
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th December, 1962

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to say that the Minutes of the past five Meetings are not yet ready.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the Consumption Tax Order, 1962.

On behalf of the Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, I am commanded to lay the Customs Duties (UNICEF greeting cards,) Order, 1962.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition to incorporate the Home for Elderly Gentlemen.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Premier and Hon. Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve an amendment to the note relating to Item 3 of Head 9, in the Estimates 1962-63, Part II — Capital, providing for staff for Capital Works.

Resolution to place the sum of \$145,250 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63, No. 29, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to consolidate and simplify the law relating to perjury and kindred offences.

A Bill to determine and regulate the powers, privileges and immunities of both chambers of the Legislature, and of the members thereof; to regulate the conduct of members and other persons in connection with the proceedings thereof, to give protection to persons employed in the publication of the reports and other papers of the Legislature; to regulate admittance to the precincts of the Legislature; and for purposes incidental to the matters aforesaid.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: 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 was given today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the Home for Elderly Gentlemen.

QUESTIONS

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that road workers employed by the Southern District Council in the parish of St. John have received back pay in respect only of their work done on highways, and not on tenantry roads?

2. Is Government aware that the reason given for this, is because the vote in respect of tenantry roads has been expended?

3. Will Government as soon as possible provide the necessary funds so as to make up the deficiency in the said vote in order that the workers employed on tenantry roads as aforementioned may receive the back pay due to them?"

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that several parishioners of the parish of St. Philip have long ago filed applications with the Waterworks Department for the installation of water services in their homes, but so far have received no replies to their applications?

2. Will Government speed up their programme for the installation of such water services so that water may be

made available to the said parishioners, if possible, before Christmas?"

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member mean before Christmas, 1962?

Mr. WEEKES: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If so, I would allow him to add that.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

"To enquire of the Minister of Labour:

Is Government aware that there is still a number of workers in the parish of St. Thomas unemployed?

2. In view of the fact that it is not practicable for Government to employ all the Workers in the Island, would the Minister take steps to establish a National Committee to study a programme of industrial and economic expansion which would (a) provide alternate employment for such unemployed workers and (b) create jobs in the community?"

2.45 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to move that a Bill to incorporate a Home for Elderly Gentlemen be now read a first time.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to consolidate and simplify the law relating to perjury and kindred offences was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to determine and regulate the powers, privileges and immunities of both chambers of the Legislature, and of the members thereof; to regulate the conduct of members and other persons in connection with the proceedings thereof; to give protection to persons employed in the publication of reports and other papers of the Legislature; to regulate admittance to the precincts of the Legislature; and for purposes incidental to the matters aforesaid, was read a first time.

STATEMENT *re* POLICY FOR PROTECTION FROM POLLUTION OF UNDERGROUND WATER RESOURCES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to make a Statement on the policy for the protection from pollution of the underground water resources of the Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Statement be made.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: It is as follows:-

In an effort to solve the problem of providing an adequate supply of water to meet the needs of its increasing population, the Government of Barbados sought assistance from the United Nations which provided the services of Dr. Helge Tullstrom, a Hydrogeologist. Dr. Tullstrom with assistance from Mr. E. M. Andrews and Dr. D. Mason-Smith of the United Kingdom Geological Surveys conducted research to discover new sources of water on the Island.

2. In the process of this research, Dr. Tullstrom has discovered that there is an ever-present danger of pollution of the sheet-water areas by domestic and industrial wastes, and has recommended the division of the Island into five (5) zones for water protection purposes.

3. The Government considers it essential, in the interest of the community, to protect its water resources and proposes therefore to introduce legislation shortly to give effect to this policy.

4. Pending the introduction of the necessary legislation, the Government proposes to embark upon a programme of publicity in order that the public may be made fully aware of the effect which this policy will have on further development.

5. In order that the public may be acquainted with the areas which will be affected, maps of the Island, showing those areas in which development will be restricted, will be posted in public places through the Island, in Schools Public Libraries, Post Offices, Local Government Offices, Police Stations, and will also be available to firms of Solicitors and Real Estate Agents.

6. Government fully appreciates that a number of persons in these areas may be put to some inconvenience as a result of the need to protect the Island's underground water resources but is confident that those individuals who may be adversely affected will appreciate the desirability of protecting the underground water resources in the interest of the community as a whole and will accordingly co-operate to the fullest with Government in this matter.

