

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10th May, 1960.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C. B. E., M. D., C. M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); 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*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th April, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

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

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1960.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 29th February, 1960.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report on the Audit of Accounts of the Higher Education Loan Fund for the financial years ended 31st March, 1957, 31st March, 1958 and 31st March, 1959.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Eighth Annual Report of the Social Welfare Department - 1st January, 1958 to 31st December, 1958.

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

The Customs Duties (Unfinished Stockings and Socks) Order, 1960.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1960.

Resolution to place the sum of \$13,635 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61 - Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61 No. 3, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1960."

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the 31st day of March, 1960.

A Bill to authorise the payment of a gratuity and a pension to Clifford Audley Mayers.

A Bill to remove difficulties occasioned by the provisions of certain Acts of the Island relating to the period during which subsidiary legislation is required to be laid before the Houses of the Legislature.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939.
12.25 p.m.

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

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the 31st day of March, 1960, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to authorise the payment of a gratuity and a pension to Clifford Audley Mayers, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to remove difficulties occasioned by the provisions of certain Acts of the Island relating to the period during which subsidiary legislation is required to be laid before the Houses of the Legislature, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, the Bill to amend the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 29/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the further increases in rates of Insurance Premiums of motor vehicles, is ready.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Question No. 28/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding the employment of Surgery Technicians at the Barbados General Hospital is ready.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies are ready to Question No. 12/1960 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding telephones at Elementary Schools and to Question No. 13/1960 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy regarding the enrolment of new pupils into the Primary and Secondary Modern Schools.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy are ready:-

Question No. 1/1960 regarding the steps taken by Government for the instruction of fishermen in certain aspects of fishing;

Question No. 2/1960 regarding the earning power of the experimental fishing boat "Investigator";

Question No. 3/1960 regarding the average earnings of a fishing boat and its cost of maintenance;

Question No. 4/1960 regarding the experiments made by the experimental fishing boat "Investigator";

Question No. 5/1960 regarding the operating costs incurred by fishermen;

Question No. 6/1960 regarding the average annual earning power of a fisherman.

Question No. 7/1960 regarding the condition of the Depth Recorder which was installed in the experimental fishing boat "Investigator";

Question No. 8/1960 regarding a boat known as the BAJAN GIRL.

Question No. 9/1960 regarding the number of boat owners in arrears with their payments to the Fisheries Department.

Question No. 10/1960 regarding rations for the crew of the experimental fishing boat "Investigator".

STATEMENT re WEDDING GIFT TO PRINCESS MARGARET

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the first Order of the Day, I am asking leave to make the following statement.

This Government was informed in the latter half of March that the Federal Government proposed to send a gift on behalf of the Federation to Her Royal Highness

The Princess Margaret on the occasion of her marriage and it was asked whether it would wish to be associated with this gift and if so, what financial contribution it would be prepared to make.

After careful consideration, the Government decided that although it would have been inclined to send an individual gift on behalf of the Island of Barbados, the fact of its membership of the Federation should be recognised and therefore it should certainly request to be associated with the gift to be sent on behalf of the Federation.

The gift from the Federation was a silver salver engraved with a map of the territories and the Federal Coat of Arms, having a border of agricultural and floral motifs.

In addition there would be a Fund to which the Governments are being invited to contribute and Her Royal Highness The Princess Margaret will be invited to name a charity in the West Indies to which she would wish the proceeds of the Fund to be devoted.

This Honourable House can therefore expect to be approached shortly for the provision of a suitable contribution to be made by Barbados.

ORDER NO. 1 POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1, and to proceed with Order No. 2, as the first Order of the Day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1960-61, No. 2 PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$1,402 to meet the cost of sending two delegates to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference which was held in Trinidad recently.
12.35 p.m.

The Parliamentary Association did not meet until about two or three weeks ago when the House was in recess; therefore, we did not have the opportunity to follow the usual procedure in cases of this sort, that is to say, that the Parliamentary Association would meet and they would transmit to the Government their agreement or non-agreement as the case may be, and also the sum of money which would be required to send delegates to these meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We believed it was the wish of every member of the Local Branch of the Association, that as to this meeting, being the first one of this sort to be held under the auspices of the Federal Government, every Branch of the Association should be represented at this Conference. Therefore, the mem-

bers on both sides, House members as well as members of the Other Place, realised that we were in a difficult position through no fault of our own, and it was agreed that we could select members and that the cost of sending these two members to Trinidad could be subsequently met by a Resolution and that the members who were selected would undertake to pay their own expenses to Trinidad. That was agreed upon at that meeting which was duly summoned and which was attended by representatives of both branches of the Legislature.

As I said, we know that that procedure is unusual, but taking into consideration the circumstances which I have mentioned and the wish that the first Conference of this sort to be held under the auspices of the Federal Government should be supported, that was the agreement, and here we are with this Resolution for \$1,402 to meet the cost of sending these two members to Trinidad. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that, on this side of the House, we can dismiss in such easy terms a matter of importance such as this. I should like to say at the outset that while it is true that this is a matter which has to do with the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and, as such, it is not strictly a party matter, yet I regret to say - the Premier did not say this, of course - that there has been considerable apprehension on the part of some hon. members to the effect that for some time the affairs of the Local Branch of the Parliamentary Association have not been handled in the Parliamentary spirit. All too frequently we complain that the C.P.A., at least the Local Branch of it, only meets when it is a question of choosing a delegate to go somewhere, but the real business of the C.P.A., the exchange of views and information which should form part of its functions or business in getting in touch with other Parliaments is not done except in a most sporadic manner. Whenever it is a question of a trip, as hurriedly as they can make it, these meetings are summoned and therefore they are in consequence of foregone conclusions; that is to say, that at least since I have been a member of this House, and probably before that, there has never been any genuine attempt to make the Barbados Branch of the C.P.A. work. Contrary to the usual practice in other Parliaments, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition do not fulfil the functions in the local Branch of the C.P.A. which they do in other Parliaments. In the United Kingdom, Australian and Canadian Parliaments, the Presidents of their Branches are, of course, the Speakers of the elected Houses and the Presiding Officers of the other Houses; as Vice-Presidents, you have Prime Ministers and Leaders of the Opposition jointly. In consequence of that arrangement, the C.P.A. branches in these places work with a smoothness and a fairness which, alas, is lacking in Barbados.

Here it is that these invitations were sent out from the Federal Branch of the C.P.A. to the territories. I have reason to believe that the invitation to this Branch of the C.P.A. came long before Parliament went into recess. The invitation must have come before Parliament went into recess and, while I am on this particular point, perhaps the Premier would make a note of the question as to when the invitation arrived, and why it could not have been dealt with as expeditiously as possible; why was it only dealt with when the Legislature was in recess? Obviously, C.P.A. matters cannot be party matters in the strict sense, but there is no reason why there should not be consultation on these matters; and it is passing strange that in the last five or six years, on occasion after occasion when C.P.A. Conferences have to be attended by members or representatives of this Branch of the Legislature, at no time was one side of the House consulted at all as to whether it would like to take part in these Conferences. And it cannot be a mere coincidence that members and representatives of the ruling party are invariably, with one or two possible exceptions, chosen.

12.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot expect the Local Branch of the C.P.A. to work in that one-sided manner, and one of the reasons I believe why the Local Branch does not work as

well as it should is that some members of it are well convinced that it is farcical to take any interest in its proceedings, because no issues that come before them are ever dealt with on their own merits. We have our part and would like to play our part, not necessarily by being chosen as delegates because there is more in the C.P.A. than that, because the C.P.A. has a wider range than that; but we would like to be able to play our part as a Local Branch of a world-wide membership of Parliamentarians.

Mr. Chairman, now I must - and I do so without apology - contradict the Premier flatly on one or two things he said. He said that both sides of the Legislature had been consulted on this matter

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, I never said that both sides of the House had been consulted. I said that we had reasons to believe that both sides of the House would want to be associated with the Local Branch and be represented.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for his correction. If he actually did say that both sides would have wanted to be associated with it, he has not said anything to indicate that anything was done to bring both sides into it. By both sides he may possibly have meant this House and the Other Place, but that is not what we would normally understand to be "both sides". As a matter of fact, the Official Opposition took no part whatever in the meeting which has occasioned this debate on the ground that we were not consulted about it at all, or not satisfactorily. You cannot send out notices three or four days before without giving some prior indication as to what the line of action is likely to be, and you cannot handle these matters in that way.

There is another important aspect of the matter, and I hope this is the last time I would ever have to mention this. It has always been my personal view, Mr. Chairman, that C.P.A. matters should be handled on their own level, and I have always felt that if the Local Branch could be so re-organised to deal seriously with the business that comes before it, a sum of money should be put in the Estimates every year sufficient to cover the contingencies arising out of perhaps one such Conference, and that that money should be jointly under the disposal of the President of the Other Place and the Speaker of this House. The more often you have to come to the Legislature for funds for a matter like this, the more often it would appear that it is a matter in which Government as such is interested, and you do not want Government as such associated with these matters; and I see no reason why the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association should not have funds enough at its disposal to handle at least one Conference yearly.

A dangerous situation has arisen even out of this. Now while in theory no harm is done by asking delegates to pay to defray their own expenses and then to be re-im-bursed, one danger immediately arises - and this is no reflection on delegates - but it is possible that if you tell them that, you might at some time or other get the sort of delegate who would feel it incumbent upon him to run up any bill to any amount he likes, and if you give him that blanket undertaking, you cannot then in decency quarrel with him for spending too much. That is the wrong way to go about it.

Secondly, inevitably it would happen if this method continues, that members of the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association who can pay their own way would be selected as delegates, and that is a situation which you cannot prevent, however careful you are. There will always then be the tendency to put off making these decisions until a time when Parliament may not be sitting, then to have a hurried meeting to select delegates, and those who can pay will say: I am willing to stand my own expenses, and get elected as delegate.

I am satisfied myself that if the delegates had to be chosen, it would have been all right to have one of them from each House, but not under the circumstances in which these two were chosen. I would like to warn members on the other side that if they want the Commonwealth Parlia-

mentary Association to flourish as a Local Branch, the more they could try to dissociate themselves from Party manoeuvring, the better. We are not satisfied with this at all. We think it could have been handled differently, and we want to emphasise in future it is not in the interest of the Local Branch of the C.P.A. that delegates should be put in a situation where they pay their own money, because that inevitably will tend to get them chosen as delegates.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, before anybody else speaks, I want to say that the hon. member who has just sat down seems inclined to blame the Government for this, but I just want to remind him of the usual procedure in a case of this sort. The invitation does not come to the Government; the invitation comes to the Clerk of the Local Branch and the Government only knows when the Speaker of the House and the President of the Other Place decide to summon a meeting, so I just want to make it clear that under the circumstances which I related at the beginning, that is what happened. I just want to remind the hon. member that Government takes no part in it other than that when the sum of money is agreed on, the Government entertains it and brings down a Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: I am well aware of that, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps the Hon. Premier could tell us at what point was the invitation received, because that is what none of us on this side know. We just do not know.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Clerk, I think, can give you that information; I can't.

Mr. TUDOR: Well, could the hon. member tell us when the Government first had intimation that this Conference was coming up and that money would have to be provided to defray its expenses?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Government knew about it the same time as any other member knew, and that is when the co-Chairmen decided to have a meeting.

Mr. WALCOTT: That could not be true.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not attend meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and I think it is already on the record. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind you, Sir, that as long as I am in this House and you are in the Chair, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not know it, you are Chairman of this House and not of the Labour Party either, and I definitely resent any whipper-snappers who have not cut their wisdom teeth in politics directing the Chair from the House.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will have to stress strongly that any personal reference by the hon. member I will take objection to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I say a word to you in reply? 12.55 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member made a remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In reply to what you said, I must inform you that I know nothing of what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph attempted to say. I was paying attention to you. I realise only too well what you have said. I know that I am not Chairman of any particular member or any particular Party.

Mr. BARROW: This is a wonderful opportunity to reply to the hon. member but I would refrain from doing so because if I do so now, when I would have finished with him, I would let him know that I know who my parents are. When people like the hon. member go about on public platforms, first of all, he should let the public know who his parents are and such things. Where did he get his training from, political or otherwise, to know how to behave? Did he get it from down at the Pondsides?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have no intention or desire to give any advice to the Chair, but I would mention that I do object to any personal references which the hon. member might make and I will like to feel that the Chair would mention the same thing to the hon. member.

Mr. BARROW: The personal reference was to myself. I would like hon. members of this House to debate issues which come before it and not to talk nonsense because if they do that there would not be any exposing of themselves.

I will get back to the Resolution, Mr. Chairman. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas, who should know better, came into the House today and said that they only knew when the co-Chairman of the Parliamentary Association told them about this matter. Does that answer the question which was raised by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy? Does it give a time? That is the kind of evasive answer which would satisfy people like the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

When serious questions like those are asked, how can the Hon. Premier give a reply like that especially when he knows that it is a matter of public and general knowledge that the member of the Other Place who happened to go to the Conference had made overtures to the Government and actually made offers to the Government delegate, whoever it is, to pay his expenses and passage for him. I challenge any hon. member to deny that the Hon. K. R. Hunte did not make an offer to pay the passages of the Government delegate and it is well known that that delegate other than himself would never be a member of this side. I also challenge hon. members to deny that all of that was not arranged long before and that the hon. junior member for the City did point out to the Hon. Premier at the meeting that he would be committing a gross breach of parliamentary rights and that it would be undignified to accept such an offer of any patronage from any member of the Other Place. Why should the Hon. Premier reach for his pen when that is known to every single member on this side of the House? In these days they should be throwing off the yoke of patronage from people whose only title to fame is what they can give. It is so debasing where you have it that they were asked to consider or entertain the idea of a wealthy man of this community in his capacity offering to pay the passages of members of this House to a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference. Fortunately, the Speaker of this House of Assembly happened to have enough dignity on that occasion to make his own financial arrangements to attend the Conference, but I personally regret that any member of this House should be placed in that embarrassing position, whether he be Speaker or anybody else. You are appointing members as delegates to go to a Conference and absolutely no financial provision for them was made prior to their selection.

Now, Sir, the local branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is a farce and I do not intend to support anything for it. It is a device which is used by the present Government to extend a certain amount of political patronage to those people who happen to be in favour with them. It is not an association of the members of this House with the members of the Other Place; it is an association of the Government Party and members of the Other Place who happen to have the same outlook, politically and otherwise, as members of the Government.

This meeting was boycotted by the Official Opposition for very obvious reasons. One is that we would not be a party to the undignified spectacle of anyone extending any financial patronage to any member of this Chamber which has such long and ancient traditions. When the hon. junior member for St. Thomas can get up in here with all due seriousness and in reply to a question say that they did not know prior when he knows the opposite to be more consistent with the facts, and when he says that he only knew when the Joint Committee had been summoned, will the hon. member say whether the personnel of the delegation had not been discussed by members of the Cabinet before the meeting?

The way in which the Association should normally operate its meetings is that when a letter is received from the United Kingdom or any other place in respect to a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting taking place somewhere, we should meet as individuals and not as Parties. We should meet, each one in his own right, in so far as the Association is concerned. The Speaker is Chairman of the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; he is not Speaker of the Association. The President of the Other Place is co-Chairman; he is not President of the Association. There should not be any Party voting at any meeting of this Branch of the Association; but what happens is that when we go there we find that all of the candidates have been selected long before we meet. I remember on one occasion when the now Federal Prime Minister was Leader of this House that we had the undignified spectacle of all the members of the non-political party being drawn into a corner in the course of a meeting and being told by the then Leader of this House that they must not take part in this thing because there was going to be a ding-dong battle between members of this House on the matter of the selection of the representatives who were then to go up to the United Kingdom. The representatives who were actually chosen were the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Michael, but there were other nominations which were made at that particular meeting. I think that some four or five nominations were made and members of the Other Place abstained from taking part in the meeting at the express invitation of the then Leader of the Government.

1.05 p.m.

When Her Majesty the Queen was to go to Jamaica, I was told by a member of the Other Place, and I do not intend to conceal this, that they did not want the President to go and they had arranged with the Leader of the House - I can call names if you want me to do so - that they would support the nomination made by the Government Party in order to prevent the President of the Legislative Council from being one of the representatives. How can I, with any sense of honesty, attend meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association when the whole thing is a farce? I am not quarrelling with the member of this House who happened to represent us down there because it has always been our view that if we are to be represented at all in any Parliamentary matter and there is any question of priority, His Honour the Speaker should always be our representative (*Cheers*). We feel that he is more properly representative of the House than any Party hack appointed by the Premier or any other person. On what basis could 23 members of this House support the candidature of the other representative who went down there? Is that what we want the rest of the West Indies to understand that we have in our Parliamentary and social institutions? Is that to be representative of the outlook of the people of Barbados? Do we want them to understand that we work on an industrial basis just as how the work was done in Africa before Nkrumah changed the Constitution - that so many people represent industry and so on? I know that the hon. senior member for St. Michael would want to get up and say that Hon. Mr. K. R. Hunt did not offer to pay the passages of whoever the representatives were and himself. Our political institutions in Barbados are going to be reduced to the stage where although we have a Public Treasury and there is a deficit - well, if we do not have money we should cut our coat to suit the cloth. If we do not have money for these expensive excursions - in fact, when we do have representation at these Conferences the beneficial effects are extremely doubtful to the economy and political outlook of this country.

It is far better that we do not have participation in these Conferences if we reduce ourselves to the level of accepting patronage from a wealthy member of the Other Place or from any other person in Barbados. I am sure that the hon. junior member for Christ Church, steeped as he is in the knowledge he has of the traditions of this House, would not dare to insult any member of this Chamber by offering to pay his passage, and that is the kind of thing to which Parliamentary democracy has been reduced in Barbados. On the next occasion, instead of coming for

money Resolutions, we will have to ask members of the Other Place if we can have a little money to pay the Civil Servants and the House of Assembly's salaries at the end of the month. I am not sure if we will not have to ask whether it will meet with the approval of members of the Other Place or hurt them in any way if we have to come and increase the salaries of Policemen. It is bad procedure and insulting the dignity of this House for a person to offer to pay money out of his pocket so that Parliament can be represented in a neighbouring colony. If I am misconstrued in what I say, it is a matter of supreme indifference to me; but I cannot sit here and hear the Premier say that he had no knowledge that the two Co-chairmen had summoned a meeting when it is a matter of common knowledge that everything was arranged beforehand except that they did not know whence the money was coming until a so-called generous offer was made by a member of the Legislature.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry and I am glad that this thing has taken place. I happened to attend this meeting. I would not say all that the hon. junior member for St. John has said in so far as concerns one of the delegates to the Conference as to the motives when this suggestion was made. I happened to be in the Chamber; however, when the suggestion was made, I asked the member if he were crazy, because I could only think that a crazy man could make such an offer - an offer to pay the passages of people in the circumstances. I am not surprised that the Hon. Premier does not know anything about this matter because there are other things which the Premier should know and which he does not know. That is one of our unfortunate situations. It is true that the Clerk has to take the blame in this matter and perhaps the Speaker. I do not hold the Speaker up to blame because I doubt very much that he was aware to the extent that the Speaker and the Clerk in Trinidad were aware, to the extent that the Premier of Trinidad had said that he was not going to participate in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, which was going on; which was longer than the time when we were given notice of participating in this matter. I asked the Clerk of this House on one occasion how is it that Trinidad is discussing the question of this Parliamentary Association Conference and up to this time we had not been informed about it; it seemed to me as if we were not invited; but when we received the notice, I understand that the Speaker wanted to go. In so far as I am concerned, I did not want to go; there was a meeting in connection with another matter concerning the House, which I attended and I understood that that meeting was still going on. I was not particularly interested in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting. I said on a former occasion, that a sum of money should be placed in the Estimates for the purpose of these Conferences, and the Estimates for the purpose of these Conferences and the Premier said he agreed with what I was saying, but nothing was done about it. Moreover, I have pointed out in the past, similar to what the hon. junior member for St. John has pointed out today, that it is not fair and it is the Government's attitude to these Parliamentary Association Conferences to prevent members other than those of the Government Party from going to such Conferences. The only solitary occasion of which I know when there was a departure was the occasion when they sent a former member of this House, Mr. Bethell, to New Zealand. That was the sort of representation which they preferred to give the House then.

