basis of saying what the man's salary should be made up of, it would be better to give him a salary alone. Give him £1,500. I cannot see why a man getting £1,500 as salary should receive a Representation Allowance of £400 and Entertainment Allowance of £200. I cannot see by any stretch of the imagination that that is parsimonious treatment to a post like that when you consider what Barbados pays out to other offices.

This is in reply to the Minister saying that I said "this is a third rate officer." You have a Civil Establishment. List in front of you and you know who is at the top. I could not vote for this Resolution, because if I vote for the Resolution I would be voting for these allowances. I am opposed to these allowances; therefore I will not vote for it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have had to come back here today to speak on this Resolution because I have seen the facilities which this Resolution calls for is necessary. This officer is to form an attractive eye; therefore he must have something to attract others. He is like a fisherman and these facilities in this Resolution are baits. They form a bait for this officer. In Great Britain or England you have great men, and this officer has to try to attract them and to bring them to his way of thinking. We have sent him there to go and seek for work for poor Barbadians, and every facility which is necessary should be given him. He should be given Housing Allowance, Entertainment Allowance, Representation Allowance, and every possible thing in this Resolution. He is sent out there to relieve the hardship which we have here in Barbados.

1.05 p.m.

He must have some good attraction in England so as to entertain those big officials who come to him or those to whom he goes. You have to look for bait so as to catch a good fish. This officer is seeking for work for the unemployed people here in Barbados; I am certain that thousands of people in this island have profited by these emigrants going to Great Britain; therefore we should be in a position to grant every facility that this officer needs. Not one of us has to criticise anything of this kind because criticism is not needed. If you were to look back at the schedule, you will see the thousands of pounds which we have received through this Emigration scheme. The Liaison Officer has to go to every Department and search and make negotiations so as to solve the problems in the interest of the people here; so that all the facilities which this man needs he must have.

When we pass this Resolution, it is just a bait which we are giving this man to catch fish for us here. That is all this Resolution calls for - the bait to enable poor people in Barbados to survive. This debate should have been closed since last Tuesday. It is not necessary for us to come back here and prolong it; we are not here to waste precious time. When we take an officer and send him to any country, we send him out to work for Barbadians; we are over-populated and therefore every facility which this officer needs should be given to him. I hope that there will not be any more comment on this Resolution. It is needful and it should be passed; therefore I will vote for it one hundred per cent.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong this debate because I think we have gone into every possible angle of it and all the ramifications have been investigated. I shall not be found guilty of prolonging a debate of this nature at this stage now that all the points have been gone into; however, I want the Minister to make

a special note of these two points and give me an assurance on them if he can today or, if not, at some other time. In the first place, I want some form of assurance that some public announcement will be made either over Rediffusion or in the *Advocate* or in the *Daily News* or in whichever newspaper or newspapers they may think fit, drawing the attention of the public in Barbados, and the unemployed in particular, to the fact that there are four thousand odd vacancies in England, and that anybody who is desirous can come forward and the Government is willing to help them with loans. In a case like this, these jobs can be obtained and you do not want any big security in view of the fact that these workers will be going straight to the London Transport Executive. We must try and get them there right away. Where are these people going to get these securities by way of Title Deeds from? If you are going to help them, well, help them. The Government will get back their money by taking out a few shillings every week, but all of this red tape is unnecessary. This is not any big lumpsum of money; this is a question of passage money. For the last few years the members of the Government have been getting on public platforms and talking about this scheme; therefore, let them help these people without all of this red tape. All of this signing of bonds should be done away with. If there are four thousand jobs and you are sending out even one thousand people to fill some of these jobs, let the people go out and cease all of this red tape. If you are sending these people on specific jobs on contract, you do not want any security; you have sufficient security in the fact that these people are going to jobs. If the Labour Commissioner is not going to rise to the occasion, it will be totally letting down these people. I want the Minister to listen to reason and not to listen to any junior Ministers. I know the Premier is taking a note of what I am saying.

The second assurance is this: I want it to be known that there is a housing loan scheme for Barbadian workers in England to enable them to practise thrift and industry, and the Government will help with loans to assist them in acquiring property. If we have fifteen thousand Barbadians there and in another four years we assist them to become settled and established, in another five years we may have about fifty thousand Barbadians settled; and the money and assistance derived from that source will do something substantially for those who are left here. The two assurances are that a public announcement be made through the Press and over Rediffusion about (a) the vacancies in the London Transport Service and (b) the loan scheme which has been started since 1956. By this scheme workers can contribute one-third of their money; a worker who is the type of person who will repay the money - I am not suggesting that you should give away the Government's money; what I am saying is that the Government could make loans easily available to Barbadian workers. You can advance them two-thirds of the money provided they have one-third, and the terms of repayment can be made quite easily. That is the easiest way in which you can encourage Barbadians to remain in England and make that country their home. The burning problem is to find employment for a lot of distressed people all over the place.

1.15 p.m.

To suggest that the average Barbadian worker is only willing to go to Canada or the United States is not quite right because they know that they cannot get there easily. I admit that they would prefer to go to the United States because they think that England is so cold and the climate is such that they cannot stand it; but to suggest that you cannot find suitable workers to go to England could not be correct, and if there was not all this red tape in securing passage money, you could send another thousand in six months' time; it is only a question of the passports and getting the necessary money.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I think there are one or two points to which I would have to reply largely in answer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I would like to say again perhaps for the last time that being once a member of the Government and also active in matters of fixing wages for Government servants and that sort of thing, because he was on the Whitley Council to represent the workers, I think he is well aware of the fact that in so far as the fixing of

wages, salaries and posts are concerned, we have a Department called the Establishment Department, and all these matters before they reach the Cabinet are discussed and gone into by the Establishment Department, recommendations are then made to the Minister of Finance, they reach us and then come to the House of Assembly. This is therefore not a question of a few people sitting down in an organisation and maybe the straw boss saying he must have \$1,000 a month or something like that, or somebody seconding or opposing the motion, as the case may be.

Mr. Chairman, this is a well-planned, organised system which exists in Government for the benefit of its servants. These recommendations which are before us today are recommendations made by the Establishment branch of the Government of which I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter is well aware. I quoted on the last occasion salaries which are paid to people who occupy a lower rung of the ladder. I say 'lower' because this man, say whatever you like, is the head of an office. I am going to quote again one case here of the Assistant Secretary, Public Relations Officer, in the Commissioner's Office in England. He gets \$6,480 x \$240 - \$7,440, a House Allowance of \$480, Overseas Allowance of \$960, Representation Allowance of \$1,200. That is only one case and I am sorry I have not got the estimate of the Federal Government here with me in order to quote the other figures again. I say that we have done all that, Mr. Chairman, because we have fallen in line with what obtains today and has been obtaining for some time. I am strongly in favour of this Government making our people as comfortable as is humanly possible not only in Barbados but outside of Barbados, and more particularly outside of Barbados. I do not know I could put the case stronger myself for this Government than has been put by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. A man is thousand of miles away from home, you put him in charge of an important function such as this, but you leave him at the mercy of the climate, so to speak, to regulate for him what you yourself should regulate.

Mr. Chairman, what is the position? We are paying this gentleman a House Allowance. I said - and I repeat - that his salary is comparable to an Assistant Labour Commissioner in Barbados; his salary is \$6,240, and everybody knows that in England the cost of living is much higher than it is in Barbados. When I was over there last year, I discovered that sweet potatoes alone, although no doubt as much of them may not be consumed as in Barbados or perhaps in the West Indian area, were as high as 85¢ per pound, the common avocado pear 90 ¢ and \$1.00 and even meat is also very expensive as well as fish. (Mr. T. W. MILLER: Cigarettes.) The hon. junior member for the City mentioned cigarettes; even to smoke is a luxury. I am sure that when you consider the cost of living in England and compare it with what obtains here, there is absolutely no comparison with the \$6,240 a year for a man who is in charge of an Office in England carrying out one of the most important functions we have, and that is to look after jobs for Barbados, to attend to their every need and every call, to be in sympathy with them and to help them in their distress. Will you tell me that the salary of \$6,240 with the other prerequisites and House Allowance of £400 is too much? In Barbados you have to pay anywhere around \$160 a month for a decent house. (Mr. WALCOTT: Sam Lords Castle?) In England everybody knows how high rents are, then you have to look for fuel, and you have to pay for expensive warm clothing and things of that sort which are not necessary in Barbados because of its tropical climate.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I cannot claim that this gentleman is any friend of mine. He said they were friends and buddies, and things like that; that is a matter for them, but I cannot claim that privilege as he can. I should like him to realise and appreciate that we are not creating this post for the gentleman who perhaps by accident happens to be acting in the post. He may be Liaison Officer today and tomorrow he may leave the job or something may happen. This is not for any particular individual; it is an office we are creating, and I repeat, the former holder of that office had a salary and prerequisites which amounted to just less than \$40 a month of what we are offering here now, and this was ever since in 1956 when the salary revision came about.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am sorry to cross the hon. member, but I did not make any reference to the gentleman in that way.

1.25 p.m.

The reference was made because the Hon. Minister said that when the former holder held this job there was no objection, and therefore now somebody else is holding it, there is objection. I would like to let him know that there is no objection to the person. I object to the principle. I do not care who is holding the post or who was holding the post. I say I do not agree with the allowances. That has nothing to do with who holds the post.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I noted also that the hon. member said that this lump sum of \$400,000 was just placed there and from that we would vote this salary.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that there is an Emigration Vote of \$400,000. The Hon. Minister said that when Mr. Pickwood was placed in this position we made no objection and I pointed out that under the head Emigration to which the sum of \$400,000 was voted - this Service was run under that Head.

Hon. M. E. COX: That was not correct at all. I did not refer to things under that Head, I am quite sure. By Resolution No. 82/1955 this House voted to establish this office. That had absolutely nothing to do with the \$400,000 in the Estimates for Emigration which is controlled by the Labour Commissioner. And in the Resolution was then set out the Capital expenditure of that office; the rent expenses and the rate at which those expenses were incurred and the total amount for the operating of the office to the end of the financial year was set down.

It was known that Mr. Pickwood was taking up that office because his name was referred to in the Resolution as the person who would be sent to the United Kingdom to hold that post.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that this Government is doing what it considers to be in the best interest of the community, not only to Barbados, but to our workers who leave this country and who find themselves in a strange country and who have to depend on a Service such as this. It is to our credit that such a Service has been set up. The Service has been spoken of very highly by people that matter in Great Britain and elsewhere. They praise the scheme, they praise the work and they praise the officers who administered and are administering this post. I think in the present circumstance that what this Resolution sets out to do is nothing wrong at all but just what I consider to be a reasonable pay - nothing elaborate, nothing extravagant.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church raised two points, one about lending people money and advancing total loans to emigrants. I would promise him to go into that matter but I do not know what we would do about this. He said if that we can guarantee a person - well, not any old person but a young person - we could lend them the whole amount. I do not know by what yardstick we can measure that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I suggested that the question of a person having security or title deeds be ruled out. I believe that every suitable worker - and when I say suitable, I mean every Barbadian who is selected and recruited - should be assisted without any red tape. He alone is sufficient to sign the bond and he will understand that the money for the repayment of the loan will be deducted from his wages every week. Of course, Government's money will have ample security in that way. You send him to a particular job to a particular place and his money can be deducted. Of course, I am not suggesting that it should be extended to all workers. I think the Hon. Minister made a mistake when he thought it so. As far as loans for getting to England for the mass of unemployment which we have in this country I want no red tape. I want all assistance that can be given without any red tape, without any strings attached. What more can we do?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member has established his point of order. (A pause.)

The question is -

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is quite improper to see that a member is on a point of order and to put the question as soon as that member sits down. I can only conclude that it is a deliberate attempt to stultify debate and it is contrary to the rules of this House. I have just entered this Chamber and the hon. member who was interrupted had to rise to continue debate; but Your Honour deliberately asked the hon. member to desist and you put the question before looking around the Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When I informed the hon. senior member for Christ Church that he had established his point of order, I then turned to the Minister who was speaking and he said that he had finished. I was about to put the question when the hon. senior member for St. Peter and you intervened.

Mr. BARROW: It is deplorable that we who should lead the people should degenerate to this stage which is the result of the lowering of the franchise. No leadership, no morality have come from this Government at all. Mr. Chairman, if you are unfortunate enough to be a member of the Government Party, I do not intend it to be a reflection of your part.

I am not sitting down if you put the question because I have something to say, but I will sit if you do not put it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think I have made my excursions already at the beginning of this debate, but I would have expected the Minister who was crossed by that point of order to continue his speech. I waited to see if the Minister was going to continue his reply because I was going to rise after he has sat to say that the Hon. Minister did not categorically state that I did not agree with the Resolution.

The hon. member did make an excellent point by putting Government on the spot. I am not a member of the Government: so I cannot put him on the spot. If the Hon. Minister of Labour does not know I can tell him that there is an Act in England known as the Drag Act. It is one of the things which we as Trade Unionists must study and on account of what is in the Drag Act, what the hon. senior member for Christ Church (have) suggested to the Hon. Minister cannot be done, that is to say, you cannot emigrate a worker from Barbados to the United Kingdom and ask an employer in the United Kingdom to deduct money out of his wages to pay tax or anything of the sort and remit it here. 1.35 p.m.

We would be in favour of getting the maximum assistance. I do not believe that you are going to emigrate angels; if you were emigrating angels I would go as far as the Minister has gone, but we are sending out human beings with all of their implications and they do not relish paying back money if they do not have to pay it back. I do not think that emigrants would be immune from the susceptibility of human beings. I say that the maximum assistance must be given, but that does not mean that you should not have any safeguard. The Minister is apt to think that every statement is, of necessity, a political statement. He has said something in this debate which conflicts with another debate. He says that he knows about the four thousand vacancies, that everything is in order, but I think the Minister was a bit extravagant and that is why he has opened himself to the very serious criticism that you cannot get these people and they are not going that way. Sometimes you must catch an Englishman in diplomatic, vague language. You cannot see the number of people in Barbados who are eligible for emigration; therefore you do not pretend that you are an unemployment bureau. Every person who wants to go to the United Kingdom does not go to the Minister. It is a serious indictment against the Government to say that these people do not want to go to England. The ordinary thing which these people would have to do is to change £. s. d. to \$. ¢ and know how much it is. That is something which does not require any special knowledge to do. To say that you do not get people to go to England because they lack this and that is a serious statement. Education in Barbados is so low at this stage that the normal people whom you are asking to go out - this is really a job for people from the

Elementary School. I am a product of the Elementary School, so was Mr. Ernest Bevan and he rose to be Foreign Minister in the United Kingdom. The product which you want here must be the product from the Elementary School. Do you think it would require a boy with a G.C.E. to convert £. s. d. to \$. ¢ and back? Do you want such a boy to do that? Do you want a boy with a G.C.E. to say how a letter is to be drafted? Our Secondary Schools have not got to be the medium for recruiting people to be bus conductors; if you had to recruit people from Secondary Schools to be bus drivers or bus conductors, then God help us. These people are the product of the old-time system, the system of the whip, not the product of age-grouping. When you get to the third standard and you do not know how to carry £. s. d. to \$. ¢ and backward you will pay for it. We have some 25,000 people unemployed in Barbados and out of that 25,000 people we should be able to take up 4,000. If the Barbados Workers' Union were to be asked tomorrow to submit to the Ministry of Labour a thousand people who are qualified to go to the London Transport Executive on the education basis, I would give them that thousand people in less than a week, I was surprised to hear the Minister in that breath make that statement because I saw from the record of the debate that the Minister earlier dealt with the London Transport Railways and made an opposite speech; he said it was the opposite problem, but I think the hon. junior member for St. John will deal with that aspect of the matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. BARROW rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John attempted to speak before you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did you say, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. John attempted to speak before I came into Committee? In that case, I bow.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can liken the hon. senior member for the City to Rip Van Winkle or what. Anyhow, he has shown his anxiety to get into the debate and I will not detain him out of it for too long a time. I was surprised when the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour tried to bring this debate to a premature close by asking that the question be now put.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. When did I ask that any question be now put?

Mr. BARROW: The Chairman told me so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Oh, No, No! I did not say that.

Mr. BARROW: When I was speaking on a point of order on the last occasion you said that the Minister had asked you to put the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not say that.

Mr. BARROW: What did you say?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is what I said; I said that I waited to see if the hon. senior member for St. Michael would continue to speak and that is when I started to put the question. But the hon. senior member for St. Peter got up. There was never any request made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael for the question to be put.