7. It must be emphasized that any development carried out in restricted zones, after the making of this statement, and contrary to the Government's declared policy on Underground Water Protection will, in all probability, be affected by the Legislation which will have to be enacted to give effect to the Government's policy in this matter.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time. There is only one reply to Question No. 53/1962 which was given notice of by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown on 5th June, this year. The hon. member is not at the moment in his place, and I think he will like to allow the reply to the question to stand over until the next meeting of the House.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown whose seat, I observe, is instantly vacant.

RESOLUTION *re* BARBADIAN SEAMEN EMPLOYED ON S.S. CATALINA

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas: to move the passing of a Resolution *re* Barbadian Seamen employed on S.S. Catalina.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of this Resolution.

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to investigate the circumstances surrounding the employment, conditions of work, incidence of pay and discharge of the Barbadian Seamen who joined the S.S. Catalina at New Orleans, Louisiana, U.S.A. on 10th December, 1961, and who were discharged at the Bahamas Islands approximately three months afterwards."

Mr. Speaker, we all are aware — those of us who go to the theatre and those of us who read — of the story of Captain Bligh and the Mutiny of the Bounty. What I am about to embark on is somewhat reminiscent of Captain Bligh and the Mutiny of the Bounty, the only difference being that these unfortunate seamen did not have a Fletcher Christian to come to their rescue. These men left Barbados on 10th December, 1961 and they left here with the understanding at first that they were going to join a ship by the name of the "Bahamas Pearl", but when they got to New Orleans and they went aboard a ship, instead of its being the "Bahamas Pearl", they went aboard a ship which was in

far worse condition than the "Bahamas Pearl". This ship was called the "Catalina S".

I am sure that all of us here remember that the "Catalina S". was tied up in Barbados about a month and a half ago. These men joined this ship at New Orleans and left New Orleans on 12th December, 1961 to go to Texas. After about three hours sailing on their way to Texas, there was a mishap on this ship when the Chief Engineer fell through the bilge. If you know anything of a ship, you will know, when the bilge plates begin to get rotten, that that ship is really unseaworthy.
2.55 p.m.

The ironical thing about it is that it is flying the British Flag and not the Pan American or the Liberian Flag. I would like to know what sort of insurance agents Lloyds have got there. This ship started out with a bad taste from the beginning. On the way to Texas the Chief Engineer fell through the bilge and the ship had to turn back to New Orleans. The ship sailed from New Orleans without a Chief Engineer; anybody who knows anything about Maritime Laws will know that a ship cannot leave any Port without a Chief Engineer or a Captain. This ship left New Orleans without a Chief Engineer on the way to Texas and whilst it was in Texas the authorities came aboard, stuck up notice on the ship and seized it for the non-payment of money which was due and owing by a former Engineer. That is in the days of the skull and cross-bone. After about three hours' argument, the money was paid and the ship continued to sail from Texas. It left Texas on the way to the Bahamas, but before it could pass Louisiana it broke down on its way just after Alabama. It had to be towed into Alabama where the men stayed for two days without food or proper accommodation. As soon as the ship was about to sail from Mobile, it was seized again for more non-payment. After that was clarified, the ship left on its way to the Bahamas but it broke down again when it reached Florida. This would all seem to be a joke, but that is what took place. Anybody who knows anything about Gulf Ports..... (ASIDES) That is your business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member remember that he has before him an amplifier which sometimes works.

Mr. BOXILL: That was not meant for your ears, Sir. As I was saying, the last Gulf Port is Texas. You have Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. The ship broke down again and it had to be towed into Florida. The crew members were for one month trying to repair this ship. As soon as the ship was about to sail from Florida it was seized again by the salvaging crew. As you know, Sir, if the master of any ship hears that another ship is in distress, he tries to get there first because the first ship which arrives on the spot is entitled to a fairly good pay. The salvaging ship seized that ship for the payment of more money. The money was paid and the ship continued on its way to the Bahamas. On the way to the Bahamas quite a number of minor incidents took place. When they reached Free Port, the ship broke down again and the crew were adrift for about five hours on Christmas Day. The ship was towed into the Bahamas for fuel and that was after it had broken down. I cannot see how any insurance agency could allow a ship to sail under those conditions. On reaching the Bahamas, the Captain decided to carry the ship back to the United States, whereas the men left with the idea that they would be plying between Barbados, the Bahamas and the United States. The men were badly treated in the matter of accommodation. I was appalled to think that Barbadian seamen had to work on a ship like that. It was a Barbadian trap if ever there was one.