1.15 p.m.

What I contend, Mr. Chairman, is that the Public Treasury has to pay. I have heard statements made by the President of the Association like the statement where somebody said that Combermere School and Harrison College are private schools, but Government pays the expenses, as if the Parliamentary Association is an Old Boys' Association where you can pay a contribution and become a member of the C.P.A. You are only a member by accident or design or otherwise when you happen to be a member of Parliament; that is the only way you can be a member of this Association, either by being elected here or nominated in the Other Place; but what intrigues me at this stage of our history is that when we were fighting all along, when it comes to

the Governor appointing such persons from the Other Place, you must not be treated as co-equal, but the elected Chamber must be given preference from the day when the Governor appointed a Director of Education in the person of Mr. Hayden to represent Barbados at a West Indian Conference and we protested against that sort of Colonial concept.

Now that there is a majority in this Chamber, the members of the Government aid and abet with the Other Place whenever it comes to nomination to keep some member from this House other than a Government member from going. There has never been an occasion that the members of the Government at a Commonwealth Association meeting ever nominated a member of the Opposition to go on any delegation. They regard that as if it were some prize and that this is something you get for long service; therefore you look around and say a member has not been yet and it is time for him to go, irrespective of the contribution that can be made. I take it that the Leader of the Opposition - it is true - does not like to travel by air and that might be a good excuse, because you cannot always travel by boat; but he has been in the House twenty years, and I feel that any person who has been in Parliament for as long as 20 years should know something to discuss at a C.P.A. Conference because you do not take any votes; it is nothing on which to pass a particular Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I said on former occasions that Parliamentary delegations should be so made up that you give a sort of representation of Parliament as it stands from time to time, because it is not a Government mission you are going on. As the hon. junior member for St. John said, it is not going to an Oils and Fats Conference, and I do not agree even with the Opposition sometimes when they want to go to a Government Conference. My attitude is to allow the Government to go to the Conference, make their own decisions and be responsible for their own mistakes. I am not going to be associated with Government policy when I have no share in formulating Government policy; so I do not want to go to a Conference at which Government policy is going to be enunciated if I am not part of the Government but when it comes to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, it is a matter of sitting down as Parliamentarians, having some drinks and discussing problems, and nobody is vexed with another or you do not hold a fellow out, because there is no voting involved and therefore you express your views as you see them and you are not bound by a Government measure. In this business the Government of Trinidad knew about it so long that if I had the authority to receive the invitation under such circumstances, I would have returned the letter to the person thanking him very much, but informing him that in view of the fact that he could not get the invitation to me before, I am sorry that it does not suit me to come.

We met practically the week immediately prior to the beginning of the Conference and Trinidad had been discussing it, and I do not know how long the other people received their invitation.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe that the hon. gentleman from the Other Place who was selected along with the Speaker made the suggestion with an improper motive, because he was quick to withdraw it when he was told that that suggestion was completely out of place, that is, that he was going to pay because there was no money available for these delegates to go. I do not know where the suggestion came from, but I agree with the hon. junior member for St. John in this. The Leader of the House, the Minister of Trade was there and I was of the impression and am still of the impression that the Leader of the House knew before hand that the hon. gentleman from the Other Place was going to be nominated, because when the gentleman made the suggestion with regard to paying the money the Leader of the House who was more or less the Government spokesman said nothing about that erroneous suggestion.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, is the hon. member referring to the Hon. Leader of the House or the Premier?

Mr. WALCOTT: I said the Leader of the House. The Premier was there too, but I think the Leader of the House was also present as well as the Minister of Agriculture, and no member of the Government including the Premier said anything about the erroneous suggestion. All that was said was by the Speaker after this was raised explaining the situation to me. I said that the suggestion was erroneous and I could not see how any man selected could not find money to go to Trinidad. The Speaker's reply was that it was not a question of the money to go to Trinidad it was a question that the total sum of money was in the vicinity of \$1,000, and a poor man could not find \$1,000 to go; but if he were selected he would undertake to choose means other than depending on the suggestion from the hon. gentleman who made it. I say that because no member of the Government said anything about the suggestion that was made, and I can only come to the conclusion it was an accepted matter - because you did not go there and sit down to pull names out of a bag - that the gentleman would be selected.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, it did not matter to me who went to the Conference, because in any case I think it was a matter of giving the West Indies the privilege of having a Conference in the area; but I must say under the present circumstances that it does not do Parliament any good if you restrict such meetings only to one side. I went further and said that this House should vote money not only for such purposes, but for the purpose of sending out their own Parliamentary delegations to certain parts of the Commonwealth in order that they could meet other Parliamentarians. I see that some of the same Parliamentarians came to Barbados and met me and they were members of the Labour Party, not members of the Conservative Government, and the Conservative Government is in power in the United Kingdom, and I take it that if they could do that in the United Kingdom - not that we must follow them in every respect - we should do it also. 1.25 p.m.

With all due respect to the hon. gentleman of the Other Place who said that he is not a politician, my reply to him is this. If you are not a politician, why state that you are going to a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference? The very word "parliament" connotes if you are having something to do with it that you are a politician. It appears to me that you do not want to be a politician but you want all the privileges that come to politicians. I have never known that a meeting having anything to do with parliamentarians is a meeting of non-politicians.

I would say this. In order to keep members of the Opposition out of the meetings of this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the Government's attitude has been one where they have said that the Other Place is co-equal with this Chamber in so far as being a branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, therefore they have equal rights as members of the Government going on visits. We have been noticing what takes place in other Parliaments in so far as Government members and Opposition members are concerned. Not long ago, the Jamaica Branch sent two members from one part of the Legislature and one from the other as delegates to a meeting. I remember too well, in my own experience what I had to fight for when I was a member of the Government. We were having a West Indian Conference in Jamaica - I do not know if we learnt much from it - and on that occasion there was the incident that the Other Place was pressing that one of their number should be sent to that Conference and because of that the now Minister of Social Services went from this House as an Adviser because the then Leader of the House, may be, because he had his long range views, did not want to offend the Other Place and therefore he agreed to a member of the Other Place going to that Conference. As a matter of fact, he saw to it that a member from the Other Place was selected and then said that the now Minister of Social Services would go as an Adviser.

The meetings of the Local Branch of the C.P.A. have an unsavoury history, and it is a fact that to give the members of the other side no opportunity whatsoever of going

on visits, members of the other side use the members of the Other Place whenever it suits them to do so. On one occasion they sent the Hon. Dr. Cato up to Kenya and he was the single delegate; therefore, it can be said that he represented the whole Legislature. Added to that, you had the miserable spectacle of your sending one delegate, and the one delegate you sent was not from the elected Chamber; therefore, it shows how advanced you are parliamentarily. Of course, that was done as a means of giving that particular gentleman an award and now he has been given further awards because he is now President of the Senate of the West Indies Federation. That is why I say that I cannot understand the methods of the Government. I do not know if that was the same occasion when the Speaker of this House had fallen from grace, so far as his Party was concerned, and therefore he was not nominated to go, but I do know that there was a former occasion when His Honour the Speaker, in his own right, should have been chosen as a delegate to attend the Coronation of Her Majesty and it was said then that the person to go should not be the Speaker, but that it should be the Premier. It was argued that it was the Leader of the House who should go and not the Speaker as he was not representing the House on that occasion. You get all this sort of thing happening. I just throw these things out to show that this local Branch of the Parliamentary Association has a very unsavoury flavour in so far as how members are chosen to attend the meetings of the Association.

I will say that I do not think the Government owes any right to any member of the Opposition in saying that they should choose a member of the Opposition to represent the Government at any Conference, but I will say that at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference where there is no partisan politics involved, representation should come from both sides of the House. I remember very well how at one time in our history we were strong in our condemnation that the Other Place cannot as a matter of right challenge us in this Lower Chamber when it comes to these things. Now, we are treating them with equal favour. This is how I feel about matters like this and I think other hon. members feel the same way about it. I feel, if you had to send two members to a Conference of this Association that if you left out representation from the Other Place and nominated the two from either side of this House, no harm could be done. It is being done by other Governments. As I have said, there was a time when because it was insisted that a member from the Other Place should go, you sent the hon. junior member for St. George as an Adviser. I also remember an occasion when they sent two members and both of them were nominated from the Other Place. They were the Hon. Mr. F. Hutson and the Hon. Julian Mahon.

As I have said, Sir, I do not like the way in which the business of the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is done. I feel that a meeting should be called and at that meeting it should be decided who should be nominated to attend the particular conference. I feel that way because you have got some members of the House who have never travelled before, and it is most unlikely that they can go anywhere out of their own pockets. Then, too, the dignity that you can get when you go away as a Parliamentarian is something better than when you go on your own. I consider, as old a member of this Parliament as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is, he in his right should have had the opportunity to represent this Chamber. There is no question of if the Speaker should go to a Parliamentary Conference or not because, as the hon. junior member for St. John has said, there is nothing debatable in the Speaker going to a Parliamentary Conference. I will also say that there is nothing debatable in the hon. member from the Other Place who was chosen on the last occasion going to a Parliamentary Conference.

Finally, I would say that the members of the Government who participated in that meeting of the C.P.A. in the Other Place on the last occasion should have been embarrassed to hear a member stating in Barbados, in 1960, that he was willing to pay for a delegate or delegation leaving Barbados. All that shows is that those members who make these statements about your doing something

and what the Government should not have done are not incorrect.
1.35 p.m.

All it shows is that it is not beyond suspicion that people in Barbados are saying that the Hon. K. R. Hunte not only makes loans to members of the Government but, in some cases, he underwrites the expenses for electioneering purposes and makes certain things available to them. The reason why I take that seriously is because it will take a man with more than ordinary brass to get up in a Legislative Assembly and offer to pay the total expenses of a delegation going on a public mission on behalf of a whole colony, as if you are lending somebody three cents to pay his bus fare so that he can get home. With all the excuses which you may make, suspicion is suspicion, and if you think that you can laugh away suspicion, you are mistaken. Some people laugh away shame too; you cannot prove anything, but the fact that a man like this, in respect of certain things which I have heard brought up in the Legislature - he is now suggesting that he would pay something like \$2,000 or \$3,000 on behalf of the whole delegation; that makes you feel that because he is in a position to pay this total amount of passage money, he is making this offer.

Mr. Chairman, I like to be fair to everybody. I have heard members on the other side make accusations against people for things of a suspicious nature. For example; we feel that if a man is doing business and getting the Government contract, if he is in the place where he can get the contract, it would be difficult to tell some people that this contract was not given to him but to his firm because he can sell things more cheaply than anybody else. You make people feel that his presence there makes you give the contract to him. What I said is what I heard the hon. member say himself, and I asked him if he was crazy because only a crazy man could make such an offer. Moreover, there are subsequent events which have taken place at the meeting, which made me feel that this honourable gentleman has more than passing influence somewhere with some people. In a small community when one person can wield a lot of influence, when that person happens to be a member of the Executive - one of the subsequent events led me to feel that when such a person wields that sort of influence in the community which the hon. member wields - these suggestions are things which we should watch very carefully. I say no more on this matter. I endeavour to put the most favourable consideration on these things and that is why I said I do not believe that the hon. gentleman had improper motives by making the suggestion which he made. I think that this matter coming from him and in the way and in the circumstances under which it came from him, will leave the feeling that there is too much power at some stage which a person wants to wield. It is fortunate that His Honour the Speaker did not agree with the suggestion that this gentleman should pay these expenses because His Honour would have been travelling on a K. R. Hunte entourage; it would be a question of one fellow borrowing another fellow's clothes and the owner of the clothes saying: "Don't dance too hard in these things." (Laughter) That is just a metaphor in so far as borrowing clothes is concerned, and when this offer is made you would make a suggestion to lower the prestige of Parliament. It is a very magnanimous suggestion, but it would leave a bad flavour in the mouths of those who feel that Parliament must stand above any suggestion of borrowing or any such suggestion which would emanate from the most magnanimous and generous person.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, there have been so many misleading statements and misrepresentations made during the course of this debate that I think I would be failing in my duty, as one who happens to be a member of this House for about 16 years now, if I did not try to put the record straight. I will attempt to reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter first because I can see he was labouring under a misapprehension as far as I am concerned. At that Parliamentary Conference which took place in the Other Place on the 8th April, I attended the meeting half an hour late; I was under the impression at first that the meeting was scheduled to take place at 2.30 o'clock p.m. only to find that when I got there the meeting

was scheduled for 2 o'clock p.m. and so the proceedings were well in advance. I was not present when the hon. gentleman from the Other Place to whom reference has been made in respect of an offer to stand the expenses of this trip, made such an offer. I was not present when that was done.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I want to ask the hon. member if he was present at the meeting at any time when I was there. I also went to the meeting late and therefore I do not want to make any reference to the hon. member if he was not present at the meeting when I was there. Anything which I said which would make him to be present at the meeting if he was not present, I would withdraw.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was present, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, the hon. member came after me. I will continue to say that when the suggestion or proposal was made by the hon. gentleman to pay the expenses, I had no quarrel with it. (Mr. BARROW: That is your mentality.) Mr. Chairman, if he continues with that nonsense, I will talk to him. I am saying here and now that I have no quarrel with him if he made that suggestion. It was not a question of Government being represented at anything. This was a question for the Parliamentary Association to decide, not even as a Government. We in this Government can only accept the point of view of the C.P.A. saying to the Government that they have agreed to send Mr. X and Mr. Y, as the case may be, to this Conference; it will cost X dollars, will you kindly supply us with this money? That is the only place Government comes in and not otherwise, and it is the height of nonsense to have wicked, worthless, statements made by that type of mentality which exists in this place.

The hon. member who has just sat down talked about this generous offer of \$2,000 or \$3,000 to pay for passages and expenses and that he would have to look at it with suspicion. I do not have any brief for Hunte or anybody else. I have always been in a position to speak my mind on things as I see them and I shall be so as long as I live. I do not run puppying behind anybody and the hon. member knows very well that that does not happen with me. I am not like the satellites over there running behind people.

Mr. BARROW: Have you become independent since you stopped canvassing for Mr. T. B. Pierce?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. junior member for St. John to stop the asides.

Mr. BARROW: I asked the hon. member if he became independent since he stopped canvassing for Mr. T. B. Pierce. (Hon. M. E. COX: Shut up, shut up!) Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet on a point of order, and I would not have any yard boy or anybody else shouting at me "shut up" from the other side of the House. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is on his feet while I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two members on the floor.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order and the hon. member said "shut up". Does he tell me to shut up because I was asking if he became independent since he stopped canvassing for T. B. Pierce?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I intervened at that stage to ask you to put an end to those asides. You cannot sit and pass those asides.

Mr. BARROW: The asides usually come from him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That one came from you.

Hon. M. E. COX: Could you want anything more damnable and lying than the statement he has made? I have never in my life supported any Conservative in this island; I have always been associated with democratic labour movements. Imagine him getting up and talking about my canvassing for T. B. Pierce! He is a wicked fellow and could

not be worse than he is. He is the worst thing that God has ever allowed to live. Anybody who knows me knows that I have always opposed that wealthy group. I have never yet supported any of them. Imagine him getting up here with all those lies rolling off his tongue like water!

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member made the mistake of magnifying this amount by saying: "Imagine this man being so magnanimous as to offer to Government this \$2,000 or \$3,000."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear the hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member, as I said, talked about this \$2,000 or \$3,000 for expenses for going on this trip. That is not fair and I do not know if the member did it wilfully, because even the Resolution before us now is for \$1,402.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member heard me when I said that \$80 was not anything that the member could not pay, but when I was told that it was not a question of \$80, but a question of \$2,000, I said that it would mean \$2,000 which the Government would have to pay for the two persons.

Hon. M. E. COX: Again, the hon. member is not aware of what the situation is.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am talking about what the Speaker said.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is the position when he talks about \$2,000 or \$3,000. The Government has agreed to pay the Federal Government \$1,000 as portion of the expenses for entertaining these delegates, and the amount which these gentlemen would have had to look for would be approximately \$400 between the two.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I am not dealing with the question of the amount. The question of the amount was explained to me; but I said that I asked the hon. gentleman if he were crazy to make that offer, and then I said that any member should be able to pay his passage to Trinidad anyhow, and then it was explained that the amount of money involved would be \$2,000 or \$3,000, and the Speaker said that no poor man could find \$2,000.

Hon. M. E. COX: I repeat it is all well to magnify these things or attempt to magnify them. As I said, I have no quarrel with the gentleman for making this offer. (Mr. WALCOTT: I have; it is most improper.) If the individual agrees to offer something, I am not quarrelling with him; he is not offering it to the Government of Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Peter to stop the asides.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, nothing was offered to this Government. The position was that two members of the Legislature, the Speaker who is the Speaker of this House and is impartial and is the symbol of the House, the Opposition and Government alike - he is not a member of this Government, he is the Speaker of this House.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the offer was made on behalf of the Government because his attitude was that there was no money in the Estimates to do it, and his idea was that he was going to do it until such time as Government sent it down. For whom was it being done then? The individual? The Speaker did not want money as a person; so why draw this narrow distinction between what today is approved by Government and what the person said he was going to do before the Government did it? On whose behalf was he doing it? If the Government did not do it, he could not get back his money.

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that the offer was made to the Government; I said it was made on behalf of the Government; and I challenge the Premier to say now that he did not say that the Government has al-

ready on past occasions honoured these things when they are done.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is interrupting me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry.
1.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that no offer was made either on behalf of this Government or to this Government. It was a question of the gentleman telling his colleague who was being elected to represent this Parliament at the conference what he could do. He said: "I can lend you the money until you come back."

Mr. BARROW: I say that it was a damned insult if that were so.

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

Mr. BARROW: I repeat, I say that it was a damned insult if that were so. He should not have had the effrontery to get up and make a slur like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on? Will the hon. member take his seat?

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to the word "damned".

As I was saying, the position is as simple as ever. Let us start off with the argument as to whether the Government knew, how and when the Government knew. What is the position? As happened in the past, the position has always been that in the first place whenever an invitation is offered to Parliament - not to Government - to send representatives on a conference such as this, both Houses of the Legislature meet and discuss it and decide whether or not they will be represented. If it is decided that the Legislature will be represented, then even before the selection of the delegates is made, the local branch of the Parliamentary Association writes the Government and tells the Government that it has been agreed that the local Association would send representatives to the Conference or on the Course, as the case may be, and that it would cost so much money, and will ask: "Will you kindly send down a Resolution to meet these expenses?" That is what is done and the Government, as far as I know, in all cases has sent down Resolutions for the amount required.

On the last occasion when representatives were to be sent to this Conference, if I remember correctly, it was not until after the 8th.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

On re-assembling,

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER called Question Time.

HEAD TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 24.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Education actually read the replies on the last occasion and I have received them; therefore there is no need for me to read the Questions again. I will only put a supplementary.

I would like to ask the Minister this. How soon does he expect to rectify this anomaly with respect to the salaries of these Head Teachers whose salaries are not greater than those of the graduates serving under them? If that is so, on what basis?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any exact date with respect to the time. The most that I can say about that is that it will be rectified as soon as possible. With respect to the basis, that has not been actually settled. We are considering several ways and means.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Minister to say that he is considering ways and means of adjusting the anomaly?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Yes, Sir.

Mr. TUDOR: Can he then give us some indications along the lines which he is speaking?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Not at the present moment.

CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 25.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education.

1. Will the Minister state how many children are currently enrolled in the Public Elementary Schools of this island?

2. Will he further state whether the average attendance per school is declining in the country schools?

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will he state the reasons, so far as they can be known, for this declension.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Will the hon. member postpone that until a little later? I have not got the reply to hand.

LABOUR WELFARE FUND IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF COMBERMERE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 11.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:

Will the Minister state whether Labour Welfare Funds have ever been used to finance the construction of Combermere School?