Mr. BARROW: I misunderstood what you said. I was under the impression that you said that the Minister had told you to put the question. However, I want to say this: it is passing strange that certain questions were put by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Minister was interrupted on a point of order in replying, and before he had completed answering them and after the senior member for Christ Church had finished his point of order, the Minister did not deem it necessary or expedient to continue his reply. 1.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I do not think you are right. The hon. senior member for Christ Church asked for two

assurances; he was given one and was told by the Hon. Minister that he would go into the other. The hon. senior member for Christ Church then went on to speak further and it was when he had finished that the hon. senior member for St. Peter got up.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that was not my understanding. The Hon. Minister did say that he would investigate the matter, but he did not deal specifically with the question of housing loans.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is the one the Minister said he would go into.

Mr. TALMA: I did not understand it that way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your assurances were given and he intimated that he would go into the other.

Mr. TALMA: I am glad that is so.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to come straight to the point. Certain categorical statements were made in here during the course of the debate on Tuesday last. Amongst those statements was a statement that there are enough people in Barbados to fill the three or four thousand vacancies that may exist in the London Transport, people who are of the necessary educational standard.

Mr. Chairman, my comment on that is that I should hope so because all the people who went to school before age grouping are not dead yet, and in a population of approximately 260,000 souls I should very well hope that there are at least 3,999 other persons - or I should say 3,998, yourself and myself - who without too much stress or strain will be able to do simple arithmetic; but simple arithmetic has never been one of the strong points of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, neither has dealing in a fair and honest way with the members of the public been significant of his conduct of the public's business in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. junior member for St. John to deal with the Resolution and leave out the personalities. You are not dealing with the Minister and the reference you have made is bearing on the offensive.

Mr. BARROW: It is not for the Chairman to use his privilege to take objection; it is for the member, and I have complained about your partisanship before, and unless you allow me to proceed, I will move a vote of "no confidence."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is the Chairman's duty to draw to an hon. member's attention when he is going astray and I am asking you to leave out personalities and stick to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I will do that because I do not want to waste any more time.

On page 226 of the debates of this House of Assembly for the Session 1959, on Wednesday, 18th March, 1959 in line 77 of the second column, this is a statement made by the same Minister referring to me:-

"The hon. junior member for St. John said that we were recruiting 50 people for the British Railways, but there was room for 700 people."

This was in March, 1959 before he had the excursion to London. I go on to quote:-

"Of course, I am accustomed to hearing him and I know him well."

I notice that there was no injunction there on the hon. member to refrain from being personal, but I go on to read:

"However, in as much as he is not here now, I will leave what I wanted to say about him until I meet him on another occasion. He said that the only reason why there was no recruitment of any more than 50 people for the

British Railways was because of educational policy; that these people could not measure up to the educational requirements of the British Railways."

The hon. senior member for St. Philip should have been in his place when the House met today to continue the debate. I do not want to say any more than that, but I think it is highly improper that he should be debating something while a member is on his feet. I am not in any mood to make this any laughing matter, because I am in a serious mood. I go on to read:

"The truth is that thirty people were required for the British Railways and 30 for the London Transport Executive - 60 people in all."

I think I can hear the hon. member now.

"I should like to say that there is no dearth of recruits in this island, least of all, from an educational point of view. Some time ago the British Railways asked us for four messengers and we sent them four people to work as messengers. They did not have a secondary education and they were so good that they were promoted immediately to Clerks. When the hon. member tried to decry these people and to use as something against us that the educational policy of the Government prevented these authorities from recruiting these 700 people, I say that that remark is grossly misleading."

Mr. Chairman, I am quoting all the time from the speech made by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour on the 18th March, 1959. I will continue to quote, Sir, if you will permit me just to pick back up the threads.

"I say that that remark is grossly misleading because the authorities asked for 60 people. The recruitment of these people stopped because of a bus strike in England which lasted for twelve weeks and after that, the London Transport Executive took a number of buses off the road, therefore there were less buses running; at the same time, we had the race riots and the unemployment situation rose considerably. At one time I think the employment figures were something like 250,000 and the latest figures were something like 700,000. There are many Englishmen who do not relish that type of work but who at the time were forced to do it because of the unemployment situation, and therefore they kept out many West Indians. I discussed the matter with the authorities last year, and I appealed to them to help us at the earliest opportunity, as soon as things returned to normalcy. This is the first lot of workers for which they had called since that bus strike in England took place. I have every reason to believe that they will call for more people. The authorities have told me in no uncertain manner that the quality of our people is first-class and they insist that they get that quality all the time. For an hon. member to say that these people are not being recruited because they do not have the educational standard is something which is not in our interest to put it very mildly, but something of which this island cannot feel proud when we have the best educational system in the West Indies."

He went on to say: (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Well read!) You are not in a position to judge whether or not it is well read; leave that to somebody else.

"I do not know if the Premier wants to reply, but I do not want to intrude on his reserve. I heard the Economist saying that we should budget for a deficit. I would like to know what kind of Government would do that."

Mr. Chairman, that is what they have actually done; they have budgeted for a deficit, but let us return to this matter before us. You will find, Mr. Chairman, that on page 199 of the debate bearing the same date that I had stated this which provoked that attack upon me for misleading the public by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour who is now sheltering and hiding behind his despatch box.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, this is an extract from my own speech on page 199 of the Official Report of the Debates of this House of the 18th March 1959. This was at least three months before the Hon. Minister of Trade went to England. This is what I said on that occasion:-

"I would be the last person to deny if you got a falling off in the demand for our products by an importing country due to a recession in that country or a deliberate cutting in the level of consumption in the importing country that it would not affect the balance of payment or the balance of trade in the exporting country which in this particular instance would be Barbados. There could not be an industrial recession when there are still jobs in agriculture and on the railways; and I will tell you this since I am on that: two weeks ago British Railways sent down here - the newspapers have said very little about it - to recruit about 50 or 60 people to work on British railways, and these workers, I believe, will be leaving towards the end of this month. They could use 700 now and perhaps in another three months another 700 workers; the Minister of Labour must know that is true. But what is the position? The position is that they have found that the educational standard of the workers from Barbados, particularly those who have been victims of age-grouping has fallen off; but they would be willing to have a lot more workers. That shows you what a vicious circle the lack of positive thinking on the part of the Government in all aspects of the conduct of public affairs can have on the well-being of the people, because when they do not pay sufficient attention to the educational standards of the people in Barbados, you get a falling off in the demand for workers from Barbados once the top has been creamed off."

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. o'clock, the sitting of this House is now suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On re-assembling.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there being no quorum, I ask that you instruct the Clerk to ring the bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is Question Time. I understand that no answers to questions are ready.

RESOLUTION re "NO CONFIDENCE" IN MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business. The first Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: to resume debate on the following Resolution:-

Resolution re lack of confidence in the Ministry of Communications.

On the last occasion the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was addressing the House. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, as far as I can remember, during the course of this debate was of the personal opinion that the Opposition had said nothing to convince him at any rate, that there was anything wrong with the transport policy of the Government and of the Hon. Minister of Communications in particular. I can only say that the hon. member must have been enduring a long period of hibernation from the time that the Transport Board was established and during the whole of the period when the hon. senior member for St. Thomas had been Minister of Communications and Works. He, at any rate, is one of the few persons in Barbados who is unconscious of the disreputable state of affairs which has been created by the mismanagement of the Island's Transport system by the Minister of Communications.

In 1955 after a long series of negotiations between the Government, the Department of Highways and Transport, the Ministry of Communications, and the concessionaires

on the bus routes in this island and after a breakdown in these negotiations, and after the rejection of the Report of a special Commission, as far as I can remember, which was comprised of at least three distinguished Barbadians who were people experienced in trade in this island, and which Commission had been set up during the course of that year to go into the request by concessionaires for increase in the bus fares on the various routes - it was after this Commission had recommended certainly very limited increases in the bus fares that the Government in its wisdom or its folly decided to take over the buses from some of the concessionaires. A statement was made on the floor of this House by the then Premier that bus fares would be increased over his dead body. The worthy gentleman is not dead yet to the best of my knowledge and belief, but the *rationale* of the expropriation, if I may describe it by that name, of the concessions from the concessionaires and the taking over for compensation of the buses owned by some of these concessionaires show that it was an iniquitous thing on the part of the Government, and they did so despite the recommendations of the Commission which had gone capably into the matter, a Commission which in my opinion up to today understands a lot more of the economics of transport than the Hon. Minister of Communications himself.

2.35 p.m.

The *rationale* was that this recommendation was iniquitous and it would operate as an unnecessary hardship and burden upon the taxpaying public which resorted to this form of public transport in their daily goings to and fro. So this appeal to emotion was made at that time and in 1955 the Transport Board was set up. The question of compensation then had to go to arbitration and eventually some of the former bus concessionaires were compensated. They were compensated after careful investigation by inspectors, engineers and other qualified person or persons whom the Government deemed to be fit and proper persons and properly qualified, and they were paid what was considered at that time an economic sum for the rolling stock and the spare parts which had been taken over by the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not like anyone coming along 20, 30, 40 or 50 years from now to lay the unjust accusation at the door of the present Government that they have, at any time up to the moment of this debate, committed any deliberate act of nationalisation in this country. I would like to go much further and say this: that these matters, these sectors of the economy wherein open declarations within my knowledge were made since 1948 of the intention of the Government Party to bring under public control, far from any step being actively or passively taken to carry out these declarations of intention, everything has been done to reinforce and encourage the retention of these sectors of the economy which are more vital than half of the transport system or the whole transport system, into the hands of private undertakers - I use that word advisedly. One does not have to look very far to recognise that the recent acquisition of the ordinary shares of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation by private individuals, lock stock and barrel, as they say, - to the total exclusion of the Government of this island was a very marked illustration of the principle which I had been trying to expose; because the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation was certainly one of the targets picked out and fulminated about not only on the floor of this House, but in such a remote Chamber as the Barbados Chamber of Commerce, even by the Conservative members of the House such as the late junior member for St. Andrew, Mr. J. A. Haynes. The Premier of Barbados himself threatened at one stage in a speech which is well remembered and which will be related in years to come, and it must have had a tremendous influence on the minds of the electorate of this country, that within six months of their coming into power the Electric Company would be nationalised.

If I may return to the sheep which are within the fold of the Minister of Communications - the derelict buses at Weymouth grounds - nationalisation of Transport has never been the policy, declared or expressed or implied, of the Government Party prior to this debacle

with the bus concessionaires, but afterwards it was a plank in the platform of the Government Party. In times of stress one might quite often witness strange bed-fellows relaxing in the same political or geographical position. No greater spur was given to the Government than the speeches delivered in this Chamber by the hon. senior member for the City, the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party of this House. When one examines the fact that a public transportation system in this island was probably - I say probably and I will be very brutal and straightforward without being unparliamentary - the only industry in this island to which anyone could point and demonstrate to a visitor as having been established, built up and maintained by the black people of this island by their own toil, sweat and initiative - we have no toe-hold in the sugar industry or in commerce or in any of the other enterprises such as the hotel industry and the other industries which are so fervently encouraged now by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and by the Government as a whole. You cannot say that this is a work which was built up by their own initiative and created with their own hands.

2.45 p.m.

Not only was opinion in this country on all sides and of all political hues and complexions in favour of expropriating the expropriators, but that was only an illustration - I say of expropriation after compensation, of course - where every Barbadian was willing to demonstrate the principle of absentee ownership, absentee management and all the other evils which are attendant upon such a state of affairs. Here was an industry which by speeches made by Conservative members in the Other Place, by unanimous vote of the Chamber of Commerce, was universally endorsed even by the backbenchers of the Government - as one thing in Barbados which if the economy of the island was going to expand, should be taken a firm hold of and controlled on behalf of the people of this island as a public utility. No Barbadian would have suffered if that had been done. But the bus concessions on the other hand were running; if they were not running efficiently or as efficiently as bus services are run in other countries, the surprising thing is not that they run inefficiently but that they run at all, because no assistance up to 1955 - and I would even go so far as to say 1955 and 1956 - in the way of rebates and other concessions such as duty-free concessions and matters of that kind in contradistinction to the sugar industry where if agricultural forks are imported by a plantation, it does not have to pay duty - no concessions of any kind were given to these industrious men. Because they found the situation intolerable, they made this request to the Government for permission to charge a little more on the bus fares; they were rejected and the buses were taken over.

If I say that the whole transaction was attended with immorality, I would not be trespassing on my privilege as a member of this House; if I say it was born in sin and conceived in wickedness and spite, I would not be indulging in personal abuse; but it is a well-known fact that there were some members of this House most vociferous in their claim that the bus service should be taken over, who were at logger-heads with three or four of the bus concessionaires for reasons best known to themselves, and in some cases there were members of this House who owed money to these concessionaires, and all the indications are that they had no intention of paying it back; I make that statement and I am prepared to prove it. Now that is the general background of the debate relating to the running of the Transport Board. I want to get this absolutely clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the hon. member goes too far, I should just like to check whether he said there "were" members or there "are" members.

Mr. BARROW: As far as I can remember I said there "were" members. I would not like you to press me and ask me if there still are. What was germane was that at that time there were. Now we should also get this clearly established, Mr. Speaker. When we were dealing with this question of nationalisation as an act of the Government, it was held up to the outside world that all the buses were not taken over; that some that were taken over

were handed back in some instances to the original concessionaires and in other instances to other people, friends and countrymen; some were handed from the left hand to the right hand, and some were handed from the right hand to the left hand, but some never came into the hands or into the control of the Executive of this island at all, and there are many buses, many routes and many concessions being operated in this country today independent of a Government subsidy and independent of the beneficence, control, advice and direction of the Minister for Communications and Works. As reasonable men, we have to assume that since a period of five years has elapsed since the battle between the Government and the bus concessionaires and those concessionaires who are operating buses now, whether there are buses which were given up, buses which were given back or buses which were given over to them, not one of these concessionaires has put in a petition for bankruptcy either in the Registry or in the Supreme Court or any other Court of this island; not one of these concessionaires registered as a limited liability company has gone into voluntary liquidation or had had a winding-up order made or an application for a member's voluntary winding-up or a creditor's voluntary winding-up. None of these things has actually happened in the five years that have passed since the taking over of a part of the transport system by the Executive, and we can only come to the conclusion

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

.....that these concessions are being operated without a loss.

Now it cannot be argued by the Minister of Communications or anyone else that these concessions are being operated inefficiently or less efficiently than the Transport Board operates its concessions, for the simple reason that the Director of Highways and Transport and the Ministry have very wide powers of supervision over the standard of services, the rates chargeable, the fares payable and other matters concerning the running of private concessions.

2.55 p.m.

The only power of interference which the Ministry does not enjoy directly or indirectly is the power to represent the private concessionaires by interfering with their buses. The Ministry cannot cook the books of the private concessionaires; those books are subject to scrutiny by the Department of Inland Revenue and by no other person. I have no doubt myself that if the Ministry did enjoy some such power of doing the book-keeping of these private concessionaires, the concessionaires would either be bankrupt or in jail already. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you want to be further convinced of the truth of these allegations which I make of this interference which I elect to draw at this stage to the taxpayers who pay for the upkeep of the Transport Board and who have to subsidise the people who travel on the buses due to the ineptitude of the Minister of Works, we who do not travel on these buses, the motor car owners, the bicycle owners and the donkey-cart owners, we who subsidise the Transport Board buses through the ineptitude and incompetence of the Minister of Works, do not have to subsidise the Rocklyn Bus Company, the Boston Bus Company, the St. George Bus Company, the Blades Hill Bus Company, the Progressive Bus Company - and I do not know if we subsidise the Federal Bus Company, but let us assume that we do not subsidise that - and the Liberty Bus Company; none of those services operate with a single penny of the taxpayers' money in order to bolster its finance. But on the other side of the picture we have this monolithic structure which is described in the Laws of this Island as a Transport Board, not as the Barbados Transport Board, and I think it is a creditable thing which the Executive did when they spared Barbados of having its name attached to their title; this monolithic Board, which is not a Board at all, which by statute should operate independently but which is subjected to the caprices, interferences, and the general ineptitude of the Minister of Works who is now smiling so blissfully in his chair, like Nero fiddling while Rome was burning; this big or-

ganisation that has changed its management at least three times and which has a management from day to day which has to do firings and hirings as part of the weekly going-ons in Roebuck Street, where perhaps there are over forty buses derelict, lying down, of no use either to the Board or to the members of the public and which have recently acquired at the expense of the taxpayers of this island some forty-two new units - Gargantuan leviathans which invade the narrowness of the highways of the colony, which smash into people's motor cars day after day, which run down cyclists and pedestrians, and which are driven with the same care-free abandon and lack of responsibility as is displayed by the Minister himself in the discharge of his functions.