Whilst in the Bahamas these men told the Captain — and a number of the engineers realised it — that the ship was unseaworthy. I hate to use these words, but I like to be factual. In my opinion, because these men were coloured men and they were Barbadians without representation, they met all sorts of hardships and difficulties in the Bahama Islands. Those who know the Bahama Islands know that segregation and racial discrimination are two by-products of these islands. The Captain attacked the Chief Cook with a knife and probably the man defended

himself. The Captain assaulted the Third Engineer. The Chief Cook and the Third Engineer brought cases against the Captain and those cases came before a Magistrate called Mr. James Little.

Mr. SPEAKER: Have those cases been completed?

Mr. BOXILL: Yes, Sir; that is why I am mentioning this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought so.

Mr. BOXILL: The magistrate, Mr. James Little, had at once branded three men as mutineers. Things were so bad in the Bahamas that these people could not even get their mails. These people were refused their mails and that is a serious offence. What makes this whole thing worse is that none of these seamen have been paid from the time they joined the ship. It is a normal procedure that when a Barbadian seaman joins a ship he makes an allotment to his loved ones back home, which is a common-sense thing to do anyhow. In the case of these men, their loved ones never received any allotment, and still these men were not getting the money on the ship. Sometimes they sent around a money list so that a seaman could borrow money if he wanted to do so, but sometimes a man would put down his name for \$25 and then he only got \$5. Some of these men left the ship with money owing to them of as much as \$350 U.S. and they cannot get their money. I am therefore calling on this Government to see to it that the agents, J.N. Harriman & Co., be made to see that these men are paid their money.
3.05 p.m.

If men leave here to go to work, the point is that they must be paid. They cannot leave here and go to work haphazardly like that, and if J. N. Harriman took on the responsibility of being agent for this Company, he is therefore obligated to pay these seamen their money. What made this thing worse is that these seamen were discharged with D.R. The initials "D.R." mean "Declined to Report"; it means that the seaman's conduct was so bad that you could not write a report in his discharge book against him. There was absolutely no justification for writing D.R. in these men's books under the circumstances in which these men had to come back here. Even if it were so, there is absolutely no justification in these men not receiving their pay. As a result of D.R. being written in their books, only one man has got a ship since, and the others are still here swelling the unemployment ranks of the already displaced seamen.

Those of us who read the papers fairly often would have seen that not so long ago over 400 seamen were laid off from Harrison boats, and if you add them to the other seventeen here now, that will make the number 417. It is true that we expect seamen to give of their best when they go out, and no one knows what I am saying better than I do, and I have all reasons to believe that these men meant good. I am always saying that these seamen must blame themselves, because the Barbadian seaman is a bit too lackadaisical in joining institutions that will help him foster his cases. Several months ago I tried to introduce them to the Union; some of them joined and others did not; but because they have themselves to blame is no reason why I or anybody in this Chamber or in the Island should be castigating them now, especially in a case where they are right. If they did not want to join the Union and have made their bed hard, they must lie on it; but there is no reason why I, as a member of this Government or of the community of Barbados and as a former seaman, should sit idly by and allow this money to go unchecked.

I am therefore asking Government to make representation to J. R. Harriman immediately as regards the pay for these men. I was told yesterday that the agents at Harriman have said that this shipping company owes them something like \$16,000; that is a matter for Harriman. They can afford to lose it. The ship was here and if they wanted to do something they should have seized it. Up to now the ship is in Trinidad. Barbadians were taken from here, because they are always sent out "haryscary", and sent there

because they wanted them to work in the most deplorable conditions possible. It is hard to ask a seaman — and even when he is on a luxury ship he meets it hard sometimes because the sea can be pretty rough — after getting bad food not through any fault of the agents or the owners of the ship, but through the fault of the cooks themselves to undergo some U.S. \$350; that is asking a bit too much.