(2) If the answer is "Yes", will he further state the amount so used, and whether Legislative sanction was required for this action?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The answer is this. An amount of \$59,550, part of the cost of the hall at Combermere School, which is also to be used as a Community Hall, was met from Labour Welfare Funds. The amount was provided for the purpose by the Governor-in-Executive Committee in accordance with Regulations made under the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare Fund) Act, 1947. The Act does not provide that issues from the Fund should be subject to Legislative sanction, but the intention to meet part of the cost of the hall from such funds was indicated on pages 19 and 33 of the 1955-60 Development Plan.
2.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Do I understand from the Premier that this additional expense arose out of the necessity to build a Community Hall at the School, or is he saying that the original amount provided for the construction of the School was underestimated?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As I understand it, Sir, it was always intended that this Hall should be used as a Community Hall. The amount was not underestimated; it was originally intended that this Hall should be used as a Community Hall, and for that purpose, this amount was included in the building of this Hall. It is not a question of the amount being underestimated.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will now revert to the consideration of Question No. 25 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

1. Will the Minister state how many children are currently enrolled in the Public Elementary Schools of this island?

2. Will he further state whether the average attendance per school is declining in the country schools?

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will he state the reasons, so far as they can be known, for this declension.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: In reply to the Question asked by the hon. member in connection with the attendance at the Public Elementary Schools, I should like to say this:-

At the end of December, 1959, there were 39,455 children enrolled in the Government-maintained Schools, that is, Primary and Secondary Modern Schools of the island. The average attendance per school is not declining in the country schools. On the contrary, the average attendance in every parish showed a marked improvement during the year 1958-59, as compared with 1957-58, and the attendance for the September - December term, 1959, also showed improvement. The attendance figures of each parish for 1957-58, 1958-59 and for the September-December term are as follows:-

Average Attendance as a percentage	1957-58	1958-59	September/December Term
Christ Church	79.6	83.0	83.9
St. Andrew	76.2	80.7	84.9
St. George	75.7	77.6	81.5
St. James	82.3	87.1	86.9
St. John	76.3	76.8	83.2
St. Joseph	74.0	77.0	80.4
St. Lucy	82.9	86.2	88.4
St. Michael	77.3	79.4	81.6
St. Peter	79.9	85.4	88.5
St. Philip	80.5	82.4	85.3
St. Thomas	72.7	80.8	82.1

Those are the figures.

INSTRUCTION TO FISHERMEN

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

What steps, if any, has Government taken, since the introduction of powered fishing, to have fishermen instructed:

- In the techniques of Tropical fishing.
- In the seamanship necessary to offshore fishing including the rules of the road, aids to navigation, and,
- In the care and maintenance of boats, apart from the care of the engines?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

If the hon. member is referring to fishing by means of mechanically-propelled vessels and not to methods of fish capture by the use of power such as suction or electricity the answer is as follows:-

Experiments have been carried out from time to time on the use of various types of equipment and the results passed on to the fishermen direct by the Fishery Officer. These results have also been recorded in the annual reports of the Department of Agriculture.

At the present stage of fisheries development it is not considered essential to give formal instruction in seamanship to local fishermen since they are considered to be reasonably competent in the management of their craft. Discussions are held with fishermen on the rules of the road and instruction has been given on the use of the compass. This is all part of the extension service provided by the Fisheries Division which also gives advice on maintenance including the use of proper marine paints. Maintenance work in the Bridgetown area is facilitated by the use of the crane erected for the purpose at the Mole-head.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, with respect to such instruction as is given, how often is it given and who is responsible for it? Is it given under the direction of the Fisheries Officer and is every single fishing area covered?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The Fisheries Officer is responsible for this instruction, but there have been times when the Marine Mechanic has been deputising for him. For instance, the Marine Mechanic would be more competent to deal with the engines in certain aspects than the Fisheries Officer would be, but there have been, in many parts of the island, films shown in relation to the care of engines and so on, and that is done periodically. The Government saw fit to get an outfit to educate the fishermen and this has been done in every part of the island where the fishermen congregate.

Mr. TUDOR: I am afraid that the Hon. Minister misunderstood the question and I would therefore like to redirect his attention to the third part of the question. It is this: whether the Government has taken any steps to have fishermen instructed in the care and maintenance of boats apart from the care of the engines? I want to know about the care of the hulls of the boats and not about that part which is within the province of the Marine Mechanic.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, that is done either by the Fisheries Officer or by the Boat Inspector. As the hon. member knows, we have no Boat Inspector now; therefore that work has lapsed.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: How soon does the Minister expect to have an Inspector and when will this work of the inspection of boats other than the engines be resumed?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Quite recently an advertisement appeared in the Newspapers inviting applications for the post. I think it is now being dealt with in the usual way.

EARNING POWER OF THE "INVESTIGATOR"

Question No. 2 was called.

Mr. TUDOR: Question No. 2 reads as follows:-

"Will the Minister state whether the earning power of the "Investigator" has been recorded over the last nine years?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, will he publish the figures of each year's earnings?

(3) If the figures disclose a gradual decrease in earning power, will the Minister state what is the reason for such decrease?"

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 2 is as follows:-

"1. Yes.

2. The figures are as follows -

1950/51	\$1,860
1951/52	2,622
1952/53	1,448
1953/54	1,371
1954/55	743
1955/56	829
1956/57	743
1957/58	543
1958/59	506

3. The reason for the decrease in earnings is due to a combination of the following factors -

- (a) the fact that the vessel is not a commercial operator but an experimental vessel, whose contribution to the fishing industry is not intended to be measured in terms of the revenue earned. Revenue earning is merely incidental to its operations.
- (b) reduction in the length of the operational period since 1954/55.
- (c) changes in the nature of the investigation work carried out involving for example research on plankton, trolling, mapping of fishing areas and research on bottom species using multiple hooks instead of the lucrative fishing in the earlier stages in carrying out experiments with the gill net.
- (d) a policy of not competing against the fisherman and so spoil the market for their catches."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I missed a considerable portion of the Minister's Reply, but I think I got enough to be able to ask this first Question.

Will the Minister, if he has the figures, state what has been the operating expenses of the Investigator in the years mentioned? We already have the revenue and we should like to hear something about the expenses.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Did you ask that originally?

Mr. TUDOR: No, it is a supplementary question.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am sorry I have not got the figures here with me.

Mr. TUDOR: I wonder then if we could postpone Question No. 2 and proceed to something else.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking whether in view of the answer this question could be postponed until the information is ready.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I cannot get it today, Sir.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not mean necessarily today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 2 is now postponed.

AVERAGE EARNINGS OF A NORMAL FISHING BOAT

Question No. 3 was called.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 3 reads as follows:-

"Will the Minister state whether Government has ever taken steps to discover what are the average earnings of a normal fishing boat per season, as well as the average cost of maintenance and upkeep?

(2) Will the Minister further state whether the average boat is in position to pay its annual instalment and insur-

ance, and still be maintained in a seaworthy and economic condition in hull, machinery and gear?"

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 3 is as follows:-

"1. No surveys have been made to determine the average earnings of a normal fishing boat per season. It is proposed to do so as soon as the Government Statistical Department is in a position to undertake the Survey. The Federal Agricultural Survey Officer has already been in consultation with this Government and has tendered advice on this matter. Information is available on the average cost of maintaining the average fishing launch.

2. The ability of a boat to pay its annual expenses and still be maintained in a seaworthy and economic condition in hull, machinery and gear depends on its earning power, in respect of which no survey has yet been made."

Mr. TUDOR: Will the Minister give some indication as to how soon these surveys will begin to be made?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: We have invited some very competent fishery people to come and help us along with the Statistical Department in Barbados.

Mr. TUDOR: Will the Minister state whether these persons have accepted the invitation and when they are expected?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Part of them will come from the Federation and until we get word how soon they can come, I cannot state definitely how soon they will be here.

EXPERIMENTS MADE BY GOVERNMENT EXPERIMENTAL FISHING BOAT

Question No. 4 was called.

Mr. TUDOR: Question No. 4 reads as follows:-

"Will the Minister state:-

(a) What experiments have been made by the Government experimental Fishing Boat "Investigator" since her commissioning?

(b) If any, will he state by what means have the results of these experiments been communicated and/or demonstrated to fishermen and/or Boat Owners?"

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to that Question is as follows:-

"(a) The following experiments have been made by the Government Experimental Fishing Boat "Investigator" since she was put in service in December, 1949 -

- (i) the development and use of the gill nets for intensive flying fishing.
- (ii) Trolling methods.
- (iii) The efficiency of various types of bait.
- (iv) The relation of plankton to the presence of flying fish. This work was commenced in 1950 and has been continued in collaboration with the Bellairs Institute of McGill University.
- (v) Charting of fishing grounds and positions.
- (vi) The development and use of the circular ring net for catching flying fish.
- (vii) The development and use of multiple hooks for bottom species fishing.
- (viii) The development and use of the long line for large pelagic species.

(b) the results as they become available are passed on to fishermen by direct discussions between the Fishery Officer and the fishermen. The intensive use of the results obtained by (i) to (iii) by fishermen has indicated the effectiveness of this method of disseminating information. Fishing positions are recorded on a master chart in the Fisher-

ies Office at the Reef which is available to fishermen and boatowners."

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Minister state the precise method by which this information as it is gathered is passed on? Is it for instance that the Fisheries Officer goes around to individual fishing centres to disseminate the knowledge, or is it the policy to summon the fishermen to him or are fishing boats taken out and guided by the "Investigator" to the fishing grounds?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, he meets the fishermen from time to time at various beaches, and from what I have learnt they also go out on the "Investigator" on certain occasions. They do not go *en masse*, but from time to time. It is a big scheme to initiate along this line, but very soon from now, as soon as we get certain information as regards statistics, it will be done; so the hon. member need not have any fear. We have been having a comprehensive scheme and teaching them the art.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Hon. Minister say, when the "Investigator" goes out on these missions, if she catches fish?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I understand that on every occasion that she goes out, they try to catch fish.

Mr. TUDOR: Will the Minister say how the fish is disposed of?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The fishermen get the first lot, but the rest is sold at the Depot in Bridgetown.

Mr. TUDOR: You say that all the rest is sold. Is that not offering competition to the fishermen in the trade?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I do not know that we have sufficient fish to supply our local demand; therefore I cannot see how it can be considered unfair competition.

INCREASE IN OPERATING COSTS OF FISHERMEN

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 5.

Mr. TUDOR: Is the Minister aware of the increase in operating costs over the past year, due to rises in the prices of

(a) Fishing gear (gill nets and lines)

(b) Fuel and lubricating oils

(c) Paints?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The answer to that is "Yes". The increase in the price of gear and of paints is not however entirely due to an increase in price of a comparable commodity but mainly to the use of improved gear, with longer life and a higher degree of catchability and to the use of marine paints which offer better protection than house paints which were previously used.

Mr. TUDOR: In view of what the Hon. Minister said, if the prices of these materials continue to rise, has Government any plans of subsidizing the industry by pegging the prices in some way, or can the Hon. Minister say anything of what he proposes to do to keep them within a certain range?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The question is a difficult one for me to answer at the present moment. What I would say now is that due to the better quality of the gear, they last longer and, therefore, they become cheaper in the long run.

I cannot tell him offhand that we will subsidize the industry any further than what we have been doing up to today. We know that the fishermen have been asking for an increase in the price of fish but we have to be careful

whose side we take. I do hope when we build our Cold Storage Depot that the whole complexion of the industry will be changed by it for the better.

EARNING POWER OF FISHERMEN

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 6.

Mr. TUDOR: Has the Government ever taken steps to discover

(a) The average annual earning power of a fisherman.

(b) The reason for the inability on the part of fishermen to repay their loans at the times required?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The answer to (a) is No. It is proposed to undertake a survey on such lines as soon as the Government Statistical Department is in a position to do so.

The answer to (b) is Yes. Marketing is one of the main problems of the industry. Steps are being taken to provide cold storage facilities and to improve the distribution and marketing of fish. It has been discovered that some owners utilise their vessels' earnings to settle other debts and do not repay their loans at the time required.

Mr. TUDOR: How can the Hon. Minister or the Fisheries Department know that the owners use their vessels' earnings to pay off other debts?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: We know that from the admissions made from time to time. When they come in to pay instalments, you hear that they have utilised the money for other purposes.

PRESENTATION OF REPLY TO GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER received a message by the Sergeant-At-Arms that His Excellency the Governor was awaiting the House in the Council Chamber to present their Address in reply to the Speech which he had delivered at the opening of the Legislative Session.

Mr. SPEAKER and members of the House in order of seniority, preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace, proceeded to the Council Chamber

Mr. SPEAKER read and presented to His Excellency the following Address which was passed by the House in reply to his speech:—

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly desire to thank Your Excellency for the Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature for the Legislative Session 1960.

The House share the concern of Your Excellency's Government at the anticipated shortfall in this year's crop. The House also note with satisfaction the progressive measures that have been outlined in Your Excellency's Address and look forward with eagerness to the introduction of the next Five Year Plan.

The House assure Your Excellency that they will give favourable consideration and support to all legislation submitted to them and will grant all supplies that may be required of them for the implementation of Your Government's Programme during this Session.

His Excellency delivered a Rejoinder.

Mr. SPEAKER and the House returned to the Assembly Chamber.

3.10 p. m.

HIS EXCELLENCY'S REJOINDER

Hon. Members being in their places.

Mr. **SPEAKER**: I have the honour to inform the House that on the last occasion when His Excellency the Governor was pleased to receive this ancient and honourable House in the other Chamber, His Excellency delivered himself of the following Rejoinder:-

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

I thank you for your respective Addresses in reply to the Speech which I delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislature in January, 1960, and for your assurance that all matters submitted to you will be given your earnest attention.

J. M. STOW
GOVERNOR.

CONDITION OF DEPTH RECORDER

Mr. **SPEAKER**: The next question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 7 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. **TUDOR**: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Will the Minister state whether the Depth Recorder which was installed in the Government Experimental Fishing Craft "Investigator" is still in operating condition?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state why it is not used in the discovery of new banks for the purpose of Deep Line Fishing, such as for Red Snapper and Bream?

(3) If the answer is in the negative, will the Minister state how long it has been out of commission, and the reason for its being out of commission?

Hon. **D.D. GARNER**: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

1. The depth recorder is not at present in operating condition.

2. Does not arise.

3. The depth recorder has been out of commission for approximately two years. The trouble was traced to the Transducer which is a section of the instrument attached to the bottom of the Investigator. The main instrument was therefore removed from the vessel and stored out of the salt atmosphere of the sea at the Fisheries Station at the Reef until such time as the vessel could be docked and the Transducer examined. The depth recorder has been returned to the makers in the U.S.A. for servicing.

Mr. **TUDOR**: Can the Minister tell me if the instrument was removed after the question was tabled or before it was tabled?

Hon. **D. D. GARNER**: I am not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. **BARROW**: I would like to ask the Minister from his reply, whether the Investigator is only docked once in every two years.

Hon. **D. D. GARNER**: I would not confine my remarks to that, but it is not an every-day operation. When it needs repairs it has to be docked and you cannot do that work until it is docked.

Mr. **TUDOR**: What is approximately the cost of this Depth Recorder and the likely cost of repairing it and putting it into commission again?

Hon. **D. D. GARNER**: I do not know the original price; as to what the cost of repairs will be, the bill has not yet been sent to us; therefore I cannot say what the repairs will cost us.

Mr. **TUDOR**: Will the Minister get an estimate of the cost before the repairs are concluded? I take it that they have already been started. Is the Minister getting an estimate of the cost before the repairs are finished?

Hon. **D. D. GARNER**: These people happen to be the makers of this instrument and they will repair it. I take it that they are a firm of reputable people and we will have to honour the bill when it comes.

REGISTRATION OF "BAJAN GIRL"

Mr. **SPEAKER**: The next Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 8, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. **TUDOR**: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:

Is the Minister aware that a boat known as the BAJAN GIRL and flying an American flag is registered here as a fishing launch?

(2) Will the Minister state whether the earnings of this craft are liable to local taxation?

(3) Will the Minister further state whether International Law permits ships flying a foreign flag to fish in our territorial waters?

Hon. **D. D. GARNER**: The answer is as follows:-

1. No. The Minister is aware of a vessel of U.S. registration flying an American flag and registered as BAJAN GAL III. It is understood that the owner hires out the vessel by charter for sports fishing with rod and reel.

2. If the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is satisfied that the fishing carried on constitutes a trade, the profits thereof are liable to local taxation.

3. The Government has been advised that this is not a matter with which International Law concerns itself.

At this stage, it now being 3.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. **SPEAKER**: It now being 3.30 p.m. of the clock, it is the end of Question Time.

Mr. **TUDOR**: I am asking that all the other Questions to which Replies have been given be dealt with on the next occasion, including the continuation of this current Question.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. **F. E. MILLER**: Mr. Speaker, under the Head "Private Members' Business", I am asking leave to take Order No. 11 as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. **SPEAKER**: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 11 under this Head as the first Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. *(After a Pause)* There being no objection leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

SALE OF ST. MICHAEL GLEBE LANDS BILL

Mr. **SPEAKER**: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:- To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the sale of Glebe lands and the parsonage house of St. Michael.

Hon. **F. E. MILLER**: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see, this is a Bill authorising the sale of Glebe lands and the parsonage house of St. Michael. I think it is customary with a Bill of this sort to refer it to a Select Commit-

tee after the second reading has been passed. This is a very simple matter. I think hon. members are aware that we were, more than two years ago, negotiating for the purchase of the land at the Deanery for the use and construction of the new General Hospital. For a number of reasons the matter was deferred and it was unfortunate that towards the end of the Session the House died before we had an opportunity of discussing the matter; as a result, it was deferred until the re-opening of the Legislature. Hon. members will remember the Petition which has been very carefully worded and which has been presented to this Chamber. The building is well on the way, and the land and the price of it have already been settled to the satisfaction of all concerned.

With those remarks, I do not think I need say anything more on this matter, unless there is some further information requested by some hon. member, which I would be very anxious to give. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not at all rise to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but merely to point out to the Minister that it is some time since most hon. members of this House were handed copies of this Bill, and some of us unfortunately have not got our copies here. We thought therefore, that the hon. member would have refreshed our minds as to who is buying and who is selling. I take it that the hon. member meant to convey that the Bishop and Dean are selling the Deanery to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the purpose of this Bill is to give legal sanction to them to sell this property to the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

3.20 p.m.
It would have helped if he had made that a bit more explanatory, but as I said, there is no opposition except that it might have helped if he were in a position to tell us about the price negotiated for this sale. That should be a bit of information which he should have, and we should like to know what it is.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister replies, I should like to ask whether in these negotiations pressure was placed at any time on one side or the other, directly or indirectly, or whether it was a very amicable settlement. Was the price agreed on with no threats or any such thing from either side? I do this in the public's interest because there was a time when it was thought that with Disestablishment coming on, a threat might have been used - I am not saying it was - to bring pressure to bear on the Church to release this land at a price less than what they thought they could have got in the free market; so I would like the assurance from the Minister representing Government on that matter.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: In replying to the question asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I do not know whether it would be correct to say that any pressure was used at all. As a matter of fact, it would be unkind to say that pressure was used because of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church or that Government would need to use pressure against the authorities of the Church in the purchase of this land. I suppose there was some measure of bargaining which takes place in all transactions, and I regret that the idea of pressure should be inferred in the House. I would say that it was an amicable agreement and there was some understanding of negotiations when there is the usual question of bargaining on the valuation. I would say that it was an amicable agreement with all the parties concerned, both the Government and the authorities of the Church. I do not know if there is anything further the hon. member would like to know in connection with this.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that pressure was used, but I said in the public interest and to allay any fears it might have been good if that statement was made.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the procedure which has been employed to bring this matter before the House is

one which requires a certain amount of examination by the members of this House if we are going to discharge our public duty. Now the Minister said absolutely nothing about the Bill on the second reading. He answered or purported to answer a few questions which were postulated by the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the member can speak after the Minister has replied.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not consider what the Minister said to be a formal reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is standing while you are speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was saying that I did not consider what the Minister said to be a formal reply; it was just an explanation to the member for Christ Church.