This Transport Board has caused the taxpayers of this island well over \$2 million during the past five years. The reason why we say that we have no confidence in the Minister of Communications is very simple. His handling of the Transport situation in this island has been inept. He has been guilty in our opinion of a fair amount of duplicity and acquisition; but what is more important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that sum of \$2 million would have given us free secondary education, not for five years, but for twelve years. I go further. If this \$2 million were invested with another \$500,000 or so, it would have given free secondary education for a much longer time than twelve years. It is a question of simple arithmetic. If you go to the Estimates of the current financial year, you will see that the total amount of fees collected from the Government aided secondary schools during the past financial year is in the vicinity of \$180,000. The Government is currently spending around \$8 million or \$8 1/2 million on secondary education in this island, but the amount collected by way of income is in the vicinity of \$180,000 per annum; therefore, if you in one year neglected or refused to collect school fees from any of the parents of children or any of the guardians or from the children themselves who attend the Government-aided secondary schools in this island, the taxpayers would have to pay \$180,000 and on that average each year for the next twelve years at the present rate of the school population, it will take twelve years for the taxpayers to pay \$2 million.

3.05 p.m.

Of course, our ambitions are beyond that because we want to double the amount of available accommodation in Government-aided secondary schools. That is our ambition on this side of the House immediately. At the present level it will cost \$180,000 a year. We saw recently the incompetence and ineptitude of the Minister of Communications in that he is depriving the children of having something of which he was partially unable to take advantage himself; whether he benefitted from his exposure or not is another matter altogether. A lot of us are exposed to draughts and germs and you can recover, and perhaps the Minister has recovered. He, least of all, should embark upon a policy or be stubborn in his refusal to do something effective which will inure to the benefit of the school children who are coming up.

The \$2 million - well, it is much more than that. I do not want to indulge in floating inaccuracies on the floor of this House; but I will be conservative in stating the amount of money which the hon. member has thrown away. This sum of \$2 million would save the Labour Welfare Fund from underwriting the cost of the construction of the new hospital; it would have serviced a loan of over \$30 million. Think of that, Sir; \$30 million in industrial development in this island; that is what the Transport Board cost us. The Government is supposed to persist in allocating the resources of the country on certain principles which do not admit of argument in this enlightened day. The first principle is that of the maximum social advantage; the resources of a country should be extended in such a manner that you have due regard to your priorities, but you try to equate the demands which should emerge in the principle of maximum social advantage. The Government is not housekeeping; I have said that on the floor of this House time and time again. The Government's problems are not the problems which the housekeeper has; in many ways the housekeeper has a lot more problems than a Government has, and in many ways the problems are not similar. If you apply this principle of maximum social advantage to the expenditure of money which has gone down

the drain through the devious channels of the Ministry of Communications and Works, through the yawning gulf of Weymouth into the bottomless pit of the Transport Board, could anybody in his right senses say that this money has been applied to the economy of this island in such a manner as to give the maximum social advantage to the community? Has it been applied in such a way that it has alleviated in any degree the suffering of the 26 thousand or more unemployed persons who live in this unfortunate island? To the contrary, the latest act of annihilation in relation to the survival of the masses of the people - I refer now to the purchase of the forty-two buses - must of itself deliberately deprive coach builders, carpenters, body builders and mechanics of employment. Again, the bus-building industry was one which was indigenous; the only thing which was not actually produced or assembled here was the actual chassis itself.

When I speak to you on these matters, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot afford, in the presence of an expert like yourself, to be inaccurate or in any way erratic in my statements, because you, better than any other member of this Chamber, would know the whole history of transportation within living memory in this island. You know that on many days you would see chassis being landed on the wharf and that Barbadian workers would be engaged in putting on these chassis structures which were, in my opinion, although not aesthetically perfect, at least from the conventional point of view, they were much better suited to the climatic and other conditions which we have in this island, than the blast furnaces which are imported under the name of buses. Buses designed for a temperate zone have no significance in the tropics except as an instrument of torture. I have not travelled very frequently in them, but I have travelled in them and I defy any one to say otherwise, as to the 42 buses which the Minister denied last year had been ordered but which everybody knew had been ordered, and which had actually arrived down to the very last one. That is what I would call equivocation and double-dealing. These buses are the instruments of torture in so far as the public are concerned, and the public would, in my opinion, know of the Minister's equivocation and double-dealing in the fact that they had placed orders for buses of that kind, and those buses manufactured wholly and solely in the United Kingdom or Germany inure to the detriment of the body builders and carpenters in this island.

3.15 p.m.

I go further and say this: I challenge you to ask any visitor to this island which of the two types of buses, the old boarded and shingle open-side or the new incubators, were more suitable to the tropical conditions which we have to endure here. Ask any visitor, if you think Barbadians are incompetent to judge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Ministers over there, although there is a plethora of advice available not only in Barbados but on our doorsteps in the neighbouring colonies and even as far as Jamaica, are fond of getting people to come here to tell them what to do. Mr. So-and-so must come and mark out their work for them. I know they do not like me to say these things because they hurt; but when I speak I am speaking with a great deal of sorrow because my people have not progressed any further. I am not speaking to make them feel smaller than they are, if that were possible. I am speaking with regret that it is always that we must get Mr. So-and-so to come and tell us to do what you have been told on the floor of this House for the past ten or fifteen years to do; but as soon as Mr. So-and-so comes down, it is all right because those fellows over there cannot take the credit for it. The hon. senior member for St. Peter can tell you whether what I am saying is correct; I have documentary evidence for it. An industrialist in writing about his dealings with the Government said that when they got the project okayed, they must throw a big splash and give the Minister a big build up so that the people in the Opposition would not get any of the credit for having assisted in bringing this particular industry to Barbados. Any of the Ministers who want a photostatic copy of that letter can have it for 7/6 each. (Mr. STRAUGHN: Why are you trading?) That is what it costs to copy. I am not letting the original out of my possession, and I have shown it to my colleagues. That is the approach we have in Barbados.

Now you have people in Barbados who have run buses and never been bankrupt. You have people who have flourished and gone on to greater heights in industry who started out in the bus business; you have people like yourself who know the inside of business, and, as you know, in Barbados you have people who stand on the outside and know what is going on on the inside as well; but I will leave that last category out, because the average Barbadian sitting in the pavilion can tell the Umpire which way the ball turned better than the bowler because he thinks he knows these things. Let us deal with the people who know and who are competent. The best person to tell you how to run a bus system in Barbados is a Barbadian, but we have now gone to Trinidad and got a new Manager. I believe he is originally not from Trinidad; so we cannot say that we got a Trinidadian. I would not like to speak with any authority on it, but the gentleman, I believe, is from England, and was in Trinidad trying to run things there.

I wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if any of the Ministers read the Trinidad newspapers. They have had Mr. Gibbons out here; he was a licencing officer and he persuaded them to buy one kind of bus. He was never a mechanic, so leave him out. Let us come to the present management of the Port-of-Spain bus service. It is the worst run bus service in the Caribbean next to the Transport Board, if that is possible. It has never paid. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: You lie.) The buses are not half as good as some of the buses that are lying on the scrap heap in Weymouth. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Another lie.) The buses are dirty. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Another lie.) I will give the Minister something more to speak about. The people of Port-of-Spain only use them in duress when they cannot get taxis. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Another lie.) But the Minister for Communications has struck up some remarkable friendship - I can only describe it as that - which transcends his commonsense and his patriotism with the gentleman who is going to be the new Manager of the Transport Board, but what is it costing this country? It costs us a letter of May 5th, 1960, and this is the price which is going to be attached to the new supposed, alleged efficiency of the Transport system. The letter dated 5th May, 1960 signed by Mr. Grant, the Director of Highways and Transport, was issued to all pickup owners in this island directing them that as from 31st July, 1960, their permits will not be renewed in view of the fact that the conditions set out in the permits were not observed.

Now I am saying this, Mr. Deputy Speaker; that would have to be the responsibility of the Minister. The Director of Highways and Transport could not issue this lying letter - I say this lying letter and I will give you the proof of it - to the owners of these vans unless he had a directive from the Minister himself. The letter is lying for this reason, and I never say anything unless I can back it up. Long before the 30th May, far less the 31st July, several of these van owners wrote - I say wrote because I posted some of the letters myself and so did the hon. member for St. Lucy - to the Director of Highways and Transport asking him to particularise the manner or manners in which the owners of the respective motor vans had failed to observe the conditions under which the permits had been issued. 3.25 p.m.

We are now on the 4th August 1960. No reply to any of these letters has ever been received by any of the van owners. Now, here I say that not only should the Minister resign, but he ought to take with him the Director of Highways and Transport into the wilderness. Here is the Head of the Department making an allegation which can only mean that the recipients of these letters had committed criminal offences within the statute law of this island. I can understand now why they did not reply because they would have to explain if these people committed a criminal offence and, if so, how is it that the Police did not prosecute these van owners for it. Some of the van owners had been prosecuted for some offences, such as driving their vans on the wrong route, but the majority of them had not been prosecuted or, so to speak, had not infringed the Motor Vehicle Road Traffic Regulations. Obviously, the Director of Highways and Transport found himself in this predicament, that as a servant of the Government he

had to obey the lawful instructions or otherwise of the Minister; but when it came to committing himself to writing, he realised that he would be committing himself to an action for defamation, in other words, an action for libel, had he just scratched a pen to reply to either one of these people. He would have found himself in a very difficult position. It was then that discretion became an act of valour. Although he would have liked to carry out the lawful instructions of the Minister, he tried to protect himself and his family by not committing himself to paper. That is all that happened.

I have one of the letters here and I challenge the Hon. Minister to say that this was not sent out under his directions because the Director of Highways and Transport said that "I am directed" and the only person who can direct the Director is somebody higher than the Director. I have forgotten most of the Latin that I learnt at school, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but you can help me: "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes" which means "who is going to direct the Director?" It can only be the Minister and you will notice that the Director was very careful to say "I am directed." He did not say "this is to inform you." He made it clear that he was directed and that person who directed him could be nobody else than the Hon. Minister of Communications. If it is somebody other than the Minister we would all like to know. Is it the Governor after the wonderful constitutional changes which we have, or is he directed by strangers from outside? I know he was directed.

We are now given to understand that since 15th July, anyhow shortly before the 31st July that some of these van owners received a guided missile from the Highways and Transport and this guided missile now states that the period has been extended for three months. In other words, not that they would get a new licence but the whole matter is in abeyance for three months. As a matter of fact, the person to whom this letter which I have was directed was one of the persons who received one of those guided missiles from the Highways and Transport Department.

You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what that letter stated was that the permits would not be renewed. They have not said that they would give you a permit now. They have left the matter open for three months. In other words, the date for the permits to be renewed is from the 31st October rather than the 31st July. Let us examine the position from the other side. To the best of my knowledge, any pick-up on the road today is operating illegally unless the owner had paid his motor vehicle taxes from the 1st January to the 31st December. It is permissible to pay your taxes half-yearly, but whether you do that half-yearly or not, whether you never use your car, whether you never use your car after June, you still have to pay your tax for the whole year because it is a yearly tax although you can pay it in two instalments. As I have said, the tax is due in January but you can pay it in two instalments. The fact of the matter is this. A lot of the van owners, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has gone in to the Licensing Authority who is really the Local Government Council, and they have been told that since they are operating a goods vehicle, the Licensing Authority cannot give them or accept from them their licence for the half-year even although they have their Third Party Insurance Certificate. They cannot get their licence unless they bring their permit from the Department of Highways and Transport.

I want you to consider that very carefully, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the reality of the moment is that although the Director says the 31st October, he has not yet taken active steps, up to today, to issue permits to those people to allow them to get their parochial licence to drive their vehicles. Many of the van owners went to the Local Government Authority long before the 31st July and, obviously, there had been some kind of communications - let me put it that way - between the Ministry and the Local Government Authority because on the van owners presenting their money themselves and their vans and their pick-ups at the offices of the Local Government Authority, they were told "We cannot take this money from you in view of the communication which was sent out by the Director of

and Transport because we would be giving you permission to drive a vehicle which has not been certified, checked or passed by the Director of Highways and Transport." This kind of behaviour is because of the callous indifference on the part of the Minister to the lot of the small hard-working businessmen in this island.

3.35 p.m.

Wherever there is any initiative, wherever there is any self-reliance, wherever there is any anxiety to carve out a living for yourself and your family independent of the patronage of members of the Government, independent of the patronage of the mercantile community and independent of the patronage of the plantocracy of this island, you will find the Government coming down heaviest on those people. Where a man displays any iota of independence at all, you will find hostility not only in the attitude and pronouncement of the Ministers, but active hostility in the legislation which is passed to squeeze these people out of existence and render them extinct. I have given you an illustration of the form of private enterprise which originated and was built up and carried on by coloured men of enterprise in this island, the only one at which you could look with any pride. They have turned their attention now to the small man who has saved up a little money in Aruba or has mortgaged his house so as to buy a pick-up or even a man who is going into the highways and byways and bringing the hucksters to Bridgetown. They turn themselves to create more unemployment by putting these small van owners out of existence. In whichever way you look at it, the action of the Minister must have one, and only one, result: and that is to put these people out of existence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will give you another illustration of how they want every one in their patronage. They have built two public markets - they have built one and renovated the other - and made an order that those who sold in Busby's Alley must go into the public Market; but the people who have been selling in the customary markets about the City to the detriment of no one and to the convenience of housewives, these people are huddled like cattle into the encampment at Cheapside to the pleasure of the Ministers, and they are being installed like Canons in a Cathedral. They have built a cathedral and they have taken the hawkers and made them Canons and installed them into the Public Market at Cheapside. The people who used to sell in Busby's Alley are the people from St. Philip and even from St. Thomas, the constituency which the Minister represents; they are the people who did not support the Labour Party and they have to cluster around outside the roadway and pay for the privilege of being down there. That is what they have done with these captains of industry; that is the kind of Government we have now. And people wonder why I cannot accommodate myself and my conscience to the extent of working with them! I would sooner have my head chopped off than work with them.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not have risen at all if it had not been for the hon. member saying something about the Market. I thought that he would have seen the accommodation in the Market; it is so good, that more people have joined the ranks of the hawkers.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that is absolutely ridiculous and I will deal with him now. How many licences were issued before the market was renovated? Now he has built another market in St. Philip and nobody with a tray has ever been inside there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member deal with the buses. We are dealing with the buses and therefore the hon. member should keep away from the Market.

Mr. BARROW: But the pick-ups bring products to the market.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member do away with the markets.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to do away with the Minister. I am saying that the pick-ups bring the produce to

Bridgetown. The Minister has built a public market in St. Philip and I challenge him to say that one hawker has been in it; they have about six or ten occupants cleaning the market and you cannot get anybody going in there. You go to the market in St. Philip on Saturday and you cannot find anybody there. Now they are building a market in Bay Street.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not entertaining any debate on the markets at all; let the hon. member keep away from the markets. You are now dealing with two Ministries; the markets concern the Minister of Agriculture; so let us deal with the Minister of Communications.

Mr. BARROW: The position is this. I was referring to the type of person on whom this burden is imposed. When you come to the Americans and the Canadians, you lend them money through the Development Board; you can lend them \$75,000 and you let them build hotels. But when you come to the small man you encompass him with restrictions, you fetter his movements and he cannot do anything. Do you not think that that is something which should be stamped out at the earliest possible opportunity? So closely do these people operate with the Conservatives that the Conservative press would not give a fair report of the vote of "no confidence" which is taking place. The hon. member is amazing and unqualified in his ambition to be better than some one else; he himself is so shortsighted that he does not see that this vote of "no confidence" is probably the shortest route for him to take. (Laughter) This is no laughing matter; this is a serious matter. This is a very serious crisis; it is a crisis in the affairs of the island.

3.45 p.m.

In the Estimates for the current year, the Government estimated an expenditure of \$22,960,605; that figure was subsequently revised after the printing. Now it is significant that in the Estimates which were approved, not even a token vote for \$1.00 was put to do something which you as the Chairman of the Local Council knows will have to be done; that is, at least two of the Local Government authorities will have to be subsidised perhaps to the extent of \$500,000, certainly not less than \$300,000. That is a matter of fact that can be seen and it is also a matter of public and general knowledge that the local authorities have not been able to send out their bills because the Government has not made up its mind.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again the hon. member is straying.

Mr. BARROW: I am not straying, Sir; I am trying to show the importance.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Local Government Councils have nothing to do with this.

Mr. BARROW: It is impossible to discuss the expenditure of the Transport Board, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unless I can illustrate where the money has gone and what it can be doing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At least it has not gone to the Councils.

Mr. BARROW: That is what I am trying to say; it could have gone to the Councils, and I know that that you speak with authority when you say that. The rates could have been approved by now if it were not for the Minister of Communications, and the taxpayers would know where they stand. Do you mean that they will wait until Christmas when things are hard to tell us that we have so much rates to pay? That shows that the Transport Board cannot be looked at in isolation.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order, from the hon. member's argument is he implying that he is not moving a motion for confidence against the Minister but against the Government?

Mr. BARROW: You do not want me to say anything to him. I have been in here far too long, Sir, to allow anybody like him to put me off, or any other whipper-snapper; but I only want to say that it is impossible to look at the Departments which the Minister controls in isolation.