I have my doubts about Captain Webster, because if he were a legitimate captain, I think he would have known something about maritime rules, and as far as has been reported to me, this man has broken every rule in the book. I do not know how he was impressed. Probably thought that Barbadians came from the deepest part of Africa or from the Congo and had nobody to represent them. I am calling on the Government to institute an investigation into this matter, and as a matter of fact, I am asking that D.R. be erased from these men's books immediately, because if these men go to another shipping company, they will not be hired if D.R. is written on their books. This is a stigma and is reminiscent of when a boy in Barbados goes to Dodds, and if you do not know a fellow has been to Dodds, you do not worry. When a Captain takes a man's discharge book and sees D.R. in it, it means that this man is so bad that the other Captain who wrote it refused to make a report. I am calling on the Government to have this D.R. erased immediately because we do not know what might happen. With the present situation, the world might be plunged into war any moment and you will need seamen, and I am sure that Barbadians as in the 1939 War would be willing to go, but whether or not there is war, no Captain is going to take a man if he is of bad conduct.

Mr. Speaker, without much further ado I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I think that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has covered almost all the points that were also brought to my attention; but just to strengthen one point, those men who worked on the boat were Barbadians, and we have heard that due to no fault of their own, since they are not members of the Barbados Workers' Union, it might be impracticable for the Union to represent them. I feel that this Government should come to the rescue of these men and make strong representation to the Head Office in connection with obtaining the wages which are due to these men. We have heard that some of the men's wages happen to be in the vicinity of U.S. \$350 and this is no small amount for these men who go to sea in ships and occupy their business in great waters, and therefore I feel that this Resolution at this time is most fitting, and I counsel hon. members to support it wholeheartedly in order that the Government can act immediately in trying to implement some solution which will tend to bring satisfaction not only to these men but to their families.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution, I must say that we should take the greatest interest in these seamen who leave dry land to go to the high seas and work for their living and also to support their families. 3.15 p.m.

I have heard one hon. member say that we should think of those people who go to the high seas and do business in great waters. When we think of how these ships go through heavy seas — sometimes ships go down and yet the crew are rescued and manage to reach their native land again — you should not be too harsh on those people who go down to the high seas and do business in great waters. These seamen should be highly respected and their interest should be protected by the Government as a whole because when these seamen go out on ships they leave their homes for years or for months, and therefore they cannot see their families or relatives during that time although sometimes they are able to correspond with them. How hard it must be to them when they cannot hear from their family because of some misfortune!

I am saying from henceforth no seamen about to join a ship should do so without an enquiry from the Union. I am sure if they were members of the Union and they made enquiries first that a lot of the trouble which is now passing through the hands of the Government would have been in the hands of the Union and we would not have to make an appeal here.

I hope the Government would take an interest in these poor people and look after their rights and welfare and get in contact with the agents of this ship and see that these poor seamen be rewarded for their tasks.

Sir, every seaman, whether he be a fisherman or whether he works on a large ship, should be recognised and the utmost care should be taken of him. It does not take a fearful man to go to sea; it takes a fearless man. Fishermen go out to sea when we are lying down to bring in food for us. These poor men go out to sea at the risk of their lives to search for food for us. Therefore, I am willing to support a Resolution such as this and I hope that the Government will make speed, hurry up and do the best they can for the protection of these poor seamen.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. George caught my eye first.

Mr. MILLER: In reply to this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a simple contribution. I have listened to the wonderful demonstrations and dramatisation of sympathy by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and I was looking forward to living again in 1890, the story of the Mutiny on the Bounty.

What I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, is if we are not wasting time, and I was thinking whether what this House is now considering as stemming from the motion of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is something which we can do anything about. Surely, if nothing can come out of it we can use some of the energy in some other direction so as to bring some relief to these seamen in another way. Unless we are told by the Hon. Minister that we can do something, I believe we are wasting time. What effect this Resolution is likely to have when passed by this House is just as much as our wishing one another the Seasons' Greetings and singing the carol of the Three Ships or the Three Kings. If there is nothing which we can do, I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the House generally to save us from this precious waste of time. During the debate, we observed that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew did take a trip out to sea, but I think we are really wasting the time of the House in discussing a matter of this nature.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who moved this Resolution did so in the best interest of not only those who may have suffered but those who may be engaged in the same sphere of activities. A Resolution of this sort would no doubt be the circumstance to inform hon. members of what he has said would be gone into, and I have no doubt that what the hon. member has said, the facts which he has put to the House, when the Government goes into those facts, the Government may well think that it is a question which needs an amendment to the maritime law or may call for some specialist advice.