(Laughter from Opposition.)

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pity that before people present themselves

Mr. SPEAKER: I must tell the hon. member that I have dealt with the situation quite easily; so he can continue.

Mr. BARROW: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I very much deprecate the procedure which has been adopted in the introduction of this Bill. Here is a Minister of Government introducing a Private Member's Bill; the transaction is between the Government and the Dean and Chapter of the St. Michael's Cathedral. This is a Bill which should more properly in my submission have been presented by the hon. junior member for St. Michael, because the other hon. member for the parish also happens to be a member of the Ministerial Benches. How the hon. member for St. George who also is a Minister, who is not the Minister of Works, who is not a practising Christian or Anglican Christian as far as I know - I think that his car has been seen parked in James Street on infrequent occasions - comes to be introducing a Bill of this kind is a question which we would like answered on this side of the House. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Minister was completely inadequate on his introduction of the second reading of this Bill, because I do not think it is in the interest of Parliamentary democracy that if the Government is purchasing a property from a corporate body or group of individuals, a Minister should introduce a Petition and a Bill on behalf of the vendor of the property, he being part and parcel of the purchase agreement, and he having to be responsible for any misfeasance or default on the Government side. I do not think it is in the interest of Parliamentary democracy that we should entertain a procedure of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, no one has been able up to now from my present inquiries to explain how it is that the hon. junior member for St. Michael who is also the Chairman of Committees was not given the handling of this Bill through all its stages in this Legislature, and as a matter of fact, I believe he did do another Church Bill not so long ago. It is not a strange thing therefore, Sir, that we could not get satisfactory answers to the queries which have been made on this side of the House during this debate or any similar debate when a member of the Government introduced a Bill for the Dean and Chapter of St. Michael. The position as far as I understand it is this: this is another aspect of the matter to which I would like to draw the attention of Your Honour. It is a matter of public and general knowledge that the fourteen acres of land or part of it was acquired for the purpose of the new Barbados General Hospital. Anyone who is not blind travelling up Martindales Road and knowing the location of the Deanery, as it then was, will be able to see that the Government has done extensive building on the site and that a historic building has been torn down. I am not saying that buildings do not have to be torn down some time in the interest of progress and in the interest of the community. Months and months after all this has been done, we get a Minister of Government presenting a Bill asking permission of the House

to sell the land at the Deanery at Martindales Road when it is a *fait accompli*, unless they have now adopted the principle of expropriation. It is difficult to understand what the function of this House is other than a rubber stamp in circumstances of this kind.

I think that members on this side, and I believe perhaps Your Honour, on occasion have had to draw attention to the fact that Heads of Departments and some Ministers sometimes come to the conclusion that this House exists only as a Mutual Admiration Society or an Approval Association or to ratify all the deeds and misdeeds of administrative officers and Ministers of Government. Now I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if those things that ought to have been done had been done, in this particular instance, this House notwithstanding would have granted permission to the Dean and Chapter of St. Michael's Cathedral to sell this land to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but that occasion would have been utilised - I also have no doubt - as an expression of the manner in which the development of the fourteen acres would have been taken up, the mutilation of any parts of the historic building which was one of the architectural highlights of the parish of St. Michael, and other matters which perhaps may not be materialistic from the point of view of the Government, but certainly matters which vitally affect the outlook and social and economic well-being of the citizens of this island.
3.30 p.m.

There is not only the materialistic side of human beings; there is also the set up in the spiritual side as well, and I hope that Your Honour when you are presented with a Petition of this kind in the future will draw it to the attention of the Ministers or whoever is presenting one, that it is not a proper thing for a Minister to introduce a Private Member's Bill because then it would probably be a public matter.

Here is a corporate body, recognised by the Anglican Church Act to be so, asking permission to do something which is not expressly stated in the Anglican Church Act and therefore it has to come to the Legislature to give it the necessary authority to do it. But we also know that the purchaser has already taken possession of the property. Let us suppose that the Anglican community was against the desecration of the property. Let us suppose that they were against the bulldozer destroying the beauty of that building and they would have preferred to see it being there and would go to any amount of inconvenience rather than entertain any idea of desecrating it. Surely they should be given the opportunity to say what part of the Deanery they would like to sell. After all, it appears that the Government is using the big stick on the vendors or wanted to use it - and if the Government wanted to use it, all that it would have to do is to come under the Land Acquisition Act to obtain the property, and if they could not agree on the price, then let the matter go to arbitration; and it would be for the Minister of Works to come to the House and say that they have tried to negotiate with those people but they have refused to sell, and therefore, whether they like it or not, Government intended to acquire it under the Land Acquisition Act. Instead of that, we have this kind of what I would call a bastard procedure in which the Hon. Minister of Social Services comes with this Petition when he is a party to the transaction. Here it is that the purchaser is acting for the vendor.

He is a Minister of the Government. He does not tell us what the feelings of the Anglican community might be on an important issue of this kind. He just comes to the House and says: "I beg to move the second reading of this Bill to authorise the sale of this land." Nobody hearing him saying that would even know that he was talking of the sale of the Deanery in Martindales Road. Sometime ago, when he had a similar Bill seeking authorization for sale of a parochial property in the parish of St. George, the Vestry of that parish had the greatest amount of difficulty with the same Minister over bringing the Bill to the House and I had to introduce that Bill as a representative of that parish and on my doing so, all sorts of delaying tactics were put in the way of the Vestry. The Ves-

try of St. George was doing so in order to get better medical facilities for the people of that parish which the same Minister represents. Now he has jumped in the 'ling' as one of the purchasers of this particular property and he comes to introduce a Bill to ask permission to sell this property. He is not an Anglican. I do not know if he is a Christian at all. Therefore, how does he get into this thing at all? Why does he not leave it to the people who have interest in the Anglican community here? He is not even a representative of the parish. Are we going to allow people like the Hon. Minister to represent the purchaser, the vendor and the Anglican community, all at the same time, when he has not even been to an Anglican Church except to a wedding?

Sir, I certainly do not approve of this procedure at all and I am sure that the matter must have slipped your attention. It is not right procedure. The Governor-in-Executive has the right to come under the Land Acquisition Act and say that they intend to acquire this property under that Act. The Hon. Minister, on the other hand, has no right to present a Private Member's Bill or to do any Private Member's Business, ecclesiastical, social or otherwise. It is no wonder that he made such a sorry pass over the introduction of this Bill.

Sir, I do not want this to be taken as a precedent. *Ex post facto*, we are asked to give authorisation to this measure and I am going to ask the Dean and the Chapter of St. Michael's Cathedral, if they want to do their business properly, to do it in the manner which is above suspicion and not to insult the House in asking the House to do something which they have virtually done already. The only thing which they have not done as regards this matter is to accept the purchase money. No explanation has been given and this matter affects a substantial portion of the immediate vicinity of the centre of the City of Bridgetown. What development is going to take place in this area? What drainage is going to take place on the Constitution River which flows through this property? What facilities will be made as regards playing fields and such things? All of those questions are matters which we expect the person who presented the Bill would have been able to put before members. I hope the Clerk of the House is being paid his fee of \$16 for this matter. I can see very well from this procedure where he will be deprived of his fee. All of these things must be taken into consideration. The Hospital building is going up on this site and members of the public have been given no opportunity to express their views on the matter. The Government can put up a Fish Market on Bay Street. They can empty sewage in the Constitution River from this Hospital and nobody can raise a voice about it. This is not democratic and as long as I am in this House I am not going to sit down and listen to people like the hon. junior member for St. George coming in here with a Bill like this and just saying that there is nothing in this Bill. That is not good enough.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. John is concerned over the fact that the hon. junior member for St. George being a Minister is in charge of this Bill to authorise the sale of glebe lands and the parsonage house of the parish of St. Michael. The hon. junior member for St. John thinks that it is not a fit and proper thing for the hon. Minister of Social Services to introduce this Bill or to be in charge of such a Bill.

I must point out to this House that the Petition signed by the Dean has been put in the hands of the hon. junior member for St. George who is a member of this House. The Petition is respectfully worded and is in order. There is nothing in the law that says that the hon. junior member for St. George cannot present this Bill as put in his hands by the representatives of the Chapter of St. Michael's Cathedral and Rector of the parish of St. Michael. This House has already honoured the Petition and, as far as I am concerned, everything is in order. As far as I am concerned, it is lawful and right for the hon. junior member for St. George to take charge of this matter. If he were not armed with this Petition and this House did not have it before them, well then, he would be out of order.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if you will hear me on a point of explanation, at no time did I mention the word "legality" or "lawful". I said that I consider it would be a precedent and I gave my reasons why I consider it undesirable for a Minister to present a private Petition. I said that it was highly undesirable for a Minister to do that because we do not get our questions answered in the way in which we want them answered. I think that the tradition of this House is that the hon. member representing the parish, who is not a Minister, usually presents Petitions and Bills in this House and I think it is undesirable that this tradition should be broken.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as this House is concerned, this House honours this Petition.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks in reply to what has been said. Whether I happen to be a Minister or not, it is true that the Government negotiated for the purchase of this land for more than two years. You will remember that the matter was discussed in this House and every hon. member is quite familiar with the purchase of the land at the Deanery. The Dean, as trustee for this property, is free to sell it and I had a request from him to handle this Bill. What did hon. members expect me to do? Did you expect me to say "No?" Is there any regulation or law against my doing this? I had a very simple request from the Dean and I thought I would honour it. I happen to be a Minister of the Government and I feel that hon. members would understand and appreciate this. The Dean, I repeat, requested me to handle this Bill.

It is true that I am a member of the Government but I do not see what difference it would make to my handling this Bill. We have had precedents for a Minister handling a private matter in this House but this is where the Dean requested me to handle this Bill.

I would like to reply to the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. The price of the land is \$100,000 but there has been much discussion about this Bill for almost four years; all the matters concerned with this Glebe land have been exhausted in this House already. On the presentation of this Bill, we are here merely tidying up the legislation so as to provide the Church authorities with the right so that they will be free to sell this land to the Government-in-Executive Committee. It is just one of those simple things in connection with which I do not think we would need to have any long debate in this House. Is it a question of whether the congregation will protest against the use of this land as a hospital? I do not know what the hon. member is getting at; does he mean that if one wants to handle a Bill in this House he must be a member of the Anglican Church? The whole island knows that we are building a hospital up there and I have explained the reason why this matter was delayed. There is no idea of saying that the area of land is too much and the cost is too much; the Dean happens to be trustee for the land and I think that this is just a formality. I think that every living creature knows that we are building this hospital; it is a question of presenting this Bill and telling hon. members that we are tidying up these matters so that the Dean and Bishop will be able to sell this land to the Government for the building of this hospital. Everybody who has spectacles and those who have not can see that this building is going on. The Order Paper is heavy and I believe that we can save time on a question such as this.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following hon. members to serve on the Select Committee to examine and report on this Bill:- The hon. junior member for St. George (Hon. F. E. Miller), the hon. senior member for St. Thomas (Hon. R. G. Mapp), the hon. junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. G. E. S. Straughn), the hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. F. C. Goddard) and the hon. senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. J. C. Tudor).

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I learn from the hon. leader of the Opposition that he would have no objection to

reverting to the consideration of Government Business at this stage.

Mr. WALCOTT: I learn that too, but the next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in my name. *(Laughter)*

RESOLUTION re POST OF PERMANENT SECRETARY TO THE PREMIER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution re one person performing the duties of two Permanent Secretaries.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the position in the Government Service where you have one Officer holding two posts.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the Legislature recently approved of an Establishment Order for the creation of the post of Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education;

AND WHEREAS the present holder of the said newly-created post is in addition to his substantive duties at present acting in the capacity of Permanent Secretary to the Premier, a post which has been vacant for some considerable time;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplore the existing situation in which one person is performing the duties of two Permanent Secretaries and call upon the Government to take immediate steps to fill the vacancy of Permanent Secretary to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me here in this Chamber to point out that the Government is acting in this capacity in something which is against the very interest of the Barbadian situation. If there is one place in the world which cannot afford for one man to do two jobs, it is in this small island of Barbados with its redundant population. This is a country which boasts of education, of a system in the Caribbean different from the others in so far as the people we can produce; but it is the one place where, although we boast of our internal self-government, our constitutional position is largely behind that of other territories when it comes to a serious matter such as this.

3.50 p.m.

Now I am going to say at the beginning that if there is no need for a Permanent Secretary you should abolish the post: but what do we find here in Barbados? In the Secretariat we are spending over \$1/4 million on personnel. You came down to the House of Assembly in September, 1958, and appointed the hon. senior member for St. John as Minister of Education; so this is the second year that he has been Minister of Education. The Government found it necessary that this colony could no longer work with five Ministers, but must work with six Ministers. Now the Ministers deal with policy; it is easier for a Minister to handle ten Departments just as the Premier is handling a Portfolio for General Purposes, Finance, Police and everything under the sun; but of all persons, you get a person of the Premier's ability and political sagacity who can do without a Permanent Secretary! In our local context he is Chancellor of the Exchequer and Prime Minister of Barbados, and without a personal reference, with his outlook on public matters and his lack of vision if he can do without a Permanent Secretary, then the whole structural position for Permanent Secretaries should be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, here in the Head II - Secretariat - Item 5, you have six Permanent Secretaries, and this is how they were divided:

Communications and Works	- 1
Agriculture	- 1
Social Services	- 1
Labour	- 1

Education	-	1
The Premier	-	1

Mr. Frank Odle has been appointed as a Permanent Secretary and has gone to the Ministry of Communications and Works; Mr. J. C. King is Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture; Mr. F. L. Cozier is Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Social Services; Mr. Vere Carrington is Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Labour; and Mr. C. A. Burton is playing Jack. I do not know if in the Northern District you have played cricket to the stage where you pick two sides from 23 men and you had to find a place for the 23rd man on both sides; so the extra man used to field and bat on both sides, and you call him Jack. Mr. Burton is the Secretariat's Jack in the Permanent Secretaries' hierarchy. Mr. Carrington was appointed Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour. (Hon. M. E. COX: Oh no!) Well, all you have to do is to go and tear up the Official Gazette. If it has been gazetted so and it is not so, it is not so; then he is still Registrar and not Permanent Secretary. Mr. Burton is Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education.

Now you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministerial structure started off in Barbados with five Ministers and on that occasion you also started off with four Permanent Secretaries. They found it necessary to split the situation which existed, and on one occasion there was a Permanent Secretary to both the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Trade Industry and Labour, and the person who held that post was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Secchi. When the change was made a startling situation took place in which the Permanent Secretary concerned received the salary relative to both posts, that is to say, he was substantively in one post and was gazetted to act in another, so it meant that he received a salary from one post and I understand half the salary of the other. I realised what had taken place on that occasion and I came to the House and pointed out then that that was a peculiar arrangement, that in Barbados you were allowing one man at that time to draw a salary that was equivalent to \$1,000 a month when the substantive post was something like \$600 or \$570 a month, but he was getting this, it proved, as a Permanent Secretary, which was equivalent to more than the Chief Justice of Barbados was drawing as a salary from the Government of Barbados. That happened under the heels of Ministers and with their approval and consent.

Now what is more serious than that is that an Order was sent down in the light of that maybe a week after or simultaneously with the creation of this post asking the Legislature to agree to a Civil Establishment Order - Civil Establishment Order No. 12, 1958 - to establish an additional post of Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Education. But what is taking place? Mr. Burton is substantively the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education, but you have allowed him to act in both posts, unless you have abolished the post of Permanent Secretary to the Premier.

In this House we have on the Civil Establishment list six Permanent Secretaries, and these are the ones so far that have been appointed: Mr. Odle, Mr. King, Mr. Cozier, Mr. Carrington and Mr. Burton. Those are the five Permanent Secretaries in Barbados. Mr. Williams is in England and Mr. Odle was appointed to act for Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams is Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour. Mr. Donald Wiles and Mr. L. N. Chenery were two Assistant Chief Secretaries, but I have not got to that point yet.

4:00 p.m.
You have two Assistant Chief Secretaries, six Permanent Secretaries, an Assistant Financial Secretary and a Cabinet Secretary - ten people of the same calibre and drawing the same salary. Mr. Odle was supposed to be acting in the Ministry of Labour. Mr. Wiles was promoted to Administrator of Montserrat and Mr. Odle was supposed to be seconded to act for Mr. Wiles in the position which he held. Now, Mr. Williams who is in England is still Permanent Secretary for that post but Mr. Robert Clarke who was the Postmaster-General was appointed as one of the assistant

Chief Secretaries; therefore you can assume that Mr. Odle is acting in the position of Mr. Wiles who was the Assistant Chief Secretary.

We have no Permanent Secretary to the Deep Water Harbour. There is not such a post; therefore Mr. Odle could not be that. There is no such post of an official being Permanent Secretary to something; you can only be Permanent Secretary to a Minister; you cannot be Permanent Secretary to an object. It is true that you have a Cabinet Secretary but an Officer who is a Permanent Secretary cannot be Permanent Secretary to the Deep Water Harbour. When Mr. Wiles was Permanent Secretary, they termed him as the Communications man but we cannot allow a situation like that to go on.

I would say now that according to what you are doing, you need no Permanent Secretary to the Hon. Premier. We want to know who is the Permanent Secretary to the Premier. Who is he? What is happening is this: what they are trying to do is to take the whole lot of Permanent Secretaries who are six in number, just like the six Ministers. You say now that you need six and that is why I was very careful when they were passing the law creating the number of Ministers to say that you are passing a law in a small community to create Ministries but you are passing it without any qualifications; therefore it remains that an unscrupulous person can come along and have a different number of Ministers, that is to say, you have 24 seats in this House and you can have 24 Ministers. What are you trying to do now as regards Permanent Secretaryships is what was done with the Ministries.

It was expressly stated in here when you appointed your Minister of Education that the Premier who had Education under his portfolio could not be expected to control education and all of those things pertaining to that Ministry and therefore you created a separate Permanent Secretaryship for the Minister of Education. Mr. Carlisle Burton, who was then Permanent Secretary to the Premier, succeeding Mr. Pinard, who was formerly Permanent Secretary to the Premier and who was subsequently appointed Cabinet Secretary at the same salary, was appointed to the Ministry of Education. Therefore, it left the Permanent Secretaryship of the Premier vacant. What has been the arrangement? Mr. Burton has to do whatever jobs are there to be done. He is acting in both posts. I do not have any discussions with Mr. Burton on these matters because I understand that Mr. Burton apart from being a Civil Servant is more the Premier in certain respects than the Hon. Premier. I say that because we have it that he is acting Permanent Secretary to the Premier and on the last occasion that there was an Education Conference in the area, he represented the Island at that Conference. I am only drawing that as a reference.

I understand that Mr. Burton was appointed as pointed as Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education and was also informed that he had to perform the duties of Permanent Secretary to the Premier and it was made clear to him that there would not be any additional money attached to the post, that is to say, he would not be paid any extra money for acting in that post. We also had the situation that Mr. Secchi was Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour and also acting as Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

Sir, I am going to make this broad statement now. I feel that you have had Ministerial Government long enough that you should be able to view it in its right perspective as to your needs. I was one of those people who felt that every Minister should have a Permanent Secretary from the point of view that if you really needed a Minister, you will also need somebody of the calibre of a Permanent Secretary to assist him. There are only a few posts which carry a higher salary than that of Permanent Secretary. They are the Chief Justice, the Financial Secretary, the Attorney General and the Director of Agriculture. There are only five in the whole Establishment that carry a higher salary than that of Permanent Secretary which is placed at the salary of \$8,160 per annum.

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

If you say that you require these six posts of Permanent Secretary then how can you be silent on this matter? When I asked the Hon. Premier about this matter, do you know what was his reply? He said: "We do not have anything to do with the Civil Establishment and the appointment of people in the Service." I am not asking you to appoint any person; but I say that if it is a post created for you, therefore, you should have somebody filling that post.