There is one thing that it is competent for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to do, and it is to get there like a sitting hen and cackle unto himself all the time; if he wants to say something he can rise to his feet. He is in here on sufferance like the other members of the public.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I raise objection to those remarks. No member of this House is here on sufferance like other members of the public. If you are a member of the House, you are a member of the House; but the members of the public are here on sufferance.

Mr. BARROW: We suffer him because we suffer fools gladly.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I was saying is that it is impossible to look at the Transport Board and the Transportation system of this island *in vacuo*. (Mr. STRAUGHN: That is why the motion is stupid.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph must not interfere with the hon. member when he is speaking. If you wish to speak you have your time.

Mr. BARROW: I think you ought to remind the hon. member that he has had his time in every sense of the word; he has had his time in this debate and in the House as well. I know that having been born in Deacons Road which is below sea level, he cannot even rise to the level of the debate.

Not only is it a question of the inconvenience of the travelling public, not only is it a question of what the taxpayers have to endure, the additional burdens which are imposed on them which they would never have had to endure had it not been for the mismanagement of the Ministry, but it is a question of the other social and economic purposes to which this money which has been expended could have been put. It is also a question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of some other factors such as those I have been outlining, factors such as the putting out of employment of the owners of small vans and pickups, the herding into corrals or compounds of hawkers, the inconvenience which these people who largely operate the distributive trades of this island in green vegetables, garden provisions and fruit will have to suffer as a result of the policy of the Minister of Communications. There are all of these things that are involved. Not only that, but we are so well provided with skill and experience at the level of labour that we are actively pursuing a policy in this island of sending people up to the London Transport Board to work up there; so it could not be that the Minister can blame, as he has attempted indirectly and not by a direct formal attack, - but he has certainly made statements along the lines - the conductors and drivers by saying that there has been a lot of thievery going on. We know there is thievery and corruption but it is not at the level he wants to attribute it to

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I challenge the hon. member to produce any statement of mine in this House or outside where I made use of what he has just attributed to, that is that there has been a lot of thievery going on. Let him produce it.

Mr. BARROW: The Minister does not really expect me to stop now, but if he will give me an opportunity to make a statement at the next meeting of the House, just to give him the page and supply you with one, Mr Deputy Speaker, where he has made reference to stealing going on at the Transport Board, I will do that. He might not have used the word "thievery" and I said I was not speaking in the precise terms that he used. Is he going to deny it? If he used the word "steal" and I say that there is thievery, is that something to interrupt me on?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been going on but not at the level at which the Minister wants to ascribe it, but at a much higher level.
3.55 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have not made any statement of any kind referring to thievery, or stealing on any level on which it is going on. I object to the hon. member's remarks of stealing on any level because no debate of mine states that there is any thievery going on at the Transport Board at any level. He is putting words into my mouth. He cannot bring in anything which I have said in here to support what he has said.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to ask the hon. member a record question. If it is not within his knowledge that there is stealing going on or that there has been stealing going on, what was the reason therefore for the introduction of the turnstiles? What was the reason behind it?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I repeat, let him look at my speech on the introduction of the turnstiles. Let him look at my speech for the passing of the Resolution. Let him refer to it and he will see that I made no mention of thievery at any level at the Transport Board. He made a wide statement. Let him see if I made any reference at all to that.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister forgets that I work in the Courts. The Hon. Minister will also pretend that I have been away when I have been present in Court when they attempt to prosecute people of the Transport Board in Court for stealing.

I have asked him to give reasons for the introduction of the turnstiles, but during the time that the Transport Board was under his direction, I am prepared to submit proof that he has made a statement attributing some of the losses to the lot of stealing going on there. Does the hon. member expect after a course of a year or two years, or say 18 months, that I can quote him *verbatim*? I do not have any family working at the Transport Board. That is all I have to say. If they worked there, I would know that they would have to be prosecuted if there were any stealing.

Accounts of the Transport Board which were to be presented to this House, which should be presented in October, when they were presented to the Ministry, they asked them to take them back. I wonder if the Minister knows about that. Investigate it, if he does not know and see if somebody did not ask that they be sent back because the accounts were not right. The hon. senior member for the City, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and other hon. members know about it. Ask the Hon. Minister to investigate it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We have never in our Ministry sent back audited accounts of the Transport Board.

Mr. BARROW: Did I say anything about accounts?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Only audited accounts are sent from the Transport Board to the Ministry; therefore there are no other accounts to be sent back to the Transport Board.

Mr. BARROW: I will go so far as to saying: how can people be so brazen? Is it that the people in Barbados are surrendering their country to these people who are supposed to represent them through a sense of right-doing? Why is it that people like that should represent people of good-will?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I object to the remark "people like that." He means to say that the people should look up to people like them, people of no character.

Mr. BARROW: I said "people like that". There is nothing unparliamentary about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker; but when that Hon. Minister - I cannot even describe him;

as I cannot describe him with words suitable for this Place, I will tell him outside.

However, just ask him to withdraw that remark that I have no character. I said "people like that". I invite him to get up on a point of order and say that I have no character.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John I was rapping my gavel and drawing your attention to the hon. member rising on a point of order. When the hon. member was speaking you were still on your feet and I was telling you that the hon. member had risen on a point of order and then you sat. I did not hear him use the remark.

Mr. BARROW: He said it after I sat down. If you want to deny he said it, it is all right with me; I will go on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John is objecting to the remark of your having said that he is a man of no character.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I objected to the remark he said in reference to people over on this side. I have not heard anything of that yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member said "people like that". I don't consider that as anything unparliamentary, so I would not be able to ask him to withdraw the remark. I do not know whom he meant at the time. Now he is referring to your saying that he is a man who has no character.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If he says "people like that" he is referring particularly to members of this House and it is out of order. Any one can get up and object to that. No member can be referred to as "people like that." I object to that.

Mr. BARROW: I want to get this thing back on a rational level.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am waiting on the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: When an objection is taken, no further debate is allowed. Immediately as the hon. member made the remarks, I got up and objected. When you force him to withdraw them, then I will consider any further actions.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to make it clear that the hon. member did not get up to object to anything that I said and I did not make any personal remarks to him. I made a general statement. He got up and delivered an unprovoked tirade and made an attack upon my personal character. He said "you have no character." I take it according to the Rules that if he wanted to object that the proper thing for him to do was to get up and say "I object to those remarks" and sit down and allow you to rule. He did not do that. 4.05 p.m.
I do not think I would be intimidated by the Ministerial benches either.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said I did not hear the remarks. I was drawing to your attention the fact that the hon. member was on his feet and I asked you to take your seat. The remarks were made then. I did not hear them because I was knocking the gavel. You said that the hon. member began to attack you; the position is that the hon. member is objecting to your remarks and you are objecting to his.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member made a personal attack on me. There is nothing unparliamentary about the statement "people like them". I said that people would surrender their morality to people like them. Must I say that the people are right to vote for them when the essence of debate is a motion for "no confidence" against them? I ask you to ask him to withdraw the statement that I have no character. The trouble is that there are too many persons to make a ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now that the hon. member has referred to people of immorality, that is making matters worse. I did not hear the remarks at first but I would take objection to the remarks which you used.

Mr. BARROW: I said they would surrender their morality to people like them. That is what I said. I did not accuse anybody of immorality; I made a scathing remark about them but it is not unparliamentary. It is no different from saying that the Minister is incompetent. The Hon. Minister has not objected to the use of the word "incompetent" because this is a debate about his incompetence or lack of competence; but the Minister said that I have no character. I object to that, and I am not going on with this debate unless you ask him to withdraw that. The hon. member has made a personal remark about me and according to the Rules of the House any hon. member can object to such remarks against him. Suppose I said that the Government is lacking in political morality or in any other kind of morality; is that something to which to object? But I have not said that in this debate and all these digressions serve to illustrate that you must be firm in your decision at once. You allowed the hon. member to bandy about in such a manner that the whole tenor of the matter is lost.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is very firm on the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I did not hear the remarks but what you said in your remarks may have caused the hon. member to say what he should not have said. The remarks which you admitted you made are not the best remarks to be used and I rule now that you will have to withdraw your remarks and the Hon. Minister will have to withdraw his.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in so far as you consider the remarks a reflection on the House, I withdraw them, but the cap must fit somebody for him to draw the string.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas withdraw his remarks?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In so far as you consider them offensive to the House, I withdraw them.

Mr. BARROW: It is not a personal affront although he is taking an objection; it is an affront to the Rules of debate; therefore I am not worrying if he says that in so far as you consider the remarks offensive he will withdraw them. I would give the hon. member \$10 for each word if he says them outside this House; I cannot afford more than that. But I would repeat what I said about him outside at the earliest opportunity. The hon. member can call witnesses, I will call mine and I can repeat to the hon. member what I said. I say nothing in here that I cannot repeat outside with impunity. Here you have a situation in this island where you have a public transportation system and you have also a private transportation system - which is a rather anomalous state of affairs; you have private enterprise and you have Government control in the same industry. You have a subsidiary service in the form of pick-ups and you find them, as I have illustrated, going into the highways and byways of the rural parishes of this island and bringing provisions and those who sell these provisions down to the City of Bridgetown; and they take them back up at night with their household goods and the balance of their unsold products. The Transport Board itself cannot and will not provide any form of service for these people. You will get directives issued from the Department under the Minister's control which have the effect not only of putting the pick-ups and their owners out of existence but of depriving the hawkers who distribute the produce of this island of the facilities for marketing their goods. Mr. Chairman, that is the point I was trying to make. Anyhow, the Minister will relish the approach of the day when you will be able to buy a breadfruit only in a Broad Street store or from one of the members of the Shipping and Trading Association. 4.15 p.m.

He will relish the day when carpenters will not be able to get any money for making trays for hawkers to sell out of, because the hawkers would be extinct.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Communications does not anticipate that the effect of his policy will be to put not only the van owners out of work, but to put more money into the pockets of the people who are concentrated in the monopolistic practices which exist in this island of trade and industry, so that today people who would despise even handling a breadfruit out of a tray are selling them in big shops, not only in Bridgetown but in the Marine Gardens and places like that. If you want to buy thyme, you can go to one of the big stores and buy it. There is nothing wrong with it, but when a Government carries out a policy which would have the direct or indirect effect of concentrating trade into the hands of a few people, one has to ask oneself whether their pretensions to be working on behalf of the masses are not hollow and a sham. That is what we have to consider.

When we turn now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the position of the taxi drivers and taxi owners, the situation is even more deplorable than it is with the owners of vans and pick-ups. I myself witnessed a spectacle one day during the past tourist season in this year of grace, 1960 when I was on the Pier Head and a tourist boat was in. Three buses of the Transport Board and nine other buses were on the Pier Head, making a total of twelve buses which would have a full carrying capacity of 480 persons, not only by contract, but by consent of the Minister, to take the tourists on a tour around the island. Now what did that mean? This is what it meant: the average carrying capacity of a taxi is four persons; each taxi has one taxi owner or taxi driver and it meant that on that day when I was present on the Pier Head - myself and the hon. senior member for the City and certain Police Officers were down there - one hundred and twenty taxi owners were put out of jobs at \$20 or \$30 each; that would be \$3,600 which would have gone into the pockets of those taxi owners. The remarkable thing about it was this: the buses charged less than, let us say, \$60 from my information and they could have carried 48 passengers seated. My information is that the tourists were not charged any less or any different rate from the rate which they would have had to pay to the taxi drivers if they had gone in the taxis, so that on each bus which had a potential of, say, 48 passengers, at, let us say, \$10 a minimum the amount charged would have been \$480; so a profit of \$300 would be made on each bus. They claimed that they gave the tourists lunch. Well, I do not know where the lunch idea cropped up - I do not know whether it was after we appeared at the Pier Head - but the lunch could not take care of the \$300; but I know that anyone who comes from America, from Scotland, Oslo, from New York, Boston or Philadelphia to the West Indies and is so short of money that he can only afford to get in a bus is not the sort of tourist we want in Barbados at all, because once you get them in a bus they are shepherded and herded to specific resorts and attractions and they are not allowed to stop off in Broad Street and shop, and the Minister knew about that because the taxi drivers telephoned the Minister and went to see him, though some were unsuccessful in seeing him, and those who saw him got no reply from him.

You will see, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is not only a question of our not liking the Minister's manners or his face, or the way he carries himself in public, or his teeth or glasses, or his clothes; it is a question that we the small taxpayers and businessmen who are trying to be independent of Government and of everybody, are the people who are being hit, because we have to subsidise the people who ride in the Transport Board buses. We do not have to subsidise the people who drive in the Boston or Rocklyn buses, but because the Minister is controlling these buses, that is what he is doing. We had to subsidise them to the tune of \$2 million within the last three years or so, and it means that one of the results of his policy is that 120 taxi drivers were put out of work on one day alone. That is the Minister's policy that we are complaining of. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, your colleague, is an infant in politics and he will begin to understand one of these days. His days are numbered; so your constituents will handle that problem. I think they have resolved the problem already. (Mr. STRAUGHN: You are rather concerned.)

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a vote of "no confidence" is not a thing to be lightly embarked upon; it can only be

after due consideration and after public opinion is so strong on our side that affairs call out for a debate of this kind. A vote of "no confidence" can only be carried at a time when there are sufficient numbers of people in the Government Party who have a conscience or commonsense to see the writing on the wall. In any Government in the world, it must necessarily be so because either they abstain from voting or vote on the side of the Opposition as happened to Mr. Neville Chamberlain in 1939. Either you refrain from supporting the policy because you do not want to go down in the ship or you vote on the other side; so those are the principal conditions under which a vote of "no confidence" could be successful.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there have been in the history of Parliamentary and Democratic institutions many votes of "no confidence" which have not been carried; but the impact effect of these votes although not carried has been to startle the country into some sense of emergency, to focus the spotlight of public opinion on the ineptitude of the Ministry concerned, to highlight the incompetence, the equivocation, the double-dealing and all those matters which should not operate in public affairs which are operating in one or other of the Departments of public affairs.
4.25 p.m.

That really is the purpose, the *rationale* and the objective of a vote of "no confidence." I have no doubt, Sir, that so much do they despise the electorate as a whole that they would want to treat this matter lightly. It is true that the people in Barbados appear to be in a somnolent state at the present moment, but if there is one way in which you can stimulate the interest of Barbadians is when you begin to make your policies felt on their pockets. The affairs in this country especially in the sphere of Communications have reached the stage that nearly everybody living in the community has felt the impact of the Minister's negligence and incompetence in his pocket. The taxi drivers have felt it, the pick-up and van owners have felt it, the people who do not ride on the buses have felt it and the people who ride in the buses have felt it by the increase in bus fares. If that does not touch every department, every stratum and household in this island, I do not know what other public issue can possibly be of greater importance to the electorate of this island and of greater importance to the management of the financial affairs of the colony. I cannot possibly conceive of a worse Minister of Communications or any kind of Minister than the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. He has an inexhaustible potential for wrong-doing and doing the wrong thing at the right time. If that is not sufficient justification for a vote of "no confidence", I do not know what.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock, it is time for Government Business.

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

RESOLUTION re BARBADOS IMMIGRANTS LIAISON SERVICE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. junior member for St. John was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I was quoting from the debates of this House dated Wednesday, 18th March, 1959, and I was quoting from page 199 from a speech which I made during the debate, as far as I can remember, on the Estimates. I had got to the stage where I had pointed out in the course of that speech that the London Transport Executive wanted 700 workers and could get only 50 or 60 from Barbados and that the educational standard of the colony was lacking. I have already read the Minister's replies. If I go back a couple of lines, it is only to pick up the threads. In my speech I continued as follows:-

"The position is that they have found that the educational standard of the workers from Barbados, particu-

larly those who have been victims of age grouping has fallen off; but they would be willing to have a lot more workers. That shows you what a vicious circle the lack of positive thinking on the part of the Government in all aspects of the conduct of public affairs can have on the well-being of the people, because when they do not pay sufficient attention to the educational standards of the people of Barbados, you get a falling off in the demand for workers from Barbados once the top has been creamed off. Now nobody wants the leaves and the left-overs because the jobs which they are called upon to do up there will call for a certain amount of aptitude and a certain amount of educational background, which, say, fifteen years ago, we could have supplied willingly; but now today they say they cannot take more than 60 because their experience now is that if they attempt to recruit more than 60 workers at a time the quality would necessarily suffer. That is a fact. Why has the Minister of Finance not mentioned this? Why blame the technological innovations which have caused from time to time temporary recessions in the United States and the United Kingdom on the ill state of the economy of Barbados? I can prove to him, Sir, that emigration from Barbados was at its height at a time when there was a very severe industrial recession and the industrial demand had fallen off in England, but there was still a high level of employment in the United Kingdom."