In supporting the spirit of this Resolution, I say that when the matters are gone into by the Government I have no doubt that some attempt will be made by the Government to see what merit there is in the Resolution and if anything can be done to help these poor seamen. If something can be done, I am certain that there will be no hesitation by those in authority to do something.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas started out by quoting the "Mutiny on the

Bounty". In the days of "The Bounty", those were hard days and hard men, and the Articles of Association signed by crews in those days coped with the days in which those men lived. I would say that for a man, William Bligh, to navigate an open boat for a distance of 600 miles is no mere feat in those days, and it would only take a man of very hard calibre and hard days that could perform that feat. Today, crews of ships are bound by law, especially crews of British ships, which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas well knows about, and the crew of any ship trading outside of the coastal waters of the United Kingdom is required to sign Articles of Agreement, and in Articles of Agreement the wages of the crew are stipulated and there is a Clause with respect to the food, the conditions and every possible thing relating to safety. This agreement is signed between the crew and master of the ship, and upon any violation of it by the Captain, if the ship is in a foreign port, the crew has a right to call on any British Consul for their representation.

As regards the matter of the "Bahamas Pearl" or the "Catalina S" which was one and the same ship — apparently her name was the "Catalina S", and the ship applied for registration to be called the "Bahamas Pearl" when she was lying in one of the Gulf Ports and she had a crew selected from the Harbour and Shipping Master's office in Bridgetown to proceed to that port to join the "Catalina S".
3.25 p.m.

The Agreement was signed by Harriman & Co. up to that time for the arrival of the crew and they would have had the right to make their selection if they were not satisfied with the conditions. A seaman should know a ship and he should know whether the ship was suited to go to sea or not. The seaman would have the right to call upon the British Consul of that Port as to the seaworthiness of the ship.

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister said that, from his experience of going to sea, a seaman should know if a ship is seaworthy or not. The Hon. Minister is forgetting that a seaman is not an insurance agent. The British representative in New Orleans is so far distant to reach that these men will have to spend all their money before they could see him.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the information of the hon. member, these men could not be far enough removed because the only place or person that the seamen could sign a copy of the agreement would be before the British Consul. As long as there is a British Consul in a port and there are seamen signing on to a ship, under British registration it must be before a British Consul. The hon. member is quite aware of that; he should know that. If that is not done then there is a violation of the law. If a ship is proceeding to sea outside the official hours, then the seamen sign on at the first port. The crew will get information that they were to sign on. In relation to the hardships endured at sea and the breaking down of the ship at sea, all that is part of the calculated risk. That is completely different from the seamen not receiving their wages. I have no worry about the hardships endured at sea because those hardships will make those men better men.

With regard to the hon. member saying that the Chief Engineer fell through the bilge, that is another one coming to me. I have reports that there was a depth of 14 feet of water in the engine room, but I would like to see a ship which could propel again with that amount of water in the engine room. As a seaman, I have to think again when people say that a ship had 14 feet of water in the engine room and it was still propelling out to sea. To me that is a joke. Anybody who accepts that would have something else coming to him. That is the sort of thing to which you have to pay great concern. We have heard that the ship had been sold. The first claim on any ship is the wages of the crew, irrespective of whom they owe. A ship can own harbour dues and anything else, but the wages of the crew must come out first. That is something which is international; that is known all over the world. It is very mysterious to me to hear that this ship was seized and sold in the Bahamas as stated by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of order. I am sorry that I have to interrupt the hon. member, but I cannot allow him to say that I made statements which I did not make. He has said that I said that the ship was seized and sold in the Bahamas, but I have never said anything like that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The hon. junior member for St. James said that the ship was in the Bahamas. I understand that it was broken down on the way to the Bahamas, on the way to Free Port. That is near to Nassau which is the capital of the Bahamas where I have spent about 15 years. There are very strong currents prevailing in these waters; the Bahama Islands are just slightly to the East of the Gulf Stream and the Gulf Stream is along the coast between the Bahamas and the United States near to Cape Hatteras. In March, this year the Government received information and letters from members of the crew of the ship "Catalina S" that they were stranded in the Bahamas. Several cables were sent to the Government and the Comptroller of Customs who is also Superintendent of Shipping in the Bahamas, for the repatriation of the crew. I paid great attention to this matter before anything was done in making it sure to the crew that leaving the Bahamas without legal claims to their rights would have been forsaking their rights. As long as the ship was there, several lawsuits came out of this matter between the master and the crew. The master charged several of the crew with being mutinous and some of the crew members charged the master with assault. At that stage the Government could not do anything in the matter of negotiations when a lawsuit or lawsuits were going on between the master of the ship and the crew, and we had no idea of the Articles of Association which had been signed by the crew members of the ship. The whole idea of this matter hinges on the copy of the Agreement which was signed by the crew of the "Catalina S" and the Barbadian crew who were members of that ship.
3.35 p.m.