This is the serious aspect of this matter and this is where I want to speak very strongly. If you can run the Island without filling this post of Permanent Secretary, then I say that you do not need so many Ministers now. You do not need a Minister of Agriculture, a Minister of Labour and a Minister of Social Services, unless you need the Ministries just to have the gentlemen in a position to buy big motor cars. If you do not need all these Permanent Secretaries, what do you need a Minister to all these posts to do? Are you only creating these Ministries just to have a Minister attached to them so that he would be able to draw money for travelling and therefore he would be able to change his motor car every two years? I say so because it seems to me now that you do need this post of Permanent Secretary which you said that you wanted and who has the bulk of work to do for the Minister, or should have to prepare for the Minister what he has to do. Imagine of all people that you do not need a Permanent Secretary to the Premier! Is it because the Hon. Premier is so bright? We can see his brightness when he has to move a toast. He forgets to mention the people to whom he is moving it!

4.10 p.m.

I am serious about this matter because it is an indication of how we would run a country. This is the sort of thing which we have to face today; we are facing a situation today with this type of leadership, innocuous as it is and it does not spell well for the country. You have created these top posts; in all you have ten of them. You have here two Assistant Chief Secretaries, six Permanent Secretaries one Assistant Financial Secretary, a Cabinet Secretary, people in that bracket; you have ten of them and you find that for nearly 18 months you are asking one person to perform the job of another, which shows that this post could not be as important as you say it is and as you have made the Legislature to believe it is. Even as a matter of show you should not allow this post to remain unfilled whereas you ask one person to fill two posts. That is something which you would have to do in an emergency. If you are abolishing the post of Permanent Secretary to the Premier then you should come down to this House and say so; and in this context I would say that you do not need any Premier.

I feel that the time has come when I can no longer sit in here and agree to the passing of further Civil Establishment Orders. The Minister of Trade usually tries to show how the Establishment works but you cannot make two into one. If you have not appointed a Permanent Secretary to the Premier - well, you cannot make more appointments than the posts allow. You have two Assistant Chief Secretaries but who is the second Assistant Chief Secretary? What they are doing up there is to take names and put them in a box and say "Don't worry with this name"; but you cannot run a country like that. You have in the Estimates two Assistant Chief Secretaries at a cost of \$16,320 a Cabinet Secretary at a cost of \$8,160, six Permanent Secretaries at a cost of \$48,960, one Assistant Financial Secretary at a cost of \$8,160. I challenge any hon. member to show me the ten men in the Establishment in the posts which you say you should have; you are taxing everybody in the community for a post which you have no intention to fill. If the post of Premier is the most important post in the Ministerial set-up, how is it that you can function without a Permanent Secretary there? If the members of the Government are not interested in the whole aspect of Government work, then they should resign. Personally, I feel that the time has come for an Election; I say that with the legislation you send down to us, you come down here with four Orders on the Order Paper, and the time has come when an Election should take place. You are not appointing anybody to this post, you run the Service like this and I think that you should put the taxpayers to

the expense at one time and let us have an Election; let us have a fresh "go". This is a positive example of mismanagement; you work out things like this and Tuesday after Tuesday you adjourn for two or three weeks. This is not the Federal Parliament which is called once or twice a year and you pay people to "blow a comb". I want to know what is the justification for not filling this post. (ASIDES) The Hon. Minister of Trade says that he has six permanent secretaries; well, he has six by calling them six. Who is the sixth person? Who is the Permanent Secretary to the Premier? I have called all of them, Mr. Williams, Mr. Cozier, Mr. Burton, Mr. Odle and so on - the ten posts in the establishment to be filled have not all been filled. You have people acting in one or two posts in the Ministry of Communications. The Minister of Communications has two Permanent Secretaries but the Premier has none. (ASIDES) If we are creating a Deep Water Harbour Permanent Secretary, I would like to know where is this Deep Water Harbour Ministry? However, on a more appropriate occasion I will refer to what has been revealed, in that there is a scandalous situation which is taking place at the Deep Water Harbour. As I say, however, a more appropriate occasion will arise for that; but there is a serious situation when you come to the non-appointment of this Permanent Secretary. We are now dealing with principles, not with personalities. I want to say that if you do not have in the Civil Service an individual who is capable of filling the post of Permanent Secretary, then we are very badly off indeed; our situation is something which we should examine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is true that the Civil Service Association is not a virile Body, as I have already said. If it were a virile Body I would not have to be making a speech like this; but I am making a speech in a public sense because I feel that we should not create a post which we have no intention of filling. If the Civil Service Association were a virile Body and there were men who would face such issues, they would protest against one man acting in two posts for such a prolonged period, because it would be inimical to the best interests of other members of the Service.

4.20 p.m.

To say the least, it has deprived another Civil Servant from getting another emolument of which he is in need and therefore giving him the opportunity of acting in a post of greater responsibility so that if there is any ability in him it can be seen. If the Civil Service Association itself is unwilling to undertake a task which is fundamentally a task of the Civil Service Association, then I feel I have to draw that to the attention of this Chamber in order that they can see that this is an unsatisfactory state of affairs, and it should not have been existing for such a long time in Barbados. To have any one man acting in two posts of the calibre and the responsibility of a Permanent Secretary is scandalous and does not go down to the credit or prestige of the Service nor to the educational system of Barbados which should be able to produce such men, and I know that in the Service we have enough men who are capable of acting in and filling the post of Permanent Secretary with credit.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion of the hon. member that this Resolution do now pass and to say that we of the Official opposition have long viewed with concern the absence of someone to fill this particular Permanent Secretaryship. In this country more than in any Unit territory of the Caribbean, there can be no possible difficulty at all in filling such a vacancy, because as you know, Sir, with our, as it is called, overpopulation, with our educational facilities, with our eminently academically qualified personnel in the Service and without, there is no difficulty at all in finding someone who is suitable for a post such as this. There is no shortage or absence of adequate material, and it is not in the interest of the Service or in fact of the reputation of our island for the vacancy to have existed for this length of time which it has. Everyone of the local Permanent Secretaries, I think we will all agree, has done a good job. Mr. Odle is efficient, Mr. Cozier is most helpful and genial, Mr. Burton is sound, and the new acquisition, Mr. Carrington, if he does almost as well in that

office as he has done on the Bench and as Registrar, will, I am sure, in a very short time, become a shining light to all Permanent Secretaries throughout the Caribbean. Mr. King is also doing, so far as I can gather, quite a good job of work, though I must confess I have less experience in dealing with him than I have in dealing with people like Mr. Burton and Mr. Cozier.

The Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will commend itself to everyone in this Chamber, and the hon. proposer of it has very fully dealt with its various aspects. I do not think it is necessary to add anything more other than to urge the Government to see the necessity to have this post filled and let it not continue on record that for a period of two years for some inexplicable reason, Government has not seen fit to have this office filled. The material is available, the money is presumably there and the office certainly deserves to be filled or abolished. There is no suggestion of the latter and the former is the only thing which should be done and that without any more delay.

I have pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to all the remarks made on this Resolution, and I think that if there are men and women in this colony with the proper qualifications, education and ability to fill a job in this colony, we should count it an honour to know that our land can produce the necessary fruits of which we are in need. I should hate to think that we have such people in this country and still have to send outside to bring in people to fill these jobs. In many offices I have seen that several people have been thrown aside and others brought in from outside to do various jobs while these people watched on. If you go through certain Departments, you will find there were men acting in certain positions and doing a very good job, but then people were brought in from outside to fill these jobs instead of elevating these men or women. That is what I call taking advantage of our people and I would like Government to know that.

HOUSE RESUMES GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION (LOCAL BRANCH)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, when the Suspension was taken, I was outlining the procedure which had been adopted for a long time.
4.30 p.m.

I think that I had got to the point where I was explaining that with regard to representatives being sent to this Conference, it was not until the 8th day of last month that the Houses of the Legislature met to discuss the invitation which was sent on behalf of the Federal Government to send delegates to attend this Parliamentary Conference which took place in Trinidad recently. Every hon. member can remember that this House met on the 5th April and then adjourned until the 26th April, so that when this meeting was held to discuss whether or not representatives should be sent to this Conference, the House was in recess and it was not then possible for any money to be voted by the Legislature to defray the necessary expenses which would be involved in delegates going to this Conference.

I understand that the delegates left sometime around the 18th or 19th of April. That was before the House resumed from its recess; therefore, since there were no funds to meet the expenses, well then, it is obvious that those persons who were selected would have to defray their own expenses or make whatever financial arrangements would be necessary to defray them pending a refund from the Legislature.

I would like to repeat that it has been customary and I remember well the first occasion I happened to be one of those selected to attend a Parliamentary Course in England - and that was in 1952 - that the procedure was that the Local Branch of the Parliamentary Association met first under the Chairmanship of the President of the Other Place and the Speaker of this House and decided whether to accept the invitation. They decided that the invitation should be accepted and then it was learnt that the cost would be X dollars. The Parliamentary Association in the House of Assembly then submitted to the Governor-in-Executive Committee (1) that the invitation was submitted and that the Local Branch had accepted it; and (2) that the cost of sending delegates to that Conference would be X dollars. Government agreed and it was not until after that was settled and the Resolution was passed by this House and the Other Place that members of the joint Houses met in the Other Place and decided who should represent Barbados at that Conference.

I emphasise that because I said in my opening remarks that there was so much misrepresentation, so many slanderous and wicked remarks made against this Government by the hon. junior member for St. John. In his early remarks he said that this was agreed to, and the Cabinet had discussed it, and agreed to send Mr. K. R. Hunte on this delegation even before the Parliamentary Association had met in the Council. Nothing could be more further from the truth. That is absolutely untrue. Not one discussion, not one iota, had been discussed as to who should go. The first time that I heard who were to represent Barbados at that Conference was at that meeting. As I mentioned earlier, I got to the meeting late, a half-hour after it was started, and I was informed that the Hon. K. R. Hunte and His Honour the Speaker were nominated unopposed to go to this Conference. Absolutely nothing of who was to represent this Island did I know before the meeting. Therefore, it is not only misleading but a wilful inaccuracy, a wilful misleading statement made when it was attempted, as so often is done, to link us - the Government - with the Hon. K. R. Hunte. I think I have said what I have said just now on the floor of this House already. I will repeat it one hundred times. The Hon. K. R. Hunte may be a friend of many, but as far as the Government of which I happen to be a part - and of course the Government is not only the Ministers but even the Legislature, the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and so on - if the hon. member said that the Hon. K. R. Hunte is a friend of the Government, he may be a friend and a very good friend of theirs.

The hon. junior member for St. John said that this was not a Parliamentary Association; it was an association of members of the Government and members of the Other Place. I think I am correct in saying this. I remember that the hon. member was present at the first meeting in 1952 when two members were selected for that course. I think I am correct in saying that on that occasion members of the Other Place who were present said that they were not prepared to take any part because they considered it a matter purely and simply for members of the House because of the terms of reference which were sent to us. In other words, they wanted us to send representatives from members of the House who could not find sufficient money to go, and members of the Other Place said that the matter did not apply to them; they thought that the matter applied to the House of Assembly and they further said that although they were members of the Parliamentary Association, they were not prepared to take any part in that meeting and they did not vote. Members of the House alone voted on that particular question; so how can one say that this is an association of members of the Government and members of the Other Place?

I will pause at this stage to say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter made the same mistake as the others made when they talked of our being able to get our members selected for these courses and no member of the Opposition was ever selected. I would like to say from the outset that hon. members ought to know what my stand is, and would be always, in matters of this sort and in any sort that concerns the Constitution of this country and other things, social and otherwise. I have

always made my position clear and will always do so. 4.40 p.m.

I say that both sides of the House should be represented. I stand by that. I do not subscribe to the view that on each occasion this representation should be of a certain kind, that only Government members or people who are friendly disposed to the Government should go to these Conferences. I feel that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows my point of view on this question quite well. There is no question of our getting together and preventing people from the other side from being nominated, elected, selected or whatever it may be. If the hon. member would check carefully he would see that as far as we are concerned, we, as a Government, could not really get our people elected. This is a sort of democratic set-up; there are fifteen members in the Other Place, and the most we have ever had in this House is sixteen, which leaves the other side with eight members. Therefore you have twenty-three members against sixteen. (MEMBERS: Shame! No! No!) That is a fact. Do not think that at any time we had more than sixteen members in this House and therefore there were eight members on the other side and fifteen in the other Branch of the Legislature. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is misleading.) Suppose you gave us three members from the Other Place. (MEMBERS: Why three?) I say three because the policy of the members of the Other Place is more in keeping with the Opposition than with the Government. Everybody knows that; everybody knows that they are more in keeping with the policy of the Opposition than with that of the Government. That has always been so and it is still so; if I said "Give us three", they would still have the majority.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. The hon. member said that I made some mistake and he went on to deal with the members voting up there. I said that I do not agree, even with the members of the Opposition that when it comes to matters where Government policy is involved, Opposition members should be on a Party Government Delegation. I said since 1954 when the Cabinet System was introduced that there has been this question of Parliamentary Association meetings where the Opposition has been excluded from going to Conferences. If you talk about the facts, well then the facts are on my side.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, since the Hon. Leader of the House has given way to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I think I will take this opportunity of interposing here to say this. When the Hon. Leader of the House says that I know his point of view and his policy in respect of certain selections and things of that sort appertaining to non-partisan measures, I have certainly heard him express the point of view which is most praiseworthy and laudable; but I cannot recall one single instance in which he has voted in a joint session for a member of the Official Opposition to attend one of these Conferences, neither have I ever seen any evidence of the hon. member having brought his colleagues round to his point of view, even with his forcible rhetoric (*Laughter*). Apart from the occasion when Mr. F. E. C. Bethell, who was a former member of this House, whose passage was paid to New Zealand, when the entire composition was changed because the hon. junior member for St. George asked me to give him my vote, we have had the Hon. Minister of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries going to India, His Honour the Deputy Speaker, going to the United Kingdom, you, yourself, Sir, going to the United Kingdom and the Hon. Dr. Cato going to Kenya. All of those members are members of the Labour Party and we also had a former member of the Labour Party, who is now the Clerk of this House, going for a ride (*Laughter*).

Hon. M. E. COX: I am glad that the hon. member made that interjection, but I think that he will also agree with me that the voting goes by ballot. I will not say that he did not give me a vote, but I know that I did not get more than I expected from my colleagues. If a member fails to get a sufficient number of votes so as to be selected, he has to accept it as a democratic set-up. If

you campaign throughout the island and you fail to get the required number of votes, just as hon. members failed to get votes in the Federal Election, you just didn't get them. I still maintain that, on this question, it is not merely the people who are connected with the Government who should go on these delegations, but I think that the selection should be done on a wide basis. It cannot be said with any truth that the Government out-numbers the Other Place, and that therefore whenever somebody is nominated he goes on this delegation. The Speaker makes his position quite clear on all occasions; he is the Speaker of this House and his decision must be for the House and not for the Government or for any particular member. No one can say that it is in view of the fact that His Honour the Speaker has some connection with this Party - and naturally anyone who wants to do anything which is in the interest of the working classes in this island would have some connection with the members on this side, he is selected to go to these Conferences. When we select His Honour the Speaker to go to such a conference, he is the representative of this House. I do not say, as some hon. members have said, that no member from the Other Place should be selected to go to these conferences.

4.50 p.m.

The reason for that is that we have already accepted a bi-cameral Legislature; therefore the Other Place is part of the Legislative body of this island. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, you cannot say that that body has no right to be represented at a Parliamentary Conference. A member of the Other Place in Jamaica represented Jamaica; he was among the representatives of the Jamaican delegation on this Parliamentary Association Conference. I should also like to say that the Other Place has on all occasions, with the exception of the time when the Hon. Dr. Cato was selected, decided to give preference to the Lower House. (Mr. WALCOTT: They have to.) and if on this occasion a member of the Other Place was selected, I do not see why we should have any quarrel, because I repeat there was nobody who felt that these two gentlemen were not quite fit to represent this Island, and as I said, there was no opposition; no other members were nominated beside the two, and therefore we unanimously approved.

Now before I sit down, I just want to refer to this point again in so far as the question of payment of passages and expenses involved in sending these gentlemen to Trinidad is concerned. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, I was not present when the meeting started, and unlike the members on the opposite side who were not present at any time during the meeting, I cannot speak with any great authority. I remember that the hon. senior member for St. Peter came to the meeting, but I am referring to those members who spoke as if they were sitting in the Hall but who never appeared at that meeting at all.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, not only was I not present, but I never intended to be present, and I said in the course of my remarks that I have made up my mind to boycott all meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. All we are concerned about is where Mr. Hunte insulted this House to the extent of offering to pay the passages of himself and His Honour the Speaker. All we are concerned about is his insult to the dignity of the Chair, and the hon. member laughed like a hyena when I said that. I am not concerned with whether I was there at all; I have to rely on the words of my colleagues.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must object to the nasty remark he made just now that "the hon. member laughed like a hyena".

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw that, but I should like to say "like a jackal".

Hon. M. E. COX: I would expect anything from you; you inherited it and I will tell you later where you inherited it from. You cannot do better.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to get back to the Resolution before the House and leave out the personal remarks.

Hon. M. E. COX: He just cannot get up in this House and say one word without being nasty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked you to get back to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was referring to those members who spoke and who were never present, but spoke as if they were present. Many years ago I know there were people who if they wanted a witness only had to go across to the Central Station, and they only had to relate the story to somebody and that individual would go into the Court, kiss the book and swear as if he were present. That, Sir, exists in this island today and regrettably in this House of Assembly.

I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that I have been reliably informed that the committee sat and the first thing that the Association decided was that Barbados should be represented at that Conference, and the next thing for obvious reasons that was decided was that each member should bear his expenses until he returns and the Government reimburse him. As I said, it was obvious that that would happen, because as I pointed out before, the House was in recess. This meeting took place on the 8th May while the House went into recess from the 5th until the 26th, and these delegates had to leave and attend the Conference around the 18th or 19th May and would have been back in Barbados before the House re-assembled. During that period, no money could be passed. There was no vote from which this expenditure could be met, and therefore the only logical and obvious thing that could have been done was for each member to stand the expenses out of his own pocket; and I repeat it was not \$2,000 or \$3,000; it was merely \$400 between the two which either of them could have found until they returned and the Government reimbursed them.

Those were the things that were decided, Mr. Chairman, and I have been reliably informed that it was just by the way that His Honour the Speaker intimated that it might be all well for a big fellow but not for a poor man like him, and coming from that this gentleman suggested that he would advance the money as he could always get it back. That is what took place and it was definitely not an insult or intended insult to any member of this House, and least of all to the Speaker. That is what I have been reliably informed - and I believe - took place; but whenever there is any talk inside this House, this Government is always linked with the Hon. K.R. Hunte doing this and that. The member insinuated that there is connivance, collusion and corruption. Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter went so far as to say - I do not know whether he said it was his experience or he heard it rumoured - that this hon. gentleman was helping some members of this Government financially, and in addition to that he had underwritten some election expenses for some members of this Government.

5.00 p.m.

Well, I want to say here and now that I do not believe it can be anything like true. There are so many wicked people whose only ambition it is to slander people and to lie and to blot and to emasculate people's character. So many people do that, that I am saying that I do not believe that that has happened to any member of this Government. However, I would like to say for myself, where I am concerned, that I am not the individual to whom the member is referring at all. I am not that individual.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but would he care to tell this Committee who the individual is?

Hon. M. E. COX: The individual is you. I said that I did not believe it is any member of this Government who is really guilty of the accusation or the allegation made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I went on to say as for myself, I know that I am not the individual and I never will be; I never can be. I have always said it, and I mean it, and it shall always be so, that I must always find myself in a position whether I have to do

so by tongue or pen, to speak in a manner in which I consider the most firm and outspoken manner against or for anybody. I say that, Sir; therefore it is not fair to us for a member, merely because he hears somebody say: "I believe this man should be helping you with money", to come in here and say it too.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But you have said that too about us.

Hon. M. E. COX: When we say it, we say it with good authority.