I quoted from that debate not because I want to say that 'I told you so'. It is a matter of regret to me as a Barbadian that the Ministers cannot find it possible to approach their jobs with a little less partiality. It is a matter of regret that they should not sometimes try to do those things which would be good to the people of this island. Since that statement was made and the statement of the Hon. Minister to which I referred on page 226 of the same debate, that reply given by him amongst other things that I was always misleading, several things have happened and I will not mention other things which could be mentioned now but which will come up in this House for a debate at the appropriate time, - and that will be the next vote of "no confidence" - but the Minister of Trade after he went to England, if he said I would check this, one would be able to forgive him; but as the hon. senior member for St. Philip stated, he was rash enough to do nothing about it. I would be more charitable to him and say that perhaps he did not have the opportunity to check what I told him, but he made a categorical statement which was inconsistent with what I said. He said that there is no true educational standard in the world. I say that the sooner we stop this foolish habit which we have in Barbados of saying that we have the best educational standards, the best island and the best Constitution and get down to doing a job of work, the more respect the people in the other parts of the West Indies would have for us. When you go outside you are fond of telling others that we have got the best educational standards and the best of everything and it is that kind of careless talk which caused us to lose the Federal Capital.

4.35 p.m.

If the Minister had said: "That sounds very interesting, I will check that", nobody could criticise that; but he did otherwise. He went to England and came back and said that he would set up training centres - I think there were six of them - and he gave reasons. When you examine the reasons, you find that he was told by the people just what I was telling him six months ago, and he said I was misleading the House! Now that the hon. senior member for Christ Church has come down from England, he said that there were four thousand jobs open. The Minister said we have these four thousand people who can work £. s. d but they do not want to go to England. When I was going to Wesley Hall with the hon. senior member for St. Peter and one or two other enlightened members, I could find third and fourth standard boys who could do £. s. d. I think that we have at least 4,000 people out of our population who can work £. s. d.; but are the only people who can do £. s. d. those who do not want jobs? That is the result of the age-grouping policy inflicted upon us by those in power, other considerations aside. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas went to a Secondary School but you can go to a secondary school and get nothing by the

exposure. I would like to say that if I had to employ somebody or any of them over there, the hon. member would be the last person I would employ. To boast that we have at least three or four thousand people who can work £. s. d. is something of which to be ashamed, not of which to be proud, and the fact that those who can do that service do not want jobs is something of which to be more ashamed. The Hon. Minister has made that indictment against the educational policy of the island.

The Minister of Education is faced with this situation in Barbados that compulsory education has not been a matter of urgent necessity as it is in other islands. People voluntarily have a thirst for education in this island; but they get to the schools when they get to them, and when they get there, what are they learning? It is indeed an indictment that after spending over three million dollars on education we have set up centres ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can see the hon. member's point but I do not want him to make that the subject of his debate. I do not want him to make a debate of the Government's educational policy.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you know what used to happen in my day and yours. If Barbadians were not employed it was not because of incapacity or ineligibility or lack of educational standards. Many Barbadians left the Elementary Schools of this island and went abroad and with the minimum of effort were able to qualify for University entrance and got educational qualifications. Is that true or not, Sir? As regards the doctors and lawyers in places like Brooklyn, Harlem, Chicago and Boston, some of them were colleagues of yours at Combermere School, but a lot of them went to Wesley Hall. And the Minister of Education would know that many are the numbers whom he has produced at St. Margaret's. When I was at school, and that is not so long ago, there was nothing more that you had to learn; you had to go through Book VII in Longman's. I digress here to say that there are things like stocks and shares that I left behind for a period of twenty years and only reached them when I got to the University in London, things I had done in an Elementary School. That, Mr. Chairman, is as true as John 3.16. I never reached that level either at Combermere School or at Harrison College until twenty years later. I left it at ten years and came back to it years later.

Mr. Chairman, they are giving these Liaison Officers these high - fatutin allowances. Not only is there a certain amount of validity in the arguments of other hon. members who have suggested that you are going to introduce disparity in the salary structure - and, Sir, with an election coming up, you will have a very difficult job to convince the Civil Servants that the whole system should not be rationalised.

4.45 p.m.

You are establishing what is in truth and in fact, now that we have a Federal Government, a super structure on the Federal High Commissioner's Office, independent of the Federal High Commissioner's Office which probably could be better managed now that we are paying our hardearned money to the Federal Government by and out of the funds which we supply to them. You want an officer who will be drawing emoluments in the vicinity of \$11,500 a year which is more than a Labour Commissioner or a Permanent Secretary down here! It is true you will get these expatriate Barbadians who will entertain Ministers and other members of this House, but this personal approach to politics is one I cannot suffer or understand. We see it in several Departments, and even if it is a job in the House of Assembly, you have to canvass somebody. Nothing appears to be done on a question of merit; it is a question of personal approach. But I would like to say that as a person with public duties to perform I could never give any friend or relative of mine a personal undertaking to impose expenditure on the taxpayers of this island independent of the question of merit or merit-worthiness. It is true that I have not, fortunately or unfortunately, been in a position where I could test my personal reaction, but I think it is human that if two people came up for consideration you would prefer to give the one you know rather than the one you do not know.

Mr. Chairman, that may be good business sense, it may be shrewdness; but it may also be extended to the degree where the dividing line between patronage and industry would be very difficult to define. I am not unaware of the dangers especially in a subsistence economy like Barbados where there is a perpetual struggle for jobs, but we have to watch the public expenditure very carefully and make sure that no blandishments or inducements are held out to any member of this House, whether Ministers or other members, to do something special for an individual officer when it would only create dissension within the ranks of the Civil Service and such disparity in the income capacity of this Civil Service that the inevitable result would be a further inflationary rise in the cost of the administration. This is only the thin edge of the wedge because the Liaison Officer will now be in a position which will be superior financially to that of his Superior Officer here in Barbados as Labour Commissioner.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, now that we are talking about Federation, we are all struggling to have embassies? That is what it looks like to me. We all want to be High Commissioners and friends of the High Commissioner's office. Why should we do that now that we are moving towards Federation? Why should an officer who took a job to work in England be offered these special privileges? It must have been a job to which there was a certain element of competition; there must have been other people who were desirous of seeking and taking this appointment at the salary which was then held out, which was probably less than £1,000 a year. It is now nearly £2,500, nearly up to the Governor's salary when you consider all the total emoluments and everything else. Take a lady called Miss Ogilvie, the Deputy Labour Adviser to the Colonial Office. She is in charge not only of Barbados but of all Her Majesty's far-flung Dominions and Colonies when it comes to advice on Labour. She is not the Senior Labour Adviser, but the Chief Executive Officer in the Labour Department of the Colonial Office.

During Tuesday's debate I had a look at the Colonial Officers; I do not have it here now; otherwise I could show to the Minister the salary of that lady who is in charge of the actual advice to Labour Commissioners, goes around the Colonies - Mauritius, Uganda, Barbados, Jamaica, the Seychelles - all over the British Empire and advise on labour administration. Her salary starts at £1,650 a year which is less than the Liaison Officer for Immigrants' Service in the United Kingdom. What you really want out there in England in the Federal aegis is this; you do not need any Labour Department in England because there are Labour Exchanges in England; you want a Citizens' Advice Bureau. This is not really a job in Barbados like a Labour Officer or anything like that; he does not find jobs for people because there is a well established system of Labour Exchanges throughout the United Kingdom, not one in every town, but several. Employers make contact with their potential employees there, not through the Colonial Office and not through the Immigrants' Liaison Service.

Mr. Chairman, I would say this at least for the British Law, that all people in the eyes of the law up there are equal in so far as the provisions for National Insurance, the National Health Service and the availability of jobs are concerned. The right to use the Labour Exchange belongs to any resident or British subject or citizen in Great Britain. That is the letter of the law which the English try to observe and do not always live up to when they come outside England, but let us give credit where credit is due. No West Indian can ever say - I have not heard a complaint - that he has gone into a Labour Exchange to look for a job and has been refused. I do not know of one reported case, and if there was one I would expect the Minister to come here and tell us. No one can bring a case where a fellow went for a job there and was refused because he was a West Indian. They have to make the material available; therefore what is the function of this Officer? His function can only be that he is more a psychological officer than anything else, because immigrants do have problems. What you really need is a Citizens' Advice Bureau. Furthermore there should be accurate checks of immigrants to see if they have avoided Court Orders for supporting their families, and to give advice

to prevent them from committing bigamy. I know that there are things like that going on and that is a pathetic state of affairs.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is need for one officer charged with that kind of function inside the High Commissioner's Office. I do not see how we can be paying for a Federation and paying for things which are Federal matters at one and the same time; it means we are paying for Federation twice and maintaining a monolithic structure there, another one here and duplication of services throughout. In Washington on the other hand, we have a West Indian Migrants' Labour set-up which the hon. senior member for St. Peter can tell you about, from which we usually detach Barbadians to Connecticut where they have the tobacco industry and to other parts of the country. Working on a West Indian basis, that is the kind of approach we ought to have to the problem of an Immigrants' Liaison Service.
4.55 p.m.

Sir, the reason why Government does not intend to do anything about our suggestions is this. One of the most famous orators that they had in Rome was a man called Cicero who was a member of the Senate which was a parliamentary Chamber like ours. He had his head cut off by Mark Anthony. After his death it was discovered that he had written out some terrific speeches to be given in Senate against Mark Anthony and it was said of Cicero that if he had the opportunity of delivering those speeches he would have been able to despise the swords of Mark Anthony; that is to say, if he had opportunity to state all the things that he had written down to be said. I do not intend to be Cicero, and for my head to be cut off by anybody over there, but I intend even if my head is cut off, if it goes on the block, it would go for my convictions and it would go on record that I have pointed out the errors of the members of the Government.

I have pointed these things out so that members of the public would be able to examine them and would abide the dictates of common-sense in analysing what I have had to say. This is not a question of personalities. This is a question of principles. Why should the Government wish to draw this Service into the Civil Establishment unless they seriously intend to adopt an inflationary attitude in respect of cost administration? Personal approaches like this must be ignored when we are dealing with individuals. We have to look at the whole structure and say whether this is to conform to some recognised pattern, or if that pattern has to be changed. Any other way can only head to confusion and discontent.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, there are two points which I would like to make and both have come out of the debate so far. One is this. On Tuesday in the course of the speech by the Hon. Minister he disclosed that it had been their policy to lend persons in the United Kingdom money to purchase houses. That disturbed me and other hon. members, and I would like to know if he can tell me the vote from which it came, the circumstances and the agreement of these loans. It was certainly surprising to some of us on this side who heard him. I would like to have some full explanation of it, if the Hon. Minister has it.

A second thing is this and it arose out of the argument as regards passports. I wish to draw this to Heads of Government Departments. It appears to be the practice, if not the policy of the Social Welfare Department, to advise the Police not to give passports to young girls who are minors. Some of these young girls going up to the United Kingdom have found it difficult to get their passports and I have been informed by one or two of them that the reason given by Miss Arne at the time was that representations were coming in that Barbadian girls were molested on some of the Italian ships, and consequently it was felt that young girls travelling who were under age should not be given passports unless they could prove that they were travelling with an older woman. That position cannot be always fulfilled. Very often it is difficult for the girls to get an older woman to travel with them or even to find an older woman travelling who would go into the Social Welfare Department

and say that she would stand responsible for such-and-such a young girl going up to the United Kingdom.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a clumsy way of safe-guarding these persons' welfare; and I wonder if the Hon. Minister can tell us what the circumstances are, if reports have come into Government that young girls are molested on Italian ships. I have not heard it spoken of as regards ships of other lines, and the reason being given as why these young girls cannot have passports is because they have not gone into the Social Welfare Department with a guarantee that older people will be travelling with them.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is part of Government's duty not to neglect so far as they can the safety of young people travelling to the United Kingdom or elsewhere in search of work; but it does seem to be inept to lay down that sort of condition as mentioned when there are certain to be some cases of young persons who have the permission of their parents to travel and who cannot find older women to chaperone them.

I know of two cases who were recent pupils of the Modern High School who had considerable difficulty because they could not guarantee to Miss Arne that they could find an older woman to come in and give her a guarantee that she would chaperone them. As a result they missed two or three travelling opportunities. The difficulty was not that they could not find older women travelling but the difficulty was that the Social Welfare Officer was requiring the prospective immigrants to bring persons in and for the persons to undertake in writing that they will stand the responsibility of looking after the young persons for the duration of the voyage. The difficulty is this. An older woman might perhaps be willing to say to a parent "I will look after her" and give that assurance to the parent, but she would be reluctant to commit herself to giving that assurance to the Social Welfare Officer, because she would feel that her peace of mind might be very much involved.

It strikes me therefore that while it would be a laudable attempt on the part of the Social Welfare Department to look after young girls, it does not seem to me a very laudable thing to make that safeguard such a serious thing as to withhold a passport from a traveller, if her character is good. I do not see on what grounds other than criminality or similar grounds that you should withhold a passport from a person; and to withhold it on those grounds appears to be wrong. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister has had it drawn to his attention before the hon. senior member for the City voiced the matter and whether it is possible for the Government to protect the welfare of the girls to any extent without putting that considerable hardship on them. The two youngsters of whom I am aware suffered considerable hardship for this reason. They failed to reach the United Kingdom by a certain date. One had employment and the other was for training in a hospital, and because they could not find two older women who would undertake to look after them on the voyage, both of them had to defer their passage and put off the voyage with the consequent inconvenience, discomfort and upsetting of all their plans. The motive behind this policy is certainly good, but it is mainly the execution that I think is very much open to question. I want to hear whether the Hon. Minister can allay a certain amount of public feeling on the matter. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The questions posed by the last hon. member who spoke, if answered at this stage, might curtail a lot of this discussion, but as the Minister does not intend to answer at this stage apparently

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I was listening to hear from other hon. members, but I would like to say that I have not got the information with me now. I promise that I will get it at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, that temporarily resolves those two issues but sometimes one gets weary

even in well doing. Many are the times when we have to come to this House and prod the Government into some kind of activity or the other, or correct their wrong policies or force them into progressive policies on this question of emigrating Barbadians to Great Britain. Only within the last two days something took place of which the Government must make an explanation on the floor of the House today. If, as the Minister says, the Government has at long last become interested and anxious to get Barbadians to Great Britain, certainly, Mr. Chairman, no obstacles should be placed in the way of getting them there under the best circumstances, at the cheapest possible cost and at the earliest time. This Government has, within the last 24 hours, refused permission to 71 Barbadians to go to Britain at a cheaper rate than that at which they would be carried by B.W.I.A. There were 71 people booked to go to Britain today and at the last moment their tickets were cancelled, the flight suspended and the people forced to remain in the island to await later transportation only because, in so far as I can gather, the aircraft by which they were going would be taking them more cheaply than B.W.I.A.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. May I ask the hon. member if flights can be suspended for which permission was never given because they were never even considered to be up to standard? Let me ask the hon. member that before he opens his mouth and talks everything.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, he knows everything. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: I have to know.) I want to ask the hon. member whether the same Inter-continental flights have not been made from this island within the last six months repeatedly by the use of the same plane. It seems remarkable that suddenly Intercontinental planes are not up to the required standards when, during the previous months, they were. Let him answer that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: This is really nothing to do with this issue but we can give facts in a statement which will betray his ignorance.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The day I think that a distorter of facts like him.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to or remind the hon. senior member for St. Philip that at an earlier stage I appealed to hon. members to leave out personalities and deal with the Resolution? Personalities will destroy the tenor of the debate. That reference about a distorter of facts is entirely unnecessary. I appeal to hon. members to leave out personal references and stick to the subject matter of the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I object most strongly to those remarks and I ask that they be withdrawn. I object to them most strongly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has objected to the use of the remarks about a distorter of facts made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The remarks are offensive and I ask the hon. member to withdraw them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With pleasure. (*Laughter*). To go on with this matter, in another capacity the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has revealed himself to be a real Dr. Goebbels on propaganda. From time to time when it suits him to make

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. The particular gentleman to whom the hon. member has alluded was hung (Mr. TUDOR: hanged.) That is what they should do with you. I object to the hon. member referring to me as Dr. Goebbels; he is going too far.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has objected to the reference made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip to him as Dr. Goebbels. Again I appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Philip to withdraw his statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am in a mood for withdrawing anything you want withdrawn today; but I am

not going to have the hon. member accuse me of ignorance of anything. If it were possible he would distort the Sermon on the Mount. When I am giving facts...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member get back to the Resolution?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Minister said earlier in the debate that the Government is most anxious and eager to get workers to Great Britain. I am accusing them of putting unnecessary obstacles in the way of people getting to Britain cheaply and I said that they have refused to give permission to a flight to land here within the last forty eight hours, a flight which would carry workers to Britain more cheaply than B.W.I.A..
5.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to cross you, but the Hon. Minister, on a point of order, promised to make a statement to the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Oh no, not on that. He promised to make a statement with regard to the lines being bad of which the public knows nothing at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My reference is to the Minister of Communications who, after you had made that charge against the Government, said that in his opinion it had nothing to do with this and promised that he would make a statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The only Minister to talk about that was the member for St. Thomas, and his remark was that you could not refuse to allow people to go by an airline that was not allowed to land, and I am asking him now why it was not allowed to land. The Government itself had fourteen passengers booked to leave the island today for the United Kingdom in the Inter-continental Airways along with 57 others. The Director of Civil Aviation refused to give permission on the advice of the Government to the aeroplane to land here, and the only reason we can give for it is that they are carrying people cheaper than B.O.A.C. who charge \$360 while Intercontinental is charging \$336, and the Government passengers who were to go by Inter-continental have to wait and go by B.O.A.C. and they have to pay \$24 more.

I am asking them, Mr. Chairman, if they are so anxious and interested to get people to work in Britain, why they refused permission to Intercontinental to come to Seawell to transport passengers at a cheaper rate than B.O.A.C., and he cannot come here with any red-herrings saying that the aeroplane was not up to standard. That is not correct, because it was up to standard all the time before. These planes have been coming here regularly before, making chartered flights to Britain, and now he, from the depth of his own ignorance, says that the particular flight that was to come yesterday to leave today was not up to standard. They have not explained the reasons which have prevented these 71 people from going to England today. They had their money changed, baggage ready, plane tickets passed and everything ready to leave the island today, and because of the Director of Civil Aviation acting on Government's orders they are still in the island. (VOICES: Shame!)

Now whenever we have to come here and castigate them for one reason or another for putting obstacles in the way of people who are going to Britain, they come out..

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I object to the hon. member saying that we put obstacles in the way of people going to England. If the hon. member wants to be responsible, he should not listen to what the agents tell him in putting their side of the case. Let him ask questions and he will get the facts; but to introduce this at this time to have another round of debate, where are we getting? We have spent two days on this Resolution and he is introducing a new factor into the debate by putting one side of the story he heard from the agents.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What the hon. member has said is a fabrication. He said that the aeroplane was not allowed

to land because it was not up to standard, and because it did not fulfil the standard requirements. Either that is wrong and is a lie or it is something else which he has not told us yet. If it is something else, what is it? Do not tell us something that it is not. If the Government had a case which could stand the light of exposure, he would have stated it when he got up on a point of order just now, but in the light of the explanation he just gave, that cannot satisfy me or anybody else because these planes have been running to the island all year and taking full complements of passengers to Britain. But apparently with his superior knowledge of aeroplane mechanics and what not, he has suddenly discovered faults in the engines; he went under the bonnets, checked the machinery and found fault with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to get back to the Resolution. What you said had some bearing to the Immigrants Service in the United Kingdom, but you should now deal with the Liaison Officer.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am getting to it, but if the people do not get to England, we will not have any use for the Liaison Service at all. We cannot be paying and over paying the Liaison Officer if he has not got people to attend to; so therefore the very first point for consideration is to expedite or facilitate the getting to England of Barbadian workers; and I want to ask the Minister if he thinks that 71 passengers being refused permission to leave the country is such a simple secret that the only person who would know about it is the agent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Philip to get back to the Liaison Service. I heard the Minister say that he would give a statement on the matter of the plane which has some slight connection with this, but to have a full-dress debate on the 71 passengers who have been refused permission to leave the island is somewhat going too far. You should make your contribution to this Resolution about the Liaison Service and the Minister will give you a reply to the question of the 71 passengers who were to leave by the Intercontinental Airlines which you asked. I am asking you now to speak on the Resolution of \$1,150 for the Liaison Service.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on this money Resolution, you can hardly deny me the right to reply to the Minister's statement that I have been listening to an agent because apparently he thinks the 71 passengers are dumb and have no representatives at all except the Ministers. Does he think that people who have reached finality down to the very last matter of leaving the country are going to be turned back at the last moment without making a protest or calling on somebody to represent them?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already told the hon. member that there will be no debate on that question of the refusal of the 71 passengers. Please deal with the Immigrants' Liaison Service in England as these people have not yet arrived in England. This affair has just taken place and you can make it the subject of some other debate. That in my opinion is outside the ambit of the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have given no indication that I propose to debate that matter today. I am merely replying to the statement the Minister made which you did not say was outside the ambit of the Resolution when he made it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is why you were allowed to reply. Having replied, all I have asked you to do is to get back to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going to reply despite your protests, because if I had listened to your protests, I would not have replied at all.
5.25 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the position in so far as this matter is concerned is that there are two important aspects from one's point of view, and both of these aspects have been dealt with by speakers on this side. The hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member

for St. Lucy have queried about, if I must state it as such, the immorality of advancing money to some of these Liaison Officers for the purpose for which they have without any previous explanation to the House or to the public, and on that, we are anxiously awaiting a statement by the appropriate Minister and we do hope that he will supply the required information.

The other aspect of this matter is with regard to the point which was raised last Tuesday by myself and dilated upon and expanded today by the hon. junior member for St. John the facts of which have been so strongly denied by the senior member for St. Michael. There is no denying the fact that there is this large number of vacancies in the London Transport Service to which reference had been made by the Hon. senior member for Christ Church and which the Government has to confess could be filled readily if we had the people in this Island of the appropriate educational qualifications. It is a matter for very sober reflection that the simple arithmetical standard required by the London Transport Service for these employees is apparently unattainable by the majority of our unemployed people.

If, Mr. Chairman, the Ministers themselves cannot see in this circumstance that it has serious reflection on our own educational standards, well then, we are in a very sorry state. I am told that the educational standard required is not higher than the standard which would be reached readily 20 years ago in our elementary schools by children in the third or fourth standard and that it is mainly a simple matter of converting sterling into dollars and cents and what not. I do not propose to labour all the points surrounding this matters at this stage, but it is a matter to which the country would have to give serious attention. The Ministers themselves should realise by now the importance, not of lowering the educational standards but of raising them, but it is asking too much to ask them to process this matter in its true position considering their attitude towards the question of education. And when I say education, I mean elementary and secondary grammar school education. The country is sadly paying for the educational policy of the present Government, I imagine, Mr. Chairman, that there is no other country in the West Indies in which they would not have been a public outcry against the necessity of the Government to establish training centres to teach the most simple arithmetic throughout the Island to people who have already left school in order to reach the appropriate standard asked for by the London Transport Executive.

I have heard the argument advanced that the Minister had these training centres opened, more or less, as a sort of refresher course. Well, Mr. Chairman, you have heard all sorts of arguments, good and bad, and naturally the Government finding itself in this position has to put forward an excuse; but I want to submit that a refresher course of this nature would have been absolutely unnecessary two decades ago for elementary school children who had left school as ours have.

The illiteracy of many children who have passed through our elementary schools of today is appalling; and that, coupled with the almost total impossibility of providing an appropriate number of secondary grammar school opportunities, is undermining and ruining the core of our entire educational system. We have already begun to pay for it, and we are going to pay for it even more dearly unless attention is paid to it in the appropriate quarters and in the appropriate manner.

Our purpose for emphasizing this issue in this debate is because of the attitude displayed by the Government earlier this year when we made reference to it, and we intend always to keep it fresh in their minds and in the public mind because it is the only way to bring an end to this state of affairs. All the Government is doing is deluding itself with all sorts of arguments to which they can find answers when they know in their heart of hearts that they have not the answers. Imagine the hon. senior member for St. Michael saying that in spite of all these vacancies you cannot find people purely because people do not want to go

to England. I repeat that since we have advocated and forced the Government to go to Great Britain as regards the emigration of our people there, I have met only one young man who for two years told me that he does not want to go to England. I have met no other young man in the constituency of St. Philip who was unemployed who refused an emigration opportunity. If St. Philip is entirely different from all the other parishes, I do not know.

5.35 p.m.

I am willing to put my head on the block that tonight you cannot find 4,000 people in this island with the proper qualifications who are unemployed and who would go to work abroad, if it were not England; you could not find that number in the whole island. None of these people want to remain in England permanently; they are all going to work to acquire some training, save some money and come back home. There is not one single person in this island who would believe that there are 4,000 Barbadians who want to work and who refused to emigrate because the emigration is to England. The facts belie the statement. Every week steamers and chartered planes, until the Government stopped them today, are leaving this island jam-packed with emigrants going to Britain and bookings are heavy even for next year already. In another month or so and after the winter, emigrants will be going to England. In the same manner that the Government have been forced radically to revise their policies in the past with regard to emigration to Britain, so in the future they will be forced to revise them again, and they will be forced by the same people who were forcing them to revise their policies before. Between now and the end of the present session the Government will have to revise their policies.

When the Minister of Trade came on the floor of this House and asked for money for the establishment of Training Centres, he was admitting that our strictures on the educational qualifications of the people of this island were correct, and he was taking the only steps to improve them. As a matter of fact, the Government do not seem to appreciate what has been the impression created outside by the taking of those steps. It is only the Government who do not realise the implications of them. We should be lacking in our duty and we should be betraying the people who return us here if, with these facts staring us in the face, we fail to emphasize these problems regardless as to whether or not they are palatable to other people, and totally regardless of the efforts which the Government are trying to make to prevent us from exposing these problems. It is only by exposing them that they will be improved. The Government would be beyond the pale of redemption if, after hearing the facts and scrutinizing them in a colder and more sober atmosphere, they failed to appreciate the underlying accuracy of our contention. No human being with the faculty of reasoning and seeing things in their true perspective could come to any other conclusion than that the matter revealed by this state of affairs is one which requires deep and profound attention and study being given to it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I should like to know whether the Minister has any reply to the points I have made.

Hon. M. E. COX: I promise the hon. member to give him the information by next Tuesday.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1960-61 No. 11

GRANT TO THE WEST INDIES

OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is one for the sum of \$2,400 as a contribution to the West Indies Olympic Association. In moving the passing of this Resolution, I do not think I need say very much on it because it is quite straightforward. The Addendum is pretty clear; it sets out that this Association is proposing to send representatives to the Rome Olympics which are being held in August this year and it is proposed that this contribution should be made by the Government towards the expenses of sending a team there. As I have said, the

Addendum is pretty clear, and at this stage I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. F. E. MILLER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ALIENS (LAND - HOLDING) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:— To resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to regulate the holding of lands by aliens and companies under alien control. On the last occasion, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.
5.45 p.m.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move for the reasons given earlier in the debate that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with your permission — I hope I am not superseding the Minister's prerogative — I would like to submit the following names to serve on the Committee: the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for St. John, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, His Honour the Deputy Speaker and myself.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose that the following be the revised list of members to serve on the Select Committee to deal with the Aliens Land-holding Bill: the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. John, the hon. senior member for St. James, the hon. junior member for St. Michael and myself.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with Your Honour's permission this is a matter dealing with the Holding of Property and the Companies Act of 1948, and unless you take full advantage of the legal brains of this House, you can hardly expect to improve on what has already been said. I am suggesting that the hon. junior member for St. John, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter whose experience and general knowledge in such matters would be helpful, be added.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not here when my name was proposed, but I want to tell the hon. member that as long as the members of that Government are running these things, I do not want to be associated with anything in which they are going to dictate; so I do not want to be on any Select Committee with which they have anything to do. I am a member of this House and they must oppose my getting in here. I am not sitting with them on anything in this House; so let that be clear because I have said it on many occasions.

I thank the hon. member, but I have no intention of serving on any Committee with those members.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to be clear on this point. Is the Minister accepting the amendment and the addition of the one member?
5.55 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: No, Sir. Apparently, the hon. member who has just spoken does not think very much of his colleagues. I have great confidence in the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I have also heard that the hon. member has passed some examination.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like the hon. Minister to realise that I have both names. It is not that I have left out the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I had both and I want both.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: As a matter of fact, I did not want so many. Too many cooks make bad broth. We have the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I think that is enough. Personally, I feel that way about it. I have great confidence in him and I have implicit confidence in every member of his Party; but you do not want to over-burden this Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, the hon. Minister's argument really is not satisfactory. He claims that he does not want this Committee too over-burdened but he has the Hon. Minister of Education put on it along with the other members selected from that side. We do not object to them as members of this House, but I would expect a Select Committee such as this would contain the name of the hon. junior member for St. John; yet you have put three from that side. What can those three contribute to the matters under discussion?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, grateful am I to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the kind things he has said about me, but I cannot guarantee to this Committee that I can be present at every meeting although I would try my best to attend every possible meeting; inasmuch as there are three legal brains in this House, I suggest that one is present whenever this Committee meets, and there can be no gainsaying from the fact that legal brains are required for a Committee such as this. In view of the motion which is made and in the absence of the other legal brains qualified in this House from the list of names submitted by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I beg to move the addition to the list of the name of the hon. and learned junior member for St. John to serve on this Committee.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion which has been made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the following members be appointed to form a Select Committee to consider this Bill:—

The hon. senior member for the City (Mr. Mottley), the hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker), the hon. senior member for Christ Church (Mr. Talma), the hon. senior member for St. John (Hon. L. St. A. Thorne), the hon. senior member for St. James (Mr. Holder), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan), and the hon. junior member for St. Philip (Hon. D. D. Garner).

There is an amendment to this motion that the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. Barrow) be added to this Committee. I would put the amendment first.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. John be added to the Committee was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. TALMA, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. TALMA — 5.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mr. HOLDER, and Mr. STRAUGHN — 8.

The question that the names mentioned in the original motion be members of the Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE COMPANIES BILL, 1960

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture: Second reading of a bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is supplementary to the one which has just been sent to Select Committee and I ask leave that it be postponed.

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

6.05 p.m.

FISHING INDUSTRY AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as hon. members will see from the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill, the Bill seeks to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952 mainly in three respects. Firstly, it makes it an offence for a person in charge of a fishing-boat to permit any other person, not being the holder of a valid licence, to go to sea in such boats for the purpose of fishing for gain. Secondly, it provides for the revocation of the licence of a fisherman convicted of an offence relating to the destruction of fish by explosives; and, thirdly, it provides for the suspension of a licence to be noted on the licence and in the Register of Licences. I do not think I should have to say much on this Bill because as it is, it serves a very useful purpose. When one reads the old Act he will see that it is outdated and this amendment therefore seeks to bring the Act into modern day trends.

I quote now from Section 2 (3)(a). It says this:

"Any person who, being in charge of a fishing boat (a) permits any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act to go to sea in such fishing-boat for the purpose of fishing for gain; or (b) takes out to sea or employs at sea for the purpose of fishing for gain any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence....."

I think I told this House that fishermen have always been required to take out licences but that has never been really enforced. Now they get licences but there is no charge attached to that. I think that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy will bear me out in what I am saying as he has asked certain questions, and among the answers given is one to the effect that we will make a complete survey of the fishing industry and we expect experts to come out here shortly. We want to know how many fishermen there are and about various other matters connected with the fishing industry, because we have no list on which to go. Unless we know who the fishermen are, we cannot get on with the plan which we have in mind. We want to have these people licenced, and we want to make a general survey of the industry. It is very necessary to get this Bill through and I do hope the House will look upon it with favour. In this Bill there will be no inconvenience to the fishermen at all; they will not have to pay for any licences. I want to make that point very clear.

The Bill sets out what are the conditions and how the fishermen must get licenced. The Bill is not a very long one but it sets out various things. It is mainly in three respects in which this Bill really amends the principal Act. I do not think I will say anything more about this Bill because everything seems to be quite in order. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the first place I sympathise with the Minister if he has not got anything else to do and this is one of the means of occupying his time in the Ministry. If he finds that this is helpful in taking up his time, well, that is all well and good; but to bring legislation of this type down to this House is folly, because it cannot be enforced. The old Act cannot be enforced and the fishermen will simply ignore this amendment. You are now trying to inconvenience the fisherman in having to find out if the person who is in a boat with him has a licence. It is asking too much of a fisherman to ask him to do that. If you are helping the fishing industry, then do not do it in this way. A fisherman is a fisherman all over the world, and to go about things in this way is merely a waste of time. You can get cold storage facilities and see that the fishermen secure better prices for their catches and not have to sell them at a penny a piece when the catch is heavy; there are many other ways in which to help the fishermen. This Bill is a means of trying to make them convicts without just cause; you are trying to show that if a fisherman commits a breach of the Act he can be fined. Clause 2(3) (a) says this:

"Any person who, being in charge of a fishing boat —

(a) permits any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act to go to sea in such fishing boat for the purpose of fishing for gain; or

(b) takes out to sea or employs at sea for the purpose of fishing for gain any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars."

That is a small fine but there is another section in which the fine is one not exceeding fifty dollars.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my opinion, this Bill will not serve any useful purpose. It will create a lot of red tape with which the average fisherman is not acquainted and it imposes too many restrictions on the average fisherman or boat owner; and the Director of Agriculture who will have to administer the Act through the Fisheries Officer, will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to enforce it.