However, Sir, the hon. member knows me too well. If there is one man in this House to whom they will do anything to get out of here, or out of the Government, I am the person.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I regret that this debate which we thought would have ended in five minutes' time has taken such a length of time. I say that because both Houses of the Legislature which form the Local Branch of the Parliamentary Association came together and decided that they should be represented first of all; secondly, that these two gentlemen should represent the Island and, thirdly, that the Legislature was willing to vote the money to defray the necessary expenses incurred. I did think that it would be just a five-minutes debate, but of course I had forgotten that the hon. junior member for St. John was still in the House or that he was not out of the Island. As soon as he entered the debate he started off with his talk of connivance and collusion by the Government and all kind of things, and in his usual manner - he just cannot help doing it - he accused us of linking with Hon. K. R. Hunte and getting this and all that sort of thing.

I once heard the former junior member for St. Philip tell him that he had brains but he used it in the wrong direction. I would say now that it is most regrettable that an individual like him who has had the opportunity to get a good education free, instead of using that education as a means of edifying people who are less educated than he and using it on occasions when the necessity arises for rising to a high level, instead of doing that, he more often than not sinks down into the gutter hole. He loves that mud much better than his education.

Mr. BARROW: I am not going to sit down here and allow the hon. member to say such things without saying anything. It is my duty to expose corruption wherever it exists. I have heard it from other members. Did not Mr. Dear and Mr. Parravicino give him 26 motor cars in the last elections? Is that getting down in the gutter? I say that it is the duty of somebody to expose corruption. Why spend two hours defending the Hon. K. R. Hunte? Is it because he has paid income tax for a member of the Government Party already?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Mr. BARROW: My point of order is that you should not sit down and allow the Minister to rant and rail and you should stop him from being personal. If I find people in the gutter when I come in here, in order to expose them, I have to get down in the gutter with them.

Hon. M. E. COX: He can give but he cannot take. If he gives, he must take.

Mr. BARROW: Did Mr. Dear and Mr. Parravicino give 26 motor cars in the last elections? The hon. member can answer the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. Minister to get back to the Resolution. Personally, I do not like to hear this lot of personal attack.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I regret that I have to speak in these terms: but as the hon. member said just now, you cannot always talk on a high plane. When people are playing up in mud, you have to hit them down there to get them down.

I repeat that this thing was done spontaneously. I am not defending the Hon. K. R. Hunte or anybody. I am just giving the facts as they were because this thing, if it gets around - no doubt there are some gullible fellows and people who would attach a lot of importance to what people like him say at all times. That is why I feel that it is so necessary and important that people like the hon. member for St. John should speak the truth and give the facts. The people may be inclined to believe that there was something in it, having heard that this thing was agreed to by the Executive Committee before it got down to this place.

5.10 p.m.

I repeat that the Government could not have acted before or could not have done anything in the circumstances until the Parliamentary Association had met and had decided that they would be represented at this Conference, and then submitted officially to the Government a request for the money to defray the necessary expenses. That was done on the 8th April; the House went into recess on the 5th April, and re-assembled on the 26th April, when the Conference had already ended. That was the position.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member associated two speeches and sought to put both of them together. The hon. junior member for St. John is quite capable of defending himself. The Hon. Minister says that he sees nothing wrong in the Hon. Mr. Hunte making this offer to pay the expenses of both delegates to this Conference. I told Hon. Mr. Hunte and I repeated it (*ASIDES*) When hon. members over there think that they can run me out of here, I say that I am not afraid of anybody.... As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, when the Hon. Mr. Hunte made that offer in the Council Chamber, I asked him if he was crazy. I asked him that question when he suggested that he would pay the passages for both of the delegates. What I do not appreciate in the Hon. Minister is his making that sort of apologia in a situation where it is not necessary to do that. I am saying that this matter was going on in Trinidad for long enough that we should have known about it and we do not know whether the Clerk or His Honour the Speaker is to be blamed; but I would not have accepted this invitation in these circumstances. There is no point in the hon. member drawing a distinction when there is no distinction; the hon. member knows when he spoke about the hon. senior member for St. Joseph going to the United Kingdom, that we agreed with that proposal long before he went. We agreed to that in Fairchild Street.

Hon. M. E. COX: It was discussed but it was not agreed to. Even when we came to voting for the expenses of attending this Parliamentary Conference the hon. member opposed it and said it was a waste of money. Neither the then Premier nor the hon. member came into the House to vote for the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: My attitude did not prevent in any way the person who was to be sent from going. I say that you were not waiting until you reached the Legislative Chamber to decide the matter. We are speaking of members who know the procedure in here. There is no question of the hon. member saying that we meet in the Legislative Council for the first time and discuss the matter; you express your opinion on the matter and that does not say that prior to the meeting you did not discuss who should be sent to the Conference. The question of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph going was decided, and as to the other hon. member going that was something to be decided. When the hon. member talks about having sixteen members in here, he should be frank about this matter; the hon. member knows that the vote is by ballot, but you do not ballot by nomination. If the Government or if the members of the hon. member's Party agree that they will send a person from the Opposition as a member of a delegation, that member would have to be nominated from their side. I dare the hon. member to say that on any occasion if this House has been unanimous in a vote to send somebody anywhere, the Other Place could upset it. There has always been agreement. (*ASIDES*) If we agree to the Speaker going and they agree to send the President of the Other Place, whom do you think would go? It has always been someone from this House and someone from the Other

Place selected and the argument has always been adduced that you do not want it to appear that we want our side to go and not the other side. The hon. member knows that you nominate a member openly, and if the Hon. Leader of the House were to say "We are going to nominate the hon. junior member for St. Lucy", that is the end of it. The members of the Other Place do not talk about their wanting somebody; I have never been to the Other Place when there was a unanimous decision as to the persons whom we want to go to a Conference and that is why the Other Place has been able to come in. The hon. member says that we did not know what was taking place. I have never seen the members of the Council, since I have been going up there attending Parliamentary meetings, oppose the Government's nomination for anybody to go on a Parliamentary delegation. I want the hon. member to bear this in mind. The hon. member talked about suspicion.

5.20 p.m.

When I drew the distinction I talked about suspicion and if the hon. member is saying he is living in a world beyond suspicion and you should not speak about it, that is all right if you are fighting something in Court where you can lose justice if you do not bring evidence but in a Legislature you have to draw things to the attention of people. It is not a question of asking me to bring evidence; it is a question of saying that the honourable gentleman made a suggestion about paying his passage. The hon. member must understand that if it were a question of paying his passage I would not have raised the question. The hon. junior member for the City raised objection to the matter; but when I heard what the suggestion was, I must say the gentleman was very apologetic about it afterwards and said he did not see anything wrong in doing it, but I asked him if he were crazy to be suggesting that he was going to pay the expenses of Government in a matter like this.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must bear in mind that it is not a question of quantum; it is a question of principle; and due to the fact that you are bringing down a Resolution for \$1,400 to reimburse the persons who paid, I must ask whom you are going to pay now. Are you paying it into the Treasury? This is for something that has been done already, because the Conference has taken place; therefore you are paying this money on behalf of those people. If the man had undertaken to do either for himself or for both persons, it would have been done on behalf of the Government of Barbados; so I say that the man was acting on behalf of the Government of Barbados and not on behalf of the individual because it would be for the Government of Barbados subsequently to agree to send down a Resolution to reimburse the persons who paid in the normal way in which it should be. I want the hon. member to get it clear in his mind that every man is entitled to his own opinion. If the hon. member is entitled to the opinion that he did not see anything wrong with the hon. gentleman making this suggestion, I say that is where we differ on fundamentals, because I positively saw something wrong in it. It was an insult though he might not have intended it to be an insult, and when he made this statement about giving us the money, that is where I drew the analogy about suspicion. I am not a rumour-monger, but with all these rumours going around and with the same person now, maybe innocently, or inadvertently making a statement such as that in Parliament, it adds wing to the feeling that this man is some giant in Barbados, because everybody is saying that he gives the Ministers money, he pays this person's income tax, and now he is suggesting that he is going to do this thing.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why I say that is because the President of the United States was defending Sherman Adams to the last, but it proved that the latter did take the gift from Mr. Goldfine though not as a bribe; so you have to realise that in life when you say this thing could never happen, I have enough experience with human beings to realise that it is a peculiar thing to say what can take place; but I am dealing with it from the point of view that there is a rumour circling around that a certain ... friendly with the Gov-

ernment. I am not saying that the gentleman concerned did it as an insult and I make no apology for saying it. The hon. gentleman never made a loan to me; I have not borrowed anything from him: so I can afford to talk as I do. I borrow money from the Banks; so the point I made about the hon. gentleman making the suggestion was that it was not for him. He did not say that he was going to pay his own expenses. Many of us have paid our own expenses when going on missions, and sometimes when going on Government missions, your expenses exceed what the Government gave you. There is nothing improper about that, and I am sure that many a Minister went on a mission in which Government had to reimburse him when he came back. Sometimes you go on a short mission to Trinidad and come back before the voucher can be made out, but you undertake to do these things.

Mr. Chairman, I was not making a point to the extent that there had to be some dishonesty because he did that; I made the point that when a man in his position with these rumours going around can make these statements in a thing like that, it makes people feel that there must be something wrong. The hon. member must bear in mind that I did not say that he offered it to the Government; I said that he offered to pay the expenses, and therefore to pay the expenses would mean that he would be paying them on the basis that the Government would give him back the money, because if the man who was going with him did not have the money to pay then, he would not have to pay it now either. He was depending on the Government reimbursing him, and the Premier at that meeting said that the Government has always honoured any decision made by the Parliamentary Association and there need not be any fear that the Government would honour the situation. I told the Speaker that if any man who was going could not pay his own expenses to Trinidad, he was not worthy of going at all, and that is where I said it was an insult to offer it; but I did not say that a man who is going on his own should not pay. I felt that if the Speaker was going, under the circumstances he should pay his own expenses or do not go. In these things you must have a certain amount of pride, and I went further and said that Mr. Hunte would never have done it had it been somebody else. I do not know if the Speaker pleaded impecunious circumstances and therefore this gratuitous offer was forthcoming, but I doubt, if it was the Leader of the Opposition or the Premier, he would have been so insulted; but it was a gratuitous insult to the Speaker to say that he was going to pay the expenses. I asked the hon. gentleman if he were crazy; so I want the hon. member to know that I told the gentleman to his face, and he said that he did not mean anything by it. I have not seen the man that I am afraid of yet. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You are afraid of women, though) You are bound to be afraid of women at some time. (Laughter)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in a matter of this sort, I do not think anybody can accuse me of being parsimonious, but I think this has caused a lot of talk. Really, Sir, when I came to the House today, I thought I was coming to renew acquaintances after the little holiday, but I notice that this has engendered a lot of heat.

5.30 p.m.

As a matter of fact, Sir, one or two things interested me. I was going to deal first with what I consider an indiscreet remark which was made. What has caused this indiscreet remark to be magnified to what it is today, in my considered opinion, is when the Hon. Leader of the House himself, rather than denying that the remark was made in his presence, actually said that he saw nothing wrong in it. He went on to say that the offer having been made, it was not made on behalf of the Government. You cannot make an offer on behalf of the Government unless you were authorised to do so. I can offer the Government anything but I cannot do so on behalf of the Government. I must confess that I was shocked to hear the Hon. Leader of the House say that he did not see anything wrong about it. If hon. members

would only walk about and keep their ears to the ground! There is such an old saying as this. If mud is thrown about, some will fall on you. You hear a lot of rumours going around and then you hear that this gentleman made an offer to pay something until the Legislature meets. While it was indiscreet in the gentleman to do it, it was also lacking in commonsense for the Hon. Leader of the House to say that he did not see anything wrong in the gentleman saying that. The Hon. Leader of the House then went on to say that it was not made on behalf of the Government. I just enquired whether the Hon. Premier was at that meeting and I was told that he was present; therefore, if it was made on behalf of the Government, you would have expected that the Hon. Premier would have denied it and said "no, thanks." The Hon. Leader of the House then said that it was made to the Speaker of the House. That, to my way of thinking, is a greater insult. I would say to Mr. Hunte on the next occasion that I meet him that I think he was very indiscreet because despite Mr. Hunte's wealth, if he made that offer to the Speaker, he ought to have borne in mind that the Speaker is Speaker of the House of Assembly. Can you imagine any man doing that or saying that to the late Sir Frederick Clarke or to Mr. George Evelyn? Whether or not Mr. Hunte said that as a passing remark, it was a tremendous insult.

Let us pass on. If Mr. Hunte said it before he was selected, it would have influenced in some way the decision of the Committee. It would tend to influence their decision. If he said it after the decision was agreed to, then I think it would be an insult to His Honour the Speaker. The Hon. K. R. Hunte can make it to the Government but not on behalf of the Government.

The Hon. Premier was present at the meeting and I am surprised that he did not say that he thought the remark was most untimely and out of place. It was an improper remark, and I think Mr. Hunte's closest colleagues would tell him so.

What I am worried about is this and I want a little guidance. If you look in your Estimates for this financial year, you will see set down for the purpose of Parliamentary Association the sum of \$1,200. That is under Head XXVIII, Item 39. I wonder when the hon. gentleman went into that room if they knew about that. Then, if you turn to Head XXIX, you will see at Item 42, Conferences and Delegations, \$50,000. Surely Mr. Hunte, the Hon. Leader of the House and the other gentlemen who met in the Other Place to discuss this matter ought to have known that the Legislature already earmarked \$1,200 for these Parliamentary Conferences and another \$50,000 for Conferences and Delegations. I am surprised that such a thing has occurred and, as I have said in my opening remarks, nobody would suggest that I am parsimonious on this matter.

I would like to take the Hon. Leader of the House up on this matter. The whole trouble is that I have not attended any of these meetings since the one in which the Clerk of the House upset the apple cart and got the opportunity to go on one of the courses. I have not attended any and for the reason that apparently the Government in power has not yet got around to the democratic way of doing things. They have the example set to them by the Governments of Jamaica and Trinidad. At no time, at any of these Conferences has a member of the Opposition been selected. (A VOICE: What about Mr. Bethell?) Mr. Bethell was not selected; he was asked to go because other members refused to accept the invitation and it was because the Government had refused to vote any subsistence allowance for the person going. I say that with authority. The now Prime Minister of the West Indies and the Deputy Speaker thought that it was a waste of public money. I repeat that when Mr. Bethell went to New Zealand he was asked to go because nobody wanted to go. Nobody else wanted to pull his pocket. This House refused to vote one red cent to give Mr. Fred Bethell.

His Honour the Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Philip, the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Deputy Speak-

er, you, Mr. Chairman, have all gone on these conferences. Now, tell me something. Can you say that is a democratic approach to selection of members to represent this branch of the Parliamentary Association? I say that anything which has to do with the policy of Government should have a majority representation of members of the Government; that is to say, if you are sending four, the Government should have three.

5.40 p.m.

I say, therefore, that they have not yet reached the stage when they can appreciate democracy. They have won the elections. In all other countries, the Opposition is given a member to attend any such conference. The Hon. Leader of the House says that they have never had more than 16 seats in here; he says that he will never subscribe to the idea that a member from the Other Place should go - as a matter of fact, the hon. member has said that we should get rid of the Other Place.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. What I said is that we have always accepted the principle of a bi-cameral Legislature and therefore we have to recognise the Other Place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, Sir, we all recognise the Other Place. In the hon. member's political infancy, he says, "Let us get rid of the Other Place." (ASIDES) Why does the hon. member interrupt me? I kept pretty quiet when he was speaking. As to the Hon. Minister of Communications, I remember the motion which he tabled here, which was to get rid of the Other Place.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member is referring to me, my motion was for the purpose of limiting the powers of the Other Place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member not only wanted to limit the powers of the Other Place; he wanted to get rid of the Other Place. Does the hon. member argue that if there is a question of two people - I say that where there is any question of Government policy, the Government should have the majority; but does the hon. member say that the non-elected people are to be of greater importance to represent this Chamber than the elected representatives of the people? If you think of the elected representatives of the people, then you must think of the members of the Opposition who may be running the Government tomorrow. The Hon. Leader of the House says that they have never had more than sixteen members in here; he spoke about three or four people from the Other Place, but let us forget that. If the elected representatives of the people decided that two members from this Chamber and one from the Other Place or three members from this Chamber and one from the Other Place should go anywhere, how could sixteen members outvote twenty-three? Mr. Manley is going to Trinidad and you also have Mr. Sangster; Mr. Manley is going to England and there is a member of the Opposition going too. If you have risen to the position of Leader of the House, then you must be big enough to see that where you have brains you must use them. Do you think that if the hon. junior member for St. John was not of the necessary calibre to be in here the people would not have kept him out? I say it is the Government's duty to use persons who have ability.

Let us take Mr. Manley as an example. You always have a clash between the Hon. Leader of the House and the hon. junior member for St. John, but the consensus of opinion in this country is that enough use is not made of the hon. junior member for St. John. If the hon. member were to misuse his abilities then the people would get him out of this House. We should give place to ability; everything should be done decently and in order which is in the Holy Writ that St. Paul gave to the Corinthians. We have recognised the Other Place as being part of the Legislature. I have always felt that way and I am happy to think that the members of the Government realise that too.

I am hoping that this debate in itself, and I have listened to the Hon. Leader of the House, will not give rise to any such circumstances as to cause us to feel

that anyone in the Other Place, by virtue of his affluence, has used his position for the purpose of influencing anyone. I do not believe that the remark was made on behalf of any Government, but I cannot subscribe to the hon. member's view that he saw nothing wrong with this offer being made by a member of the Other Place. If the Legislature is in recess, the Chief Secretary orders tickets from B.W.I.A. and they are paid for afterwards.

May I remind the hon. member at this stage that I had a misfortune on one occasion in the days when we had eight members in here? In those days I was selected to go to Trinidad to the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture (Hon. D. D. GARNER: What are you quarrelling about then?) I will tell you why I was selected to go there. We had eight members in here, as against eight over there, and I was selected in the sense that I was "Hail fellow! Well met." There was an invitation sent here from the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture on its eighth anniversary; there was Mr. Julian Mahon and the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was then a member of the Government, and I was asked to go to this College on the ground that Mr. Wilkinson and the others would be put on the spot.

5.50 p. m.

They could not afford to and dared not refuse me. Had they done so the Commercial boys would have put me up and voted for me. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Who said so?) It was just a shrewd move. That was 1950, ten years ago, and we have gone a long way from that. The hon. member said the Leader of the Opposition knows his view on these matters is that the Opposition should be represented at Conferences and things of that sort, but at no time have you nominated anyone from the Opposition. Let this be the last debate that we should have on a matter of this sort. Let it be understood that at no time when it is a question of policy would I be so stupid to say that the Opposition must have equal representation with the Government; but when it comes to a Conference where it is not a question of policy, it is my considered opinion that the Leader of the House or members of the Government should so appoint a Committee and consult with the members of the Opposition and use the best ability for the particular subject with which you are going to deal.

I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, that the people in this country feel that you are not making the best use of the ability you have in the Opposition; and when you come side by side with Trinidad, Jamaica or England where people have been trained politically, we are being let down because we are not using the best ability. People must learn to forget that they are not always on political platforms two or three weeks before the elections. If you have an election and lose, you lose; but if you win and come in here, you have the interest of the people at heart. Your idea might be to move at one pace, the hon. members on my left may want to move at another pace and members of my Party may want to move at yet another pace; but, Mr. Chairman, I have been talking with a lot of people and it is difficult to understand the difference of the political Parties when it comes to the desirability of social reform.