6.15 p.m.

This is a silly piece of legislation, and the old Fishing Industry Act of 1952 is not enforced because it is impractical. This is worse yet.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. senior member for Christ Church feels that way and he has been the protagonist for the fishermen, I really wonder what this is for. The Minister speaks about getting back to the land; he should really get back to land because he is out to sea. You are wasting good, precious time. Are you at this stage talking about introducing legislation to register fishermen? The next thing you are going to do is to register a man who goes into the sea to get a bath. Are you going to register bathers at the beaches because you have had some drownings recently? What is this nonsense? You know the country in which you live; so how are you going to enforce or administer something like this? Are you going to turn out all the men at District "C" to look into a man's boat to see whether he has a licence? A fisherman goes to sea in a bathing pants or a short pants, and I hope there is not this slavish idea just as when I was a boy you had to carry a licence in the form of a piece of metal around his hip. If you want a man to register in the same way you register births, I would understand that that would be for statistical purposes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are asking a man to register, and you are saying that if a man is out in a fishing boat and he is not registered, there will be a penalty; but a fellow can go out in a yacht and catch a big dolphin, and although he is not doing it for a living he will cut it up and give it away. It looks to me that you are really running short of work and you are passing this kind of legislation; but I think you can adjourn the House and go down to Kensing-

ton and listen to Winifred Atwell; that would be something more worthwhile to cultural life. I agree that you should register boats, but a man does not go to a trade to be a fisherman. How does a man learn to be a fisherman? A boy may get into a boat at 14 or 15 years and go out to sea and though he is not registered, he is starting; he may go out today and not tomorrow because he is not doing it as a profession. Fishermen come by accident; you may live near the sea and if things get tight you go out to sea, and when things become better you do not go at all; but now you are making it a penalty for a boatowner to carry out any person who is not registered. If this was just registering a man's name you would not attach a penalty to it, but this is a monotonous business you are doing. I believe you can find more important things to spend time on and the Minister is seriously looking at the file with his spectacles on! This is something in which you can drop the file out of your hand, ask for the adjournment and go down to Kensington and listen to Winifred Atwell.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question, it is more than significant that in the face of such caustic criticism not only the Introducer of the Bill but the entire Government benches have remained silent. It appears that at long last they are beginning to realise when they are looking silly and do not want to add further to their establishment of silliness. The whole fact of the matter is that a law such as this cannot be enforced unless you are going to detail the police force to every fishing beach to check on the fishing boats when they put out to sea; but apart from that, if even it were enforceable, many days many fishing boats would not go to sea at all for the simple reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that very often the owner of a fishing boat is very hard put to to get a crew to go out with him.

There are many instances, of course, in which boats have their crews which are always available, but especially in cases of the old fishing boats, many a day when the owners of these boats go to the beach, they are not sure whether they will go out to sea, because they are not sure if they will get a crew, and at the last moment they may ask anybody on the beach who is willing to go along with them to give them a hand; and therefore to insist that so long as you are going to sea to fish for gain you must be the holder of a licence could very well mean that many of these boats will not go to sea at all on many occasions.

It has not been made quite clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the Government hopes to achieve by this amendment, anyhow. This is an entirely separate and distinct matter from that of licensing fishermen. *Bona fide* fishermen are to be licensed for purposes other than merely having a record of the number of fishermen in the island, and one can readily agree with that. If the fishing industry is to be expanded in any way, one must have reliable information with regard to the number of people engaged in it, and other relevant information about those people; but enforcing the possession of a licence by a *bona fide* fisherman is entirely a different matter from the proposals envisaged in the earlier Sections of this Bill; and in any case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no point in cluttering up the Statute Book of the colony with laws which by their very nature cannot possibly be enforced.

As previous speakers have said, it is a waste of time. The Government itself must realise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the impossibility of enforcing an Act of this sort, and there seems to be no difference, as far as we know, between people fishing for gain and people fishing for pleasure. 6.25 p.m.

Very often fishing boats take out people who are going mainly for the fun of fishing. It is a regular habit. Barbadians and visitors right in this island and people elsewhere go to sea in fishing boats just for the fun of going fishing. The phraseology in this Bill does not make a proper distinction because you can have people going to sea in fishing boats and they themselves are not fishing for gain. They are only fishing for fun.

According to Clause 2, Section 9 of the Fishing Industry Act, 1952, is amended by inserting this new subsection to be numbered 3, and it reads as follows:-

"(3) Any person who, being in charge of a fishing boat -

- (a) permits any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act to go to sea in such fishing-boat for the purpose of fishing for gain;"

It should be made clear beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt whether it means a person who may or may not have a licence in fishing for gain or whether a fishing boat is a fishing boat in the full sense of the term. Some of the people in the boat are not fishing for gain and the distinction should be made clear so that they can be no confusion on this point later on.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, without holding up the time of the House, if hon. members had taken the time to read the Act of itself, they would see that the same thing is written in the old 1952 Act.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy asked a series of questions a while ago and it appears as if he did get information about what we intend to do in the Fishing Industry. I particularly said then that we intended to take the industry a certain stage further. Experts are expected to come to the Department soon and they want to get statistics and figures; what we are doing is an improvement to the original Act. The original Act states precisely what is in the amendment and I will read it for the information of hon. members.

Section 9 reads as follows:-

"(1) Every person desirous of exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman shall apply for a licence from the Director, who shall issue to such applicant a licence in such form as shall be prescribed and such licence shall expire on the thirtieth day of September next following: Provided that any such licence issued during the month of September in any year shall not expire until the thirtieth day of September in the following year.

"(2) Any person exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman without being the holder of an unexpired licence issued under the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an offence and on summary conviction by a Police Magistrate shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five dollars."

It is in the original Act; but it does not only stipulate that; it goes a little further because we have to get this information. As I have said, we have been in touch with these experts and they have told us what to do. All of this talk is nonsensical and a waste of time. You will only talk that when you do not know. We are in the Ministry and we know what we are going about. We are going further. We must have these facts and figures.

In truth and in fact we have organized many things so as to help fishermen. We of the Government are in here and we come in here not because the flies and ants put us in here; the same people who put hon. members of the Opposition in here have put us in here. Why should we do something to penalise the fishing industry and the people who pursue it when in truth and in fact we want to help them more? In order to help them more, we must know who they are and what they are doing. This even goes further. If hon. members read Section 4, they will see that it is providing for the suspension of a licence to be noted on the licence and in the Register of Licences. There is reason for all this that we are doing and it is in aid of the industry.

I can assure hon. members that this has nothing at all to do with inflicting hardship on fishermen or any such thing. This serves a very useful purpose in that when the experts come here we will be in a position to give them

some information as to what the fishing industry is and what the potential is. Hon. members need not have any fear about it. It has nothing at all against the fishing industry.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing 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, Mr. STRAUGHN, Hon. F. E. MILLER and Mr. HOLDER. - 9.

NOES: Mr. TUDOR, Mr. TALMA and Mr. CRAWFORD. - 3.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, just allow me to point out this: Clause 2, (3) reads as follows:-

"Any person who, being in charge of a fishing boat -

- (a) permits any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act to go to sea in such fishing boat for the purpose of fishing for gain; or
- (b) takes out to sea or employs at sea for the purpose of fishing for gain any person who is not the holder of a licence in force under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five dollars."

The first point is: who is to be in charge of this fishing-boat? What must the Magistrate imposing this fine of five dollars be able to determine? Is it to be imposed against the boat-owner or whom?

Another point is with respect to the phrase "for the purpose of fishing for gain." A fisherman does not go out to fish for sport. What is the object of this phraseology? I thought that you were trying to encourage the fishing industry. Fishermen always go out to fish for gain. Of course, I am not blaming the Hon. Minister for this phraseology; it may be some member of the Crown Law Office. The Hon. Minister represents many fishing villages in which there are many powered boats. There are such bays as the Crane, Long Bay, Foul Bay, and so on, from which fishermen go out to fish.

6.35 p.m.

What we are doing in this Section is penalising the average fisherman who may be going out to fish and trying to earn a living; he will have to check and see if his companion is licensed. There may be two or three fishermen engaged by the boat owner; who will be in charge of the boat? Two or three people may be employed *pari passu* on a co-operative basis, and the boat may be owned by a person who may be a woman, who is not a fisherman at all. Against whom are you going to take action? Against the owner or those who have charge of the boat? The Fishing Industry Act of 1952 is merely for the purpose of registering boats and boat owners and fishermen for the purpose of granting loans; that is as far as we can carry it; but this bit of legislation is only padding - meaningless and unenforceable. Will the Fisheries Officer and others have to go to the beaches and see that these provisions are carried out?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I do not like the threat made by the hon. member because I take it that he is a responsible member of the community; and if he has word from the Government that it is not just what he says or thinks, I do not think he should incite people to break the law.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I am trying to open the Minister's idea. The old Act was not enforced and this Act will not be enforced either. It is just folly, wasting your time, my time and that of the Permanent Secretaries.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member asked one question and it was: Who has the charge of the fishing boats? Well, there must be a captain on the boat and whoever is the captain is responsible for it; and that person need not be the owner. Therefore so long as the boat takes out to sea, somebody must be responsible for it and that is the captain. The hon. member must appreciate that there are pleasure boats in this island and people go out in these boats. If we had allowed this amendment to come down without the words "for gain" nobody would be able to put out to sea unless he was a fisherman; therefore we had to put in these words. We have nothing to do with the pleasure boat people because we are not organising them; they do not constitute any part of our programme. We had to make a difference in the type of people who go out to sea; one type goes out for gain and the other for pleasure, and we are concerned with the commercial element.

Mr. TALMA: Do I understand the Minister to say that anybody who goes yachting and catching fish is not doing it for gain? Is he drawing a line of distinction and saying that if you are a fisherman, that is your occupation, you have to be registered, you must see that all your fishermen friends who are likely to go out with you are registered and that people will be punished if they do not obey the law? Is the Minister saying that a man who goes out in a pleasure boat and catches fish has the prerogative over other fishermen? You are thereby making fish of one and fowl of the other. The private fishermen can break the law with impunity and not be fined; they can bring in fish and sell them; but the other man will be penalised. That is not helping the fishermen. That is hampering them.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, even if we admit that this bit of legislation is necessary, how can we know that some person has taken out with him somebody who does not possess a licence? It seems to me that you are laying a great responsibility on a person who is in charge of a boat not only to ascertain that the people with him are licensed people but also for him to inform against such people if they are not. What is the machinery by which you would know that a man has gone out in a boat and he is not entitled to go out? Will a fisherman be required to take out his licence with him? These things are puzzling. In order to enforce the law, do you want people to inform on others and say "I think that Mr. 'X' has taken out Mr. 'Y' who is not in possession of a licence."? It seems to me that the licensed fishermen would have to inform against the unlicensed ones or that you will have to devise some method to have frequent checks made upon fisherman when they are about to embark on the boats. It seems to me that you will have to fall back on the former thought; which is, to get information that people are going out to sea without having licences, unless the person who has not got a licence informs on himself and I do not think that would be likely.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, we have no intention of setting up any spy system in this island. It has never even occurred to me that there was the possibility of one person informing upon another.
6.45 p.m.

All we are fighting for at the moment is for the fishermen to be licensed; and as soon as this legislation is passed, Inspectors and the Fisheries Officer will go around to the various beaches and lecture and they will know why we are doing this, because we are going to have two experts down here to lecture to them, and we expect their

co-operation. This is nothing to penalise anybody; this is not a new departure; but we want to get it enforced because we want for specific reasons to get the information we so desire. Not only that; this is to protect them and help them. I do not want to go into a long set of things which I can tell this Committee now. At a later stage I will be able to tell the Committee, but this is good legislation; it does not penalise anybody and we are not asking anybody to inform on anybody.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I understand to a certain extent what the Hon. Minister is trying to say. He would like even without the application of this Act that all fishermen be registered for purposes which the Ministry has in mind. Let us put that on one side because that is not the point at issue. You have here in this Clause that a man, who, if he is in charge of a fishing boat, allows any person who is not the holder of a licence to go to sea for the purpose of fishing, or if he takes anybody for fishing for gain, shall be guilty of an offence. What I want to know is this: first of all, how can you prove to satisfy the Courts that somebody is in charge? Secondly, how would you be able to prove that he permitted an unlicensed person to go out in the boat with him, and thirdly, how would you be able to prove that the person going out is fishing for gain?

Put yourself, Mr. Chairman, in the place of a Magistrate and a prosecution has been brought - whenever it is "bringable", I cannot think of a better word - under this Act before you. Presumably the Police Sergeant or the Fisheries Officer - I do not know who would be prosecuting - comes and says that X who is standing in the dock is charged with being in charge of a fishing boat and has permitted or employed Y to fish with him for gain without a licence. Even in proving that, the Policeman or whoever is prosecuting would have to say: "I am prosecuting on information received," because obviously it is not the sort of evidence which the Police can know about by being in the boat with the fisherman; so you may say you are not setting up a spy system, but you may be encouraging people to inform against each other, because you would only get that case prosecuted on information received.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I have in mind a boat leaving Barbados and drifting to St. Lucia; we do not know who is on the boat. If the boat is registered D4 or D6 and that boat is lost at sea, and we know that registered fisherman No. so-and-so is fishing on that boat, we know what is happening. When that boat drifts there and they are not *bona fide* fishermen, that is the only time we would know that fishermen went out to sea; or unless on another occasion a man goes out with explosives and he blasts fish and is caught and he has no licence, then the owner is liable for allowing an unlicensed fisherman to go out to sea. (Mr. TUDOR: The man in charge?) If there is an explosion and the man in charge is caught and he has among his crew an unlicensed fisherman fishing for gain, that is the only time or in fact the only two occasions on which we would know. But as far as a man going out to sea and carrying somebody to spy to see who has a licence is concerned, the details of that would not be gone into by me.

Mr. Chairman, boats have been straying regularly and many are being lost at sea, and the Insurance people have many cases of boats just lost without having any information as to who were in charge. We are now in the throes of a lot of arguments with the Insurance Agents; so this is not bad legislation, as some of you may think. This is to protect them, and there are some people whom you have to save from themselves. This legislation is to do that - save them from themselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, certainly if what the Minister says is a correct interpretation of what he wants, this cannot provide it. You would have to have legislation compelling the boat to be registered, compelling the crew of that boat to be registered, and prohibiting anybody else from going to sea in that boat. That is the only way you can enforce it. If that is his interpretation, it is even a greater waste of time.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking again because the meaning was not clear, but this interpretation put upon the Bill by the Minister has even made it more absurd. If, Mr. Chairman, you had a boat drifted to St. Vincent, as he says, and you heard that the "Mary Ann" or the "Patrick C" had gone to St. Vincent, would you automatically know who is in it? I have never heard anything more absurd in my life. The same crew, to begin with, need not go out every day, and I submit that the Minister himself is confused about the sort of legislation he wants.

For this Bill to achieve the objective he says it is to achieve, it would have to be a Bill to register fishing boats by name, to register the man in charge by name and to register the names and number of every fisherman who goes to sea in that particular boat, and you could never have any change in the names of the crew going to sea either. If one of the crew was sick who was a member of that boat and you substituted another one, you would be breaking the law, and Mr. Chairman, if you know anything about fishing boats going to sea in Barbados, you would realise how utterly foolish that is, because the same people cannot go to sea every day in the same boat. 6.55 p.m.

It is true that you have crews for certain fishing boats who go out to fish fairly often in that boat, but there have got to be changes. Some mornings a man is sick and you get another man to fill his place. During the crop time, Mr. Chairman, a great proportion of these fishing crews are cutting canes and the owners of these boats would pick anybody who would go out to sea in them. I see it for myself. I saw a fisherman go down on the beach and look all around, just only too glad to get somebody to go to sea with him. I saw boats drawn up on the beach because the man in charge could not get anyone to go to sea with him that day.

This cannot provide the Register of the type which the Government appears to want. We have already law that a fisherman must be the holder of a licence. How is the man in charge of a boat to know that the man he is getting to go out with him has a licence to go out in the boat? Unless it is that the licence is made like a hawker's licence that you can wear it around your neck like a chain. The most that you can do is to ask the fishing-boat owners or the persons in charge of boats to provide a list of names of people who go to sea in their boats and that would be a bare record; it would not be accurate. To expect, as the Hon. Minister appears to expect, that this would provide an accurate record of the personnel in the boat if a boat goes adrift, merely by the insertion of this Clause, is asking too much, Mr. Chairman, because the very day that the boat drifts would be the day when half of the crew in that boat may not be known.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, further sitting of this House is suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.

This sitting is now suspended.

On resumption,

Hon. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there being no quorum I ask that the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and the quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At the suspension, the House was in Committee.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking. I observe that he is not in his seat.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Clause 3, sub-section 2 of 9A reads as follows:-

"(2) When the Director revokes a licence in accordance with the provisions of this section, the revocation shall have effect from such date as the Director may direct, and thereupon the licence shall be given up and cancelled, and any person refusing or neglecting to give up his licence shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars."

Now, if as the Hon. Minister has been saying, it is not the intention of the Government under this Act to penalise anybody, we are wondering why for offences under section 9 the fine should be fifty dollars. We rather feel that if you must impose a fine on a person refusing or neglecting to give up his licence, it should be made at the most ten dollars, but certainly not fifty dollars.

I beg to move that the word "fifty" be deleted and the word "ten" be substituted therefor.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that. I too feel that this penalty is excessive to the extreme. I feel that there can be a Penalty Clause. I will read this new section 9A:-

9A. (1) The Director may revoke any licence issued by him under the provisions of section nine of this Act if he is satisfied, after giving the holder of the said licence an opportunity of being heard, that the said holder has been convicted of an offence under section nineteen of the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904.

"(2) When the Director revokes a licence in accordance with the provisions of this section, the revocation shall have effect from such date as the Director may direct, and thereupon the licence shall be given up and cancelled, and any person refusing or neglecting to give up his licence shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars.

"(3) The decision of the Director to revoke a licence in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be final and conclusive.

"(4) The Director shall cause to be noted upon the Register of Licences, every cancellation of a licence under this section with the addition of the date from which such cancellation is to take effect."

I regard that sum as excessive. I admit that regulations have to be kept and to be enforced and in a case like this that there will have to be a Penalty Clause; but to insist on a penalty of fifty dollars is punitive and excessive. I think ten dollars would serve a useful purpose and will meet the Bill.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I do not envisage any hardship on fishermen because of this Clause. As I see it, the only time a fisherman will be called upon to give up his licence is if he were caught dynamiting fish and they want to stamp that out. That is the only time that this fifty dollars fine would be applicable. It is to serve as a deterrent.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, here again something new is introduced. If the Hon. Minister says that the only time he can envisage a fisherman being asked to surrender his licence is if he were caught dynamiting fish, surely under the other Act there is a penalty attached for that apart from the regular licence. I cannot see dynamiting fish coming under this section.

Section 9 reads as follows:-

"(1) Every person desirous of exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman shall apply for a licence from the Director, who shall issue to such applicant a licence in such form as shall be prescribed and such licence shall expire on the thirtieth day of September next following: Provided that any such licence issued during the month of September in any year shall not expire until the thirtieth day of September in the following year.

"(2) Any person exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman without being the holder of an unexpired licence issued under the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an offence and on summary conviction by a Police Magistrate shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five dollars."

7.50 p.m.

This sets out the conditions under which the Director can call for the licence after a conviction, but at the same time, if the person refuses to give up the licence within the specified time, then he is liable to a fine not exceeding \$50. The Minister must admit that there is no guarantee that the only reason for which a licence will be revoked will be in the case of dynamiting fish. You can be called upon by the Director to surrender your licence. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: After a conviction.) That is the point. If you take somebody out to sea in a boat, somebody who did not have a licence and you were convicted and fined, it is you who would be asked to surrender your licence; it is the person who has a licence who would be asked to surrender it. This Clause says that if the person refuses or neglects to give up the licence he would be guilty of an offence, which would be another offence. The first offence would be permitting somebody to go out in a boat without having a licence, and the second offence would be not giving up his own licence when he is called upon to do so. To leave this Section as it stands with a fine of \$50 is too harsh.

When you look at the Fisheries Act, 1952, this is what Section 9 says:-

"Every person desirous of exercising the trade or calling of a fisherman shall apply for a licence from the Director, who shall issue to such applicant a licence in such form as shall be prescribed and such licence shall expire on the thirtieth day of September next following: Provided that any such licence issued during the month of September in any year shall not expire until the thirtieth day of September in the following year."

That is all right and the section which we have here now under consideration comes immediately after that. Section 17 deals with some of the points raised by the Minister. It says that if a fishing boat is lost, abandoned, stranded or materially damaged at sea, it shall be lawful for the Police Magistrate to make enquiry concerning the loss. The dynamiting of fish does not come into this matter. A man may lose his licence if he is convicted for dynamiting fish. As I see it, this Section deals with the case where a man who is in charge of a boat takes somebody out who has no licence. He is convicted and fined; he may do it a second time and when you ask for his licence and he refuses to give it up, the punishment is \$50. I think that is too severe.

The Minister has put it on record that it is not the Government's intention to take away a man's licence and still fine him \$50. That, in our view, would be too much. I hope that the Minister will see the force of our argument. We do not feel that people should disobey the law and refuse to give up their licences when called upon to do so; but if they refuse to do so, this fine of \$50 is too much. It is not necessary to impose that fine and later on in the Section you will find that the decision of the Director to revoke a licence shall be final and conclusive. The difficulty is that the fisherman gets his licence taken away in any case and for refusing to give it up he is fined \$50 and has no appeal from the Director. That is almost three penalties and if that is not an attempt to penalise the fisherman, I do not know what is. He cannot even appeal over the head of the Director of Agriculture because the Director's decision is final and conclusive. I say that the penalty is too heavy.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The Section says that on summary conviction the fine is one not exceeding so much; that does not mean that the maximum fine will be imposed.

Mr. TALMA: There are many penalties. Section 19 of the 1952 Act reads as follows:-

"The Police Magistrate making an investigation under section seventeen of this Act may enquire into any charge of incompetency, negligence or misconduct, arising in the course of investigation, against any member of the crew of a fishing boat as well as into any charge of a wrongful act or default on their part causing any such loss, abandonment, stranding, damage or casualty.

(2) The Police Magistrate, if satisfied that any member of the crew of a fishing-boat has been guilty of incompetency, negligence, misconduct or a wrongful act or default, may suspend the licence of such member of the crew for such time as he may think fit and may also impose a penalty not exceeding one hundred and twenty dollars or imprisonment not exceeding three months or both such penalty and imprisonment."

Over and above that, you surround the fisherman with another penalty Clause. You have a fine of \$500 in one Section, one of \$50.00 in another and in yet another one of \$120.00 or three months' imprisonment. What are you going to do? Are you going to amend that Section? I do not see that we need all of these Penalty Clauses. I think that we should make the fines reasonable because it is just a question of embarrassing the Police Magistrate in the first instance. No Police Magistrate would impose any fine of \$120 on a fisherman.

8.00 p.m.

This is 1952 legislation and you are trying to amend and you should try and do it properly. I would suggest that the Minister adjourn this matter at this stage and try to straighten out Section 19. You cannot have two fines, one of \$120 or three months or both, and then another one of not exceeding \$50. This is slipshod legislation; so let us try and straighten it out before going further.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I also agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that these penalties are much too drastic and much too severe, considering of course the offence which has been committed.

In the first place, you make it an offence by the person in charge of a fishing boat to permit any other person not the holder of a licence; then it is also an offence for a man who uses explosives, and then you suspend the licence of the fisherman. Now in this particular Section 3 Mr. Chairman, a fine of not exceeding \$10 which has been proposed by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and my colleague from St. Lucy is something which is reasonable and bears some relation to the pockets of the people who are likely to be affected by it. It is all right, Mr. Chairman, to speak of a fine of not exceeding \$50 or to point out that \$50 is the maximum, but it can well happen that a Magistrate knowing that is the maximum may in the first instance decide on half of the maximum and put on a fine of \$25 on a poor fisherman. We realise that an offence has been committed, but in fixing fines and penalties and especially maxima, you must bear in mind the type of person with whom the particular legislation has to deal and the frailties and short-comings of that type of person; and when they make a mistake it is unreasonable for legislators to put it in the hands and power of the Magistrate to put a fine of as much as \$50 on them in respect of a breach of this particular provision.

You realise, Mr. Chairman, that in the past if a Magistrate was unreasonable or deemed to be unreasonable in respect of any fine he imposed, all one had to do was to say "I appeal" and automatically there was a free appeal to the Assistant Court of Appeal by virtue of the Assistant Court of Appeal Act. If a fine was imposed on you and after conviction the accused regards it as unreasonable and says "Your Worship, I appeal", and

if the Magistrate does not send on the appeal, he can be dealt with for failing to send it on; but now the situation is entirely different. You can appeal only by depositing a sum of money or having somebody to accept responsibility for you in the sum of \$25. Compared with the exercise of the right of appeal before, there is a tremendous amount now of red tape. To give notice of appeal, you have to set out in writing your grounds of appeal, somebody has to stay surety or you have to deposit \$25, and then as you are going before not merely an ordinary Court of Appeal but the full Court of the Supreme Court, two or three judges, you have, unless you are very unwise, to secure the services of Counsel to represent you before that Supreme Court; so you see what the position is.

That is why I am supporting the amendment that the maximum be reduced from \$50, bearing in mind at the present time that it is difficult to get a Magistrate in this island from qualified personnel.

One of the Courts at District "A" - and that is your district, Mr. Chairman - is closed. I am explaining why I am supporting the reduction from \$50 as the maximum to a lower figure. You may have not a lawyer but a layman sitting on the Bench and this fine of not exceeding \$50 he may feel is a *carte blanche* to say \$30, \$40 or \$50 in an appropriate case, and the only way to get rid of that is by going to the full Court of the Supreme Court.

8.10 p.m.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will agree with me that it is essential not to put too much power in the hands of a Magistrate who may well be a layman who may not realise that it is only an extreme and unusual circumstance which would justify him in imposing the maximum penalty or one near the maximum; hence, my amendment to reduce the maximum of fifty dollars by deleting the word "fifty" and inserting the word "ten" in its place.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down in that he has elaborated the point which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and myself attempted making.

I go further now that the hon. member has made it clear to the members of the Cabinet that there is no Court of Appeal as formerly and that the question of appealing is a very costly business and out of the reach of most fishermen.

I am suggesting in keeping with their laid down principle, on which they enunciate over and over again that the right of appeal should be vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee, which is the Cabinet, that in a case like this the Director of Agriculture no matter who he is, should not have the right as set out in sub-Clause 3 where the decision of the Director to revoke a licence in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be final and conclusive. That is wrong; we can never leave that to him. Any power which is to be final and conclusive should be vested in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is a principle which that present Government now upholds and I do not see why you should depart from that principle. Let that power be vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

I think that you could get as square a deal from them as you will get from the Director of Agriculture. Without elaborating further, I am moving formally a motion for the deletion of sub-Clause 3 and the substitution of the following:-

"The holder of a licence which has been revoked by the Director of Agriculture shall have the right of appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

If you want to be democratic and want to live up to all your Labour promises which you speak of outside and if you believe in passing Socialist Legislation, you will gladly accept this amendment.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to second the amendment which was moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Our view is that unless the Government of Barbados wants to serve notice once and for all on fishermen that they the Government propose to allow the

Director of Agriculture to chase the fishermen out of the sea and make it so hard that the fishermen cannot appeal over the head of the Director of Agriculture when he has taken away their licences, they have every right to accept this amendment. Unless you want a fisherman to know that you are leaving the right to a Civil Servant to take away his livelihood and from that right which you vest in him there can be no appeal, then you must consider this proposed amendment very carefully.

We are not suggesting anything which would take power from the Cabinet. As a matter of fact, I do not know why we should take it; but if our proposal is followed, it adds authority to the Cabinet and not only to theirs but to ours if we succeed in taking over the Government, and that is as good a reason for doing it as any apart from the rightness of it. (A VOICE: That is wishful thinking.) What are you going to do? Are you going to vote for yourselves or go into all the polling stations and mark up all the ballot papers? I do not mean you, Mr. Chairman, but I foresee that you will have your work cut out persuading the electorate to vote for your colleague. (Laughter).

Hon. members opposite will see from the move which I have made that we are not being controversial. I hope that you do not regard it so. If you were to tell a fisherman in any of the constituencies - Christ Church, St. Philip, St. John, or even St. James or St. Peter - that the Director of Agriculture would revoke his licence and that he the fisherman would have no right of appeal either to the Supreme Court or anybody at all and that the decision of the Director of Agriculture would be final and conclusive, you are only asking for trouble and you are going to make it difficult for the Fisheries Officer to carry out his duties because some other people whose licence the Director of Agriculture may revoke may be people who owe him money for their boats. When you revoke their licences, you cannot dun them for the money they owe and that is why I urge the Government to accept this amendment. The Governor-in-Executive Committee in this instance is the fittest and the most proper authority to hear appeals made by the fishermen whose licences have been revoked. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is the final authority in this island in administrative matters unless we hear now for the first time clearly that the Labour Government is going to hand over the fishermen to the tender mercies of Civil Servants who in some cases may be Conservatives and who may be diametrically opposed to the interests of the people, certainly the interest of the poor fishermen. In this sub-Clause you hand over their interests to the Director of Agriculture and do not put yourself in the position of over-riding him.

I would like to know whether the Hon. Minister of Agriculture or any of his colleagues would be prepared to go to any fisherman and say to them that we are giving power to Civil Servants to take away their livelihood and we are not even giving you power to appeal to us. I am certain that if this were put to the test of argument, there is no doubt that you will find that this side is right. I say: give them the right to appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. You give the Director of Agriculture the right to revoke and the Magistrate the right to suspend a licence. But suspension of a licence is not as serious as revocation. The revocation is taking it away altogether. A fisherman has some hope if a Magistrate suspends his licence.

8.20 p.m.

You call it in, so to speak, and you destroy it; you revoke it. The fisherman has some hope if a Magistrate suspends his licence because the Clerk of the Court will know and tell him when he may come in and get back his licence after the period of suspension. It is not so when it comes to the question of revocation; the Director's power, in that matter, is conclusive and final. If you leave this Clause as it stands, Mr. Chairman, and it goes into law, there is nothing which the Government can do in cases of hardship than to come in and repeal this very thing. You are taking away from the Ministers powers which they should have. (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, I pay no attention to asides but I do re-

sent the suggestion that we are talking merely because it is nearly half past eight. However, that happens not to be true. We want the fishermen to be able to appeal to an authority which is above a Civil Servant.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot argue any more for our point of view; if the Minister thinks we are wasting time and they pass this Clause with this fine.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: What I said was that if the hon. member would give me the opportunity I would explain. Until the Constitution is decided upon, you cannot put down the words "the Minister" here in this Bill. Every time you see the words "Director of Agriculture" written in the law, well, he cannot do anything until he consults with me. That is the directive which I gave to the Director. We have it in the Soil Conservation Act. You cannot do anything unless you bring it to the attention of the Ministry and see what the Ministry says about it. When the Constitution has been changed that will be written into the law, but now the matter has to be referred to the Ministry. If that were not so, fishing boats would have been seized, but that cannot be done; nothing can be done unless those concerned consult with me. If it is not so, they will have to leave or I will have to leave and I am not leaving because I have been elected by the people. (Laughter) It is not wise to put the Minister in the Bill because all the Acts would have to be changed. It is done by convention and it has to be honoured. Mr. Chairman, do you think I would be so foolish? Somebody said that I would not get a seat.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of explanation. I say that the Minister has his work cut out in getting people to vote for his colleagues.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I happen to know that the question of Constitutional advancement does not affect this matter at all. It is simply a question that in all these Acts, if you want to get a loan, you must have a licence from the Governor-in-Executive Committee; well, let the power to revoke a licence be vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is nothing to do with any Constitutional advancement. Do not let people bamboozle and fool you; you have the Cabinet System and you have internal self-government and therefore what is the Minister talking about? This is simply a question of allowing things to be vested in a Civil Servant who is afraid of his shadow. The working of this Bill is vested in the hands of Civil Servants, who in many cases, will try to bamboozle the Ministers. It is a question of changing the old Acts and bringing them into line.

We are not voting for this Section and subscribing to any silly policy in passing legislation with a Cabinet System, with internal self-government and your talking about giving power to the Director of Agriculture. You want the power to be vested in the Cabinet.

At this stage, it now being 8.30 of the clock Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m. of the clock, the moment of interruption. Is there any Unopposed Business to be dealt with?

Mr. BRANCKER: This Bill is controversial.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that I am correct in saying that Order No. 6 which deals with the Resolution to sanction the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1960, is non-controversial, judging from the speech made by the hon. member for St. Lucy on the last occasion. I am therefore asking leave that we continue with Order No. 6.

Mr. TUDOR: I should not wonder at what the hon. member says; he has misconstrued the whole purport and purpose of my speech. I wish to tell him that he is very much mistaken.

8.30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper on Government Business having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th August, at 12 noon.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the motion is put, I have been asked by my colleague the hon.

senior member for St. Philip to request that Item No. 10 under Private Members' Business be Item No. 2. It does seem as if the motion of censure may soon be put and I would like Item No. 10 to be the next Order of the Day.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th August, 1960, at 12 noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.34 p.m.