I agree that you should vote for this Resolution today, but I think the time has come that the hon. gentlemen of the Government should see to it that the example which has been set by other trained leaders in the West Indies should be emulated, and that at all times when Barbados is to be represented abroad, members of the Opposition should be included. It is not a matter of giving a man a free trip. You carry whom you like and I know when you come back you get on platforms with a lot of fancy talk, but I will get on a platform and rip you to pieces. When you carry a man and he returns, he can talk so much balderdash - it isn't funny. In the interest of democratic Government it is time that you showed some desirability of carrying a member of the Opposition. I am not pleading a case for myself. I am not the man you will want to select,

so leave me out; I am not a man in very good health, and have to travel around with a nurse maid, so to speak; so do not worry to select me. The day I want to go some place I am going to go, but I am pleading a case in the interest of Barbados. Just remember that none of us has any control over our stay in this world; so we have to do our best while we are here. If you move out tomorrow and you are running a Democratic Government, who is to say that the people of this country will not select those in the Opposition to run the Government. If you with your form of Government are emulating the United Kingdom Government, you must do what the Leader of the House of Commons does. If you are discussing matters relative to policy, all well and good; but at all times I say you should give consideration to the Opposition, because you are in Government today and you have no control over your stay down here; you have not even got control over your stay in Government, and therefore it is your duty to do these things. The members of the Opposition may be returned in Government tomorrow and I throw that warning out to you.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if the hon. gentleman in the Other Place made that remark before he was elected, it was indiscreet, and if he made it after he was elected, it was worse; and therefore I cannot agree with the Leader of the House— and I hope he will clear it up because the whole question of saying that he saw nothing wrong with making that remark is a bad statement for him to make. It gives people a bad impression to see that he saw nothing wrong with it when everybody else sees something wrong with it. Everyone in every little crevice has been talking about this man of affluence who can get things done by the Government in this country. I think I am in the know and therefore I can say that every man in Barbados in big circles and small circles, and wherever you turn, is talking about this man who can get Government to do this and that, can have priority and all that, whether or not it is true; and therefore you cannot say that you do not see anything wrong with the statement by a man who would offer to pay for the Government on a delegation or for His Honour the Speaker. I was glad to hear the Hon. Leader of the House speak about the Speaker's impartiality, and though I do not want to say more on that, I would like to say that His Honour the Speaker is universally known as a member of the Labour Party. I do not say that in derogatory terms; I say that for the benefit of the Leader of the House that when somebody makes a statement like that, the man in the street will not take it as being said of His Honour as Speaker of the House, but as the representative of St. Peter, a member of the Labour Party, and therefore it behoves you to be like Caesar's wife. You have to be above suspicion. I have heard all sorts of things said, and I am still in here, and I am going to be in here for a long time yet, subject to the Almighty. I know that a few of you people do not believe in that. I want to issue this warning before I sit down, and it is, for your information, that I will bring a lot of people in here with me.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that this Resolution would have caused so much argument and I will read it before I comment.

"The Barbados Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association was invited and accepted the invitation to attend a Regional Conference of the Association in Trinidad.

This amount is therefore needed to meet the cost of passages and subsistence allowances for the two Barbados delegates and to contribute 1/20 share of the expenses of the Conference estimated at \$20,000."

There is nothing in this at all, and the argument that is going on over this is not needed from either side of the House. As I understand it, there was no money granted for the purpose of sending these delegates to Trinidad. 6.00 p.m.

If we do not agree to vote this money, well then, we did not want to send them at all. Surely it does not need all this

debate. We are here to reason and someone will make a mistake at some time. When a mistake is made and we can reason, we should speak in that vein. Let us have the minimum of confusion and keep the unity of the spirit unbroken. I am sorry that so much evil has been spoken consisting this Resolution. I too feel that if the gentleman, whoever he may be, had even wanted to lend someone money, the matter should not have been disclosed at the meeting. But the money has to be paid for the passages because we have selected the two delegates to go on the Conference and I do not see why I as an individual cannot agree to this Resolution wholeheartedly. I agree 100 percent to the granting of this money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir, I did not want to enter this discussion at all; but owing to the turn things have taken, I think that I should not let this debate go without saying something. First of all, it is most unfortunate after the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has taken place and a decision has been reached that so much of the discussion that took place at that meeting has been laid bare here today.

As far as I can see, the turn that this debate has taken is pivoted around what is regarded as an insult to one of the delegates and that delegate is myself. It is so unfortunate if you come late to a meeting or if you are not there at all that you should come today to speak on this matter because you are in the unfortunate position of speaking from hearsay. I was present at that meeting and was chosen as a delegate and it is not true to say that the Hon. K. R. Hunte made the offer before the delegates were chosen. He prefaced his remarks by saying that he did not think that he himself would have been chosen. He did say so after he was upbraided and criticised for making such an offer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not quite follow what His Honour the Speaker is saying. He said that it is not true to say that the gentleman made the offer before the delegates were chosen. I am glad to hear him say so. But then His Honour goes on to say that he said that he made certain remarks after being upbraided. You must make that clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Mr. K. R. Hunte made that offer without knowing that he would have been selected as one of the delegates. I was present.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did he make it before he was selected?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, before.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. I was not there and I am trying to clarify the matter. His Honour the Speaker said that it is not true to say that he made the offer before he was selected. I just wanted the hon. member to correct himself.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is in the Government at present; therefore I do not think that it would be competent for the hon. member to say what the gentleman knew. The hon. member can only say that Mr. Hunte made the offer before they made the selection of the delegate at that meeting. Sir, I say that it is more than an insult if he was selected after that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I remember telling the meeting when some member took objection to the offer being made and before I had even renounced the offer that as far as I am concerned that I was not there as a member of the Government and I was in no way tied down or associated with the Government. I was there in the capacity as a general member of the Parliamentary Association and that as regards any accusations, any supposed dealings or relationships between the hon. gentleman and the Government I had absolutely no knowledge of them; and in regard to the offer made by the Hon. K. R. Hunte, I myself did not regard it as an insult or in the light of the member who criticised it. Again I went further and said that

I looked on such an offer as if it were made by some private person. I myself did not regard it as an insult, nor did I blame the hon. gentleman of insulting me. As far as an insult is concerned, an insult is just what a person regards it as. I repeat that at the time when the hon. gentleman made the offer, I did not think it was an insult at all and I even there and then explained to the meeting that I regarded it in the same light as if it had been made by any other member or as if I had gone down Broad Street and made the loan from one of the Banks and that is what I did subsequently. However, as other members took it as an insult, I told the meeting that I absolutely renounced the offer here and now— and more than that, I asked the Clerk to note it that I had renounced the offer.

As the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has said, I do not see the need for all this debate on this matter in this Chamber. It was an offer which was rejected because some members saw it as a relationship of the hon. member with the Government. As I have said, I had no such thought.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I first got information about this meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association by enquiring from my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, who, I understand, was at the meeting. It was from him that I learned that this particular offer, which is being bandied about on the floor of the House, was made, and I also learned from him that he took the initiative in objecting to such an offer. As a matter of fact, he considered then, and I agree with him in that respect that it certainly appeared to be improper and unfortunate. Subsequently I have heard from other members who were at the meeting when the offer was made, that it was made in a spirit of jest; but even if it were so, we could say that it was just unfortunate or indiscreet. However, that has been bandied about quite enough, and even although it was improper or indiscreet or unfortunate, it still has the same effect. Mr. Chairman, I want to deal at greater length with matters which hon. members have brought up pertaining to the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and I think that the speech which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was one which carried a high tone to me. How much different in tone was the speech of the hon. junior member for St. John who, I understand, said that he wanted to say these things particularly for the record. I believe that the hon. junior member for St. John, in his more sober moments, would prefer that many of the things which he has said be taken off the record.

I would just like to comment on four points which the hon. member has made and question how he could want these things to remain on the record. I am glad that the hon. member is present to be reminded of some of the things which he has said. He emphasised that when they attend a meeting of the Parliamentary Association they should be doing it as individuals and not as members of a Party. He was very glib in emphasizing those remarks when he talked about the Opposition boycotting this meeting. He mentioned that one person would be the Government delegate, one would be a person from the Other Place, and he ended up by remarking on what he thought was the dignity of the Speaker. I would like to dwell a little on this point and show why the hon. member's remarks should better be taken off the record than placed on the record.

First of all, if the Hon. member is insisting that when people attend meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and I understand that the hon. member has decided not to attend any more of these Conferences, which would have been a decision made quite recently. (Mr. BARROW: How many meetings have you attended?) I have attended when the hon. member also attended and disclaimed that he was there. The hon. member actually said that his Party, which is the Official Opposition, boycotted this particular meeting because he would not be a party to any member of the Other Place

handing out some sort of offer to members of this Assembly.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Is the hon. member purporting to quote me or is he interpolating words of his own? I see him gazing up to the Heavens for inspiration.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Well, Sir, I think that that is a much better place from which to get inspiration than from over there. If the hon. member is saying that his Party boycotted the meeting because he did not want any member of the Other Place to make any such offer to this House, how would his Party have known, without going to the meeting, that such an offer was going to be made? How would he have known that if he said that they had boycotted the meeting for that reason?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to ask you to ask the Reporter to read back what I said. It is a matter of public and general knowledge that this arrangement was made before the Hon. member was selected on the basis on which he was selected by them. I would like to ask the hon. member who nominated the member from the Other Place?

Mr. STRAUGHN: I am glad I was there; I am going exactly by what the hon. member said today. If he is saying that he knows that this arrangement was made beforehand, what nonsensical argument is his? The hon. member talks about the Government delegate; if the hon. member wants to say that for some time members of the Opposition have not attended any of these Conferences, well let him say so; but do not let him talk about the Government delegate. Why should there be a Government delegate on a parliamentary delegation except he is the Speaker? I think that that is the most reprehensible part of the remarks made by the hon. junior member for St. John. (Mr. BARROW: Well, put me in detention then) The hon. member is in detention now; but he has to take what is coming. After saying that he thought that this offer was out of order, the hon. member said that he was glad to see that His Honour the Speaker had the dignity on this occasion and he repeated the remarks. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that different men have different reactions to the same things, but I am surprised that the hon. member was allowed even to repeat these particular remarks in the manner in which he did.
6. 20 p.m.

To me it did not reflect that he really gave the honour to the Hon. Speaker of this Chamber that should have been given, and it certainly sounded as if it had the innuendo that he was challenging the dignity of the Speaker on all occasions, because if he is that well trained and....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would take it that if I said anything which His Honour the Speaker found offensive, he would have objected.

Mr. STRAUGHN: He was not present.

Mr. BARROW: It is not competent for the hon. member to talk of what I said an hour ago. If His Honour wanted to object— and I assure His Honour that I said exactly what the hon. member said and intended it just as he understands me....

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not in the Committee in here when the hon. member for St. John made that statement. I did over-hear it and it did ring rather peculiarly to me, to be quite frank; but knowing what English is, after he had said "on the occasion" and did not say "on this occasion only", I said nothing.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member wants to know why I did not object to it then. I did not have to object to it then; the hon. junior member for St. John wanted it on the record, and if he wanted it on the record, let him have it on the record, but he would have the reply on the record too. I say, Sir, that if he has the legal training he is known to have, it was a strange thing to see that he would repeat an adverbial phrase more than

once without realizing the true significance of it. He actually repeated it, and I think, Sir, that it was really a peculiar sounding remark; I would use the words of His Honour the Speaker and perhaps leave it at that, and I would say if he is talking about the proper spirit of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I wonder if the record would show that his remarks today were made in such a proper spirit.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it is true that this matter has been very fully ventilated, but I think I should make it clear that we of the Official Opposition decided that we would not attend this meeting in the Council Chamber of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to which we were summoned at very short notice to attend when we knew that the purpose of it was to select delegates to go to a Conference in Trinidad. Because of our previous experience in that there has always been opposition and voting against the Opposition by members of the Other Chamber and members of the Government Party or at least by the majority of them, we have found it an absolutely waste of time to attend these meetings, because the whole purpose and function have always been regarded as one, by the first Premier and so far as we can see by the second Premier, to select some member of the Government Party or some member of the other Chamber for a trip.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that apart from the occasion when Mr. Fred Bethell was selected - and that was the occasion when the Government would not allow any subsistence allowance to be voted, it was the occasion when only the passage money to New Zealand was paid, and I recall giving him my vote, - the person selected has invariably been a member of the Government Party either from this Chamber or the Other Chamber. The Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries was selected for a trip to India; there was His Honour the Speaker who was selected for Australia and the other day for Trinidad; there was the Leader of the House who went to the United Kingdom and the Deputy Speaker at the same time when we proposed the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis as one of the two representatives, because if Mr. Lewis had gone with the Deputy Speaker or with the Leader of the House, you would have had a member from the Official Opposition and a member of the Government Party; but the majority of the Government Party ensured that the representation of the two was 100% of their own Party. Then there was the occasion, Mr. Chairman, when you were selected. There was another occasion when in respect of a trip to Kenya the hon. Dr. Cato was chosen as a result of the voting strength of the Party in power, and so we can go on. There has never been a solitary occasion when the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has been regarded by the Government Party either by nomination or by their voting as being a matter outside the pale of Party controversy.

Another reason, Mr. Chairman, is that it has been treated as a matter in which some member of their Party irrespective of his status or junior apprenticeship in politics has been selected so as to ensure that one of their members who might possibly show signs of disaffection by not being given a Ministry is given a free trip as a result of their voting strength to represent the Parliament of Barbados at Parliamentary Association Conferences. I think it is well for it to go on the record for the people in other Colonial Parliaments that it has never happened once in the history of Barbados with the C.P.A. that a member other than a member of the Party in power, apart from Fred Bethell when he had to pay his own expenses, has been selected.

Mr. Speaker, we are all busy men on this side of the Chamber; each of us has to work for our livelihood; and we would not waste our time attending that meeting early last month of the Barbados C.P.A. Branch, because we knew we would just have been attending and wasting our time in order to support a member of the Government Party, a selection which we have no doubt was made long before the meeting at a caucus meeting. I remember on one occasion when the Minister of Agriculture was selected for India, the other two members proposed were His Honour the Speaker and Mr. "Sleepy" Smith who was

then junior member for St. Andrew. The votes received by those who combined were much less than those of the members of the other Chamber and members of the Government Party who supported the Minister of Agriculture. We decided in view of that attitude that we would not waste our time by attending meetings; that is the reason for our official boycott of that meeting and the reason why we have no intention of attending similar meetings so long as Government adopts the policy which it has adopted from the time it was instituted by the present Federal Prime Minister.

Now, Sir, we have had excessive discussion on the manner in which the proceedings took place on this particular day early last month. I am sorry we have not had the benefit of the first-hand knowledge of the hon. junior member for the City who, I have heard, was present at that meeting and who, I am also informed, took a very manly stand and who actually brought his senior colleagues to order, to a sense of realities and put them on the spot, so I am told. Mr. Chairman, I regret that we have not had the benefit of his first-hand knowledge of what took place at that meeting but the night is yet young and no doubt he will speak in due course. But His Honour the Speaker told us, if I understand him correctly, that this offer was made by the Hon. Mr. Hunte, and Mr. Hunte knows that I so frequently refer to him as His Excellency the Governor of Russell House; he knows the inference which he can draw from that.

6.30 p.m.

When we learn from His Honour the Speaker that this offer was made by Mr. Hunte before he was selected, that can also give the impression that this gentleman knew well ahead that it was their intention to elect him, so that it may well be that he made it because he knew that it would clinch his election. That gentleman, a keen businessman, after careful thought would have said: "I will underwrite the cost." He might have said to himself: "No doubt, I would like to go to Trinidad at this time to do some business: but if I go with the status and dignity of being a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association that would be so much better." Mr. Chairman, you are a businessman. Of course, you are a very small businessman in comparison with that gentleman: but you as a businessman would know in putting through a business deal what the status and dignity of being a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association would mean in your clinching it. Therefore, when he made this offer before the meeting proceeded with the nomination of delegates, you may well have this opinion that this gentleman felt when he undertook to underwrite the cost that the members would be so captivated and fascinated by his offer that he could say: "I am already picked," and they would say: "Pick that man."

Sir, I feel that we should let it be known in a tangible way how we feel about this matter. The way in which the hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke gives me the impression that he made his private arrangements because of the feelings of members at that meeting. We appreciate that.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was done when I saw that someone sensed an insult.

Mr. BRANCKER: I never said that he needed to be fortified, but I think his moral courage must have received great support from the firm and manly attitude of the hon. junior member for the City when he expressed himself as forcibly and frankly as he did, as I was made to understand.

Sir, because of the way in which meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association are conducted here, because of the fact that the Government has invariably supported members of their own Party, and accepts the nomination of someone from the Other Place whenever it suits them, we of the Official Opposition, as a matter of protest, are moving the reduction of this amount in the Resolution by the sum of \$201. I presume that this figure of \$1,402 is arrived at in this way. One-twentieth of the

share of the expenses of the Conference would be \$1,000 if the estimated expenditure is \$20,000. If \$402 is added to that to make it \$1,402, that can be called the amount for the expenses of the delegates and divided equally it would be \$201 for each of the delegates. But as we are supporting the payment for the expenses of the hon. junior member for St. Peter and we are showing how we deprecate the attitude of the hon. member of the Upper Chamber, we are not prepared to associate ourselves with the amount to reimburse him. If he agrees to display his wealth to indicate what he can do at the extent of his cheque book, even though it is only \$201, we will still show our disapproval of the way in which it is to be expended.

I beg formally to move that this amount be reduced by \$201 for that reason. That is my motion and the reason why we look at it is clear. The hon. member of the Other Place who can offer to pay everything will, so far as we are concerned, be in the position where he can pay his own way.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I rise to second the motion by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. In doing so I just want to clear up one or two matters. I do not want to indulge in any recriminations with members on the other side. The hon. junior member for St. Peter said in the course of his remarks that the member of the Other Place, the Hon. K. R. Hunte, made this offer prior to his being nominated. I do not think that it was to His Honour the Speaker that we made this query, but when some other member was speaking, we certainly did ask who made the nominations. I have been made to understand that the nominations were made by no less a person than the Premier. To reflect on the gesture or offer, whether it was made seriously or not seriously, he cannot stop other hon. members from feeling that it is an insult to the dignity of the House and the people of this island when a single individual can so arrogate to himself the function of omnipotence that he can carry people to a Parliamentary Conference. But having exposed his lack of training, his lack of sense of decency - and I am pulling no punches because the hon. gentleman knows exactly how I feel about his machinations, political, economic and otherwise - if I were in Alaska, I would have to attack somebody up there and if I were in Chicago I would have to attack somebody up there and, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has so often said, it is a pity that we do not have a Senatorial Investigation Committee in Barbados because a lot of things would come to light in this Chamber.

The point which I want to make is this: in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman made a suggestion like that which I consider an improper suggestion to make - anybody who had any kind of decency or training would never have done it. The Speaker's reactions to it are tolerable because he is a charitable person. I do not intend this as a reflection on the hon. member of the Other Place, but I doubt very much whether in similar circumstances on another occasion, if the personnel were different he would have acted similarly:
6.40 p.m.

It is fairly well known in this island that the late Sir Frederick Clarke, who was once Speaker of this House was not a wealthy gentleman; as a matter of fact, I do not think that he was much better off than many of us on this side of the House. I doubt very much that with his gall and effrontery, the hon. gentleman who said that he would pay the expenses of this delegation, would have had the effrontery to do that if the late Sir Frederick Clarke was still Speaker of this House. Now that people like us have taken over, people like the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour cannot see that they are being treated with contempt. That is what really hurts me. I am a very peculiar person, and if I thought that somebody like the hon. member who made this suggestion was trying to humble even the Minister of Trade, I would have voted against it. I say that this is making an affront; I would regard it as effrontery to our race and it may be that I am hyper-sensitive. I think we should stop

letting these people feel that they are such masters that they can buy somebody and put him in their pocket. I want hon. members to get that straight. I am not against the Government; I am against what represents Government by conspiracy. If you study the history of the economic growth of this island and think what these things mean, you will see what I mean. If we had a senatorial investigation in this island or an organization of that type - I regret that the transactions and the doings of more of these Committees which really have the control of the day to day running of this country are not published in the Daily Press. A lot of the arrangements which are made now would not be made if the whole tenor of the transactions was laid open to public inspection. I strongly feel that way about these matters; I do not share His Honour's view that these matters should be kept concealed from the public gaze because these rumours get about.

Mr. Chairman, I come now to the most important aspect of this matter. I would not worry to dignify the hon. junior member for St. Joseph with a reply to anything he has said because he has been unable to say anything original since he has been a member of this House; but he takes every hon. member's speech like a school-master and says "Give him two marks for this, three marks for that, put him in detention" and that sort of thing. After the hon. member made the suggestion that he would pay the cost of the delegation to this Conference - I understand that after that offer was made, the Premier got up and nominated the same hon. member. That would have been very undignified, because it would appear that the Premier was saying "Since you will pay for the boys, we will put you on the delegation." Did the Premier have some conversation beforehand? Did he not even get on the telephone and ask if the hon. member wanted to go? The hon. member has developed his own political philosophy - that is, political philosophy for himself - but I have never found him to be a liar. I am sure that if I went to him tomorrow and asked him if he had spoken to the Premier on the telephone he would say "Yes" if it were so. I invite the Premier to allay the fears of members on this side of the House by saying whether he had not previously discussed this delegation going to Trinidad with particular reference to the Hon. Mr. Hunte. It was either told directly to him or a message was sent to him, because it would have been strange that he offered to pay the delegation thereby bribing the people of this country, and then the Premier should turn around and nominate the person who made the offer.

People do not feel very well when people like the Judges of the Federal Supreme Court bring these things to light from time to time and make a pronouncement in public. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that he had occasion to look with censure on the action of the Adviser to the President of the United States of America, but you cannot conduct the Government in a "saboteurial" atmosphere and succeed forever. It means that we may as well have anarchy and no one will have confidence in the Government. Mr. Chairman, I am seconding the motion which has been made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. You have the action of the Minister of Finance in this House that when a member had offered to pay for this delegation going to Trinidad, the Minister of Finance should be so lacking in self-respect and in dignity as to get up and nominate the same person who made this offer.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member speaks of being lacking in self-respect and dignity, I should like to say that my name is not "Dipper Barrow".

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, you as Chairman of this Committee will have to point out to the Premier that he is breaking the Rules of this House; because if the Premier starts that, I will tell him that my name is not "Monkey Nuts" either. Mr. Chairman, are you still Chairman of this Committee or is your mind elsewhere? I see that you are conducting a conversation with the Clerk of

this House and you are completely ignoring statements which are made on the floor of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member saying that I have no right to have any conversation with the Clerk of this House?

Mr. BARROW: Not when a submission is made. The Rules of the House say that you should not refer to hon. members by their names; the Premier could not be "Dipper Barrow" even if he were born again. 6.50 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you through? You see how patiently I was waiting on you. Have I no right to receive advice from the Clerk?

Mr. BARROW: And the Hon. Premier is breaking another Rule by reading a newspaper, and I draw that to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point I was discussing is whether the Premier had broken a Rule of the House by referring to you by name. It is a little technical because I do not think he made any personal reference to you; what he did say was that he was not "Dipper Barrow", and that is how he mentioned your name. I feel the Premier was not justified in calling the name, because he was breaking the Rules of the House.

Mr. BARROW: I will not call on him to withdraw; I will not go on. Barbados has been the laughing stock of the West Indies ever since he has been presiding over the unfortunate people of this island. He went to make a toast the other day at the Hotel with ASTA, and talked about rats and so on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must tell the hon. member for St. John that what he is saying is outside the ambit of this Resolution, and I am asking him now to stick strictly to the Resolution and desist from any personal reference.

Mr. BARROW: I would only caution the hon. member that if he was born again he could not be like me. Nobody who had any sense of racial pride at all in those circumstances would get up and nominate a member of the Other Place to go to Trinidad. Every time people like that go to Trinidad, they want to know if that is really what Barbados stands for. You have to send your best and the Premier of Barbados nominated him and then they say they believe in democracy and the rights of the Opposition and all that and he would not answer the question. He would not even stay in the House now and is going outside with three minutes to go. I am not a specialist in psychiatrics, so I cannot tell what is wrong with him; he was completely lacking in any sense of self-respect and pride, racial or otherwise, when he made that nomination; that makes it worse; and when the other hon. member says he does not see anything wrong with that, that member must be lacking in any sense at all; they must have their tongues in their cheeks. Are they trying to cover up for the Premier by saying that they would actually nominate the person to go?

I was a member of the Labour Party like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and these things were always discussed over there; but now to come to the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the reason why the Prime Minister of the West Indies did not vote was because he did not want him to go and we said the Opposition would vote for the member for St. Michael. I am not mincing any matters now. The Premier at the time said that they were not going to vote the money if Mr. Cox was nominated because there were two members—the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. The Premier of the West Indies refused to come in and vote and he knew certain members on this side were supporting him on this issue.

Hon. M. E. COX: You were not one.

Mr. BARROW: I just wanted to know if the hon. member remembered. I did not support him and I will

tell you how he knew. He met me outside of Bornns Bay Rum building and thanked me for supporting him, but I told him he was wrong, I did not support, but have a good trip.

Hon. M. E. COX: And I went to St. George and supported you like a fool.

Mr. BARROW: I told you that I did not support you and not to thank me. I was supporting the Deputy Speaker, and there is nothing to conceal about that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to get back to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: The Premier of the West Indies refused to come in and vote and said he was not going to vote any money either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I was there when he said that the Government does not interfere with these things. It would have been bad for him to make that suggestion before he was selected, but it was worse for him to state after selection that he would underwrite the thing. Why didn't the President of the Legislative Council, Mr. Lucie-Smith, Mr. Robinson, Dr. St. John, Mr. Bayne or Mrs. Talma volunteer to pay this money? It is because certain people in Barbados refuse to have any respect for Parliamentary institutions, and regard Government as a question of lobbying and influence and doing this for somebody and that for the other person, and that is the whole atmosphere in which this evil can be met. So let us get the record straight. The Government has used the big stick as the hon. senior member for St. Peter can tell you when their nominees do not go, and not once have they done Parliamentary democracy even the token favour of saying at least on one occasion in ten years we should send a member from the Opposition.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock. 7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there being no quorum, I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

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

RESOLUTION re COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The question that the sum of \$1,402 be reduced by \$201 was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BRANCKER - 1

NOES: Hon'bles M. E. COX; D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP; L. St. A. THORNE, F. E. MILLER, Messrs. HOLDER and WALCOTT - 7.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, on the declaration of Mr. CHAIRMAN, "I think the 'Ayes' have it".

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE FIRE SERVICE BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the House into Committee on a Bill to constitute a Fire Service for the island and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed to consider the Clauses, I just want to say that on the last occasion, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy asked some questions. Since we are now in Committee, I will reply to those questions as we take the relevant sections.

I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

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

Clause 2, 3, and 4 were called separately and passed.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I think I will take this opportunity to answer the question raised on points which I know the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is very well acquainted with. The hon. member asked why some certain things were done by the Governor and others by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The answer is very simple. As far as the Governor is concerned, the Governor appoints members of the Civil Service but the Governor is not responsible for policy; therefore, in any section in which the Governor-in-Executive Committee is mentioned, that has something to do with a question of policy.

Those are the broad answers to these things. The Governor makes appointments to the Civil Service and in this case, the Fire Service; the Governor will appoint men to the Fire Service but as regards the policy, that is a matter for the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

With that statement, I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

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

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

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I will make my rejoinder on this Clause to what the Hon. Premier said in

reference to Clause 5. He said that the Governor appoints, but on the matter of policy that is a matter for the Governor-in-Executive Committee. However, it must strike one on the instant Clause how thin is the dividing line. On the one hand, you must satisfy the Governor on your standard of fitness and conduct and your standard of education and then when it comes to the question of your required height and chest measurements, that standard is fixed by the Chief Fire Officer with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The dividing line is so thin that you must wonder why they attempt to distinguish between the two.

We know that formerly, there was no question of Cabinet status, and during the time of the sort of Government which we had before now, everything was put in the hands of the Governor; but the tendency today is to put everything in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.
7.55 p.m.

I do regard this Clause as being full of anachronisms; certain standards are to be satisfactory to the Governor and other standards are to be satisfactory to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The standard as to health is to be satisfactory to the Governor and the standard of education; and the standard of height, chest and measurement are to be satisfactory to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that this is wrong, but it only strikes me as being rather odd. In the same Clause you have the Governor to approve of certain standards and you have the Governor-in-Executive Committee, which is the Cabinet, to approve of other standards. One would have thought that the standard as to health, height and chest would be regarded as being in the same category, but for some reason or other, which is strange to humble laymen like myself, a distinction has been made between these things and it is most curious to me.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not see that there is anything strange about this matter. A medical Practitioner examines you and finds that you are all right and then the Governor appoints you. As far as the standard of education is concerned, I think it is generally known that the standard of education is generally a matter for the Executive Committee.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 8 was called and passed.

Clause 9 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Section, what I want to draw to the attention of the hon. member is that the Fire Service is now changed from being a part of the Military and the Police and here in Subsection (2) this is what is stated: "The Governor may at any time dismiss from the Service or dispense with the services of any subordinate officer or fireman whom he may consider unfit for further service in the Service."

Mr. Chairman, we are living in different times now. These men do not have any right of protection such as what a Trade Union could offer. The Fire Service in Barbados should not be precluded from having such freedom of association which other Fire Services have throughout the British Empire or Commonwealth. In England and in Jamaica firemen can join Trade Unions; here the Governor still has the right to dismiss these men; but what redress do these men have to show that what has been put up against them is not fair or right? There is nothing in this new Act which provides for the firemen to have a free association of their own. I am not begging for any membership but I am saying that a fireman's condition of service should be something for which he has to barter himself and not necessarily in association with the Police Force. I feel that the time has come that if you are going

to provide a Fire Service the men should not be precluded from joining a Trade Union. This Clause says:-

"The Governor may at any time dismiss from the Service or dispense with the services of any subordinate officer or fireman whom he may consider unfit for further service in the Service."

If the Governor considers a fireman unfit for further service in the Service, that is not his consideration; it is really the consideration of the Fire Officer. This Clause does not even speak of his conduct; it speaks of considering a fireman unfit for further service.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that he is now speaking on Sub-clause (4) of Clause 10. I made the same mistake as the hon. member has made.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

The question that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 10 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 10 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was speaking on this Clause just now. Now Sub-Clause (4) of this Clause says this:-

The Governor may at any time dismiss from the Service or dispense with the services of any subordinate officer or fireman whom he may consider unfit for further service in the Service."

When I came back to this island I did not have the opportunity of perusing this Clause carefully, but I thought that there would have been such protection given to firemen as obtains in other places. I would like to point out that, in other countries, there is the protection by the Trade Unions for these people. In Jamaica, for instance, the firemen are free to join a Trade Union of their choice and in Great Britain firemen are affiliated to Trade Unions; but here there is no protection for firemen where Trade Unions are concerned. Is it that something which is as vigorous as a Trade Union is not relished? I would like to know what is the attitude of the Government in this matter. A man is free to be dismissed; I have been trying to find out what redress a man has if he considers that what is done to him is not right or fair; how is he going to get to the Governor? Getting to the Governor in his case is just as if I were to try to get to Sputnik 1. I do not think that a man should be liable to dismissal where he cannot have some means of defending himself. It is the last disciplinary action which can be taken against a man and therefore he should be free to have his protection. Is this question of protection expressed, implied or otherwise, that these men would have Trade Union freedom if they should so desire? 8.05p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member knows that in this case the firemen will have the same protection as policemen and as any member of the Civil Service. In Clauses 16 and 17 of the Bill, provision is made for the appeals from the decision of a subordinate officer to the Chief Fire Officer, and if you are dissatisfied with him you can appeal to the Governor, and if you are dissatisfied with the Governor, you can appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. That is the procedure in the Civil Service and it extends to the Firemen, and in Clause 16 (b), the Chief Fire Officer, may, of his own motion or at the request of such member of the Service, call or permit to be called any further evidence, or may call or permit to be called for further examination any witnesses who gave evidence before the officer who enquired into the charge.

In Clause 17 any member of the Service who is dissatisfied with the decision of his superior officer, may

within seven days after the decision has been communicated to him and subject to the provisions of any regulations governing the same appeal to the Chief Fire Officer who may make such order as the circumstances may require; and any member of the Service who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Chief Fire Officer may, within seven days after the decision has been communicated to him, appeal to the Governor. So it is generally known that anybody has the right to appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that appeal is a different thing from representation. If these firemen are free to be members of the Civil Service Association, then I say I have no quarrel; but I want to know that they are free to join any association. What I am pointing out is that if a man has the right to make an appeal, he should be able to do that and have representation to support the appeal. As it now stands, a Civil Servant is in a better position than a fireman in this sense; if a Civil Servant is dismissed, owing to Whitley Council arrangements he can get the type of representation through the Whitley Council in order to make representation to the person who dismissed him so that the man can argue his case to see whether it is reasonable or justifiable, but in an appeal that goes before the Governor, there is no representation; it is purely a matter of how the Governor feels and the type of representation made. I feel that the firemen in this new Service should be given the right to have a Firemen's Association or be given the freedom of being in an organisation of their choice; it can be within the Civil Service Association, or it can be a structure in which they have their own Whitley Council. I have had it drawn to my attention on one occasion that a fireman was dismissed and he felt that in the circumstances in which he was dismissed, the punishment was too harsh. I had no means of representing the man because there was no avenue through which to make representation. I do not for one moment ask for such persons to be members of a Trade Union that operates outside the service, but I can very well see that with the Fire Service it does operate outside of anything in Jamaica; so the point that the Hon. Premier raised is only in connection with the appeal. I am talking about the type of Trade Union representation that a man is entitled to.

I realise, Mr. Chairman, that the members on the other side are not interested in fundamental human rights therefore the thing I am speaking on is of no interest to them in the Cabinet. But what I am saying is something that may reach Cabinet decision, because if you are setting up a new Fire Service apart from the regular Police Service, we want to know what rights and protection a fireman would have in an Association or Organisation of his own because you are granting a person - and that person is the Governor - power to dismiss this man, and the power of dismissal is through his superior officer. I want to see that a man has protection, so that a Committee, Works Council, Whitley Council or whatever you have should be given that right.

Mr. Chairman, this further speaks of Auxiliary Firemen who are not necessarily part of the permanent structure; so you are setting up a new organisation for fire fighting and it is of such that you have to do it. I do not go further into that because this is where you can enlist men for a year and there is a sort of year-by-year contract. I feel that the rights that a fireman should have should be stated. The Premier says that he has the same rights as other members of the Civil Service. If a man in the Civil Service is dismissed, he can make representation and there is no doubt about that; the Head of Department cannot send in a note and that is all. I know I have sprung something on the Premier in this matter, but I had no opportunity of discussing it before, and it struck me that these are things that should be done. I look upon firemen in the same light as I look upon nurses; it is apart from the regular run of your Civil Service. I do not know what your Regulations may permit, but these are only Regulations.

I think, Mr Chairman, that they hope to amend the Trade Union Act. I know there is a Police Association but

how well it works I do not know. All I want to know is if the Government is in favour of the freedom of association, whether that freedom of association be within the Civil Service or is the formation of their own Organisation. 8.15 p.m.

I feel that they should have the sort of freedom to deal with these things in a similar position as if they were in a Trade Union and in the way in which they can have any representation they may want.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I really do not see any objection to putting that in the Regulations. Anyway, I promise the hon. member to give more thought to it and, as he suggested, it can be included in the Regulations.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is true that the Police has an association but that is an association only in name and is of no benefit to the rank and file. As a matter of fact, somebody just above the rank and file - and I can say it very well now because that Policeman is not in the Force now - expressed a view which was different from the view of the Commissioner of Police and as a result of that he was transferred from the Station over which he was put in authority with the resultant loss of about \$40 a month which he got from travelling. The Police Force thinks nothing of this particular Association. They are expected just to go there to attend meetings just as members of the Reichstag attended meetings when Hitler was in power. They go and say "aye, aye" to whatever the Commissioner says.

I was interested to hear what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said about freedom of association and that sounds much more worthwhile than what exists in Barbados for our policemen. This Section 4 of Clause 10 is really a serious section. Considering it word for word, you realise the tremendous power, the arbitrary power, which is vested in the Governor. It says that the Governor may at any time dismiss from the service or dispense with the services of any subordinate officer or fireman whom he - that is, the Governor - may consider unfit for further service in the Service. That means that it is absolutely in the power of the Governor at any time to dismiss from the service any subordinate officer or fireman for any reason for which the Governor may consider him unfit. I know that we would be told that the Governor would not do that unless he has good reason and no one would expect the Governor to act in an inconsiderate manner. But that has happened already. We have had Governors who have acted that way. There is the appeal to the Chief Fire Officer and then the appeal to the Governor but that does not apply to Section 10, sub-section 4. We may be reminded of the appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Well, Sir, you know about that. You know that the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the receipt of the appeal will reply that he has given the matter his careful consideration and will say that he sees no reason, or that no reasons have been advanced, for him to interfere with the reasons of the Governor.

As I see it, if we leave this sub-section as it is, then any subordinate officer or any fireman is entirely at the mercies of the Governor at any time to be dismissed if the Governor considers him unfit for further service in the Service. There is no limit to his power. His power is absolute, limitless, arbitrary and uncontrolled. I cannot see the justification for that, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to oppose the inclusion of that sub-section of this Clause. I am going to move that Clause 10 be amended by the deletion of sub-section 4 thereof.

The question that Clause 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon'bles Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; M. E. COX; D. D. GARNER; L. St. A. THORNE; R. G. MAPP; F. E. MILLER, Messrs. HOLDER; SEARLES; STRAUGHN and SMITH - 10.

NOES: Messrs CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 2.

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 11 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, again, in sub-section 1 of Clause 11, I deprecate the use of the phrase "without lawful excuse." That is not sufficiently wide. That Clause provides that every subordinate officer or fireman who (a) absents himself from roll-call or from duty for the space of twenty-four hours without lawful excuse; or (b) resigns from or leaves the Service without the permission of the Governor shall be deemed to have illegally resigned from or left the Service and shall be liable on conviction by a Court of summary jurisdiction to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars.

The word "lawful" is much too harsh. There are certain excuses which are lawful, that is to say, excuses which the law accepts. One of them is if a person is ill and he sends in a medical certificate to that effect. That can be regarded as a lawful excuse. If a person is too ill to turn out to work and his illness is supported by a medical certificate that is a lawful excuse; but there are other excuses which we as human beings regard as valid or reasonable which would not be regarded by law as strictly lawful.

I am sure the majority of this House would not be in favour of a subordinate officer or fireman who absents himself to be deemed to have illegally resigned from or left the Service and, therefore, to be liable on conviction to a term of imprisonment or to a fine if he has a reasonable excuse which is not in the strict term a lawful excuse; therefore, I am moving an amendment to delete the word "lawful" where it appears in (a) of Section 11, sub-section 1, and to substitute in its place the word "reasonable". It may happen that there may be a very close family bereavement of a subordinate officer or fireman and for that reason he may absent himself from roll-call. That is a reasonable excuse and I hope that hon. members will be disposed to accept the substitution of that word.

I beg to move now formally the deletion of the word "lawful" and that the word "reasonable" be substituted in lieu thereof. 8.25 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

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

NOES: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 2.

Causes 12 and 13 were called and passed.

Clause 14 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 14 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 14 stand part

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, will you please always look this way? I am sure you will do that when the present Government is in the Opposition.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the moment of interruption.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this matter is non-controversial. (*ASIDES*) Since that is so, we will have to adjourn.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, did the Hon. Leader of the House say that he understood that this matter is controversial? If he did say that, he is quite correct. It is controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter being a controversial one, it cannot be proceeded with any further at this stage.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could get on with the Rates of Income Tax Bill which should be non-controversial because the rates are not being increased and perhaps we could also get on with the Savings Bank Bill. (*AFTER A PAUSE*) I am asking leave to proceed with Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day.

RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with Order No. 5 as the next Order of the Day. And unless there be any objection, leave will be granted. (*AFTER A PAUSE*). There being no objection leave is granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year One thousand nine hundred and sixty and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill, the rates are the same this year as they were last year. There is no change either upwards or downwards. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

The Two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed. The Schedule was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

8.35 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I would like to ask that the last item which stands in my name on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business and which is not numbered, be placed as No. 1 under Private Members' Business. The nature of the Bill is such that it would, as you know, if it passes the Second reading, have to be referred to a Select Committee, and I will ask that it be placed as Order No. 1 so that at the next meeting, it being duly advertised, we might then appoint a Select Committee to consider it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th May at 12 noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.