If the crew of the Catalina had signed an agreement for six months out of Barbados plying between known waters, and the master of the ship had deviated from that agreement with regard to the limit of their latitude or longitude to which they had signed to ply between, then it would have been a violation, and they would have had every right because the master would have been breaking the Regulations of the agreement. Mr. Speaker, we know absolutely nothing about the agreement that was signed by the crew and the master which is the essential fact in this case. The agents here are not liable, nor can the Harbour and Shipping Office here hold the agents liable for the crew after they had met and signed a separate agreement. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the agreement that the crew signed in Barbados with Harriman & Company became null and void immediately after they signed the Articles of Association on that ship; therefore Harriman and Company, the agents for the ship, could not be liable at all.

I interviewed several members of the crew of the Catalina on arrival here, and they said that there was a law suit pending in the Bahamas and that they had retained Counsel in the Bahamas to represent their interests. At a time when the interests of the crew of the ship was being represented by legal counsel in a foreign country, it would have been wrong for the Government to step in and make negotiations; we could do absolutely nothing about it. What this Government did was to send word to the Comptroller of Customs in the Bahama Islands and we went as far as to cable His Excellency in the Bahamas that should these Barbadian seamen need repatriation they be looked after and be repatriated to Barbados as soon as they decided to do so, because immediately they left they were forsaking their rights as long as the master did not discharge them; the time of their agreement was not up and they would have been breaking the agreement. This Government did everything to see that they were not left in the Bahamas to be a nuisance or menace or endure any hardships, but it was clearly stated in every letter I wrote to them that if they left without being discharged or any legal claims stating that the ship was unseaworthy, they would be forsaking their rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I heard of an engineer falling through the bilges of the ship, that has beaten all I have

heard in my sea-faring life. I cannot imagine a member of a crew falling through the bilges. I saw the Catalina here a few months ago with a cargo of corn meal. For four months she was towed by a small tug making about three knots an hour. Eventually some person in Trinidad bought the cargo for feed for pigs. She was towed by the same Star 30, a small tug of about forty feet long, and they endured very heavy weather.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas made a reference to segregation and the people of the Bahamas. I do not know how many voyages the hon. member made to the Bahamas, but I have from 1941 to 1961 made voyages to the Bahamas, and I could never say so for any of the people in the Bahamas, and that is honest. I know quite a number of people in the Bahamas; I have taken several policemen, school teachers and other people to the Bahamas, and I am sure if you gave them a choice of coming back to Barbados or staying in the Bahamas, they would say possibly "Barbados to live, but the Bahamas to make finance"; and I would agree with them. I would not agree with them at all if they said that justice was taken completely out of the hands of the seamen in the Bahamas because they were coloured, neither would I associate myself with saying that of the Islands of the Bahamas. I have been associated with all types of classes and creeds in the Bahamas and I should know them.

The position at present is this: the crew of the ship was repatriated at the expense of this Government. This Government cabled His Excellency in Nassau to repatriate the crew and they were met when they came here. I sent out instructions to the Shipping Office that a clerk from that Office should meet the crew at Seawell Airport and be sure that they had transportation to Bridgetown; so I would not like anybody in this Honourable House to feel that the crew of the Catalina was left adrift and came back to Barbados and nothing was done by this Government. This Government paid to bring them back to Barbados, and I saw to it myself that a clerk from the Shipping Office went to Seawell Airport to meet them on arrival and have them transported to Bridgetown; but I made it clear to them before they left the Bahamas that they might have been forsaking their legal rights when they left the Bahamas with a law suit pending. They said they were quite satisfied and that they had legal representation pursuing the law suit. There are a lot of policemen and teachers in the Bahamas, and the mere fact that these men were from Barbados, I knew that they would suffer no hardships at all in the Bahamas. Neither one of these men could come back to Barbados and say they went hungry for one day in the Bahamas for the number of Barbadian policemen and other people I know in the Bahamas and the kind hearted people I know they are. This Government did everything in its power to see that they were repatriated, and it was made clear that if the Salvage Association people had seized that ship and brought it to the Bahamas, gone into the law courts and legal claims came out, as long as the crew's case was put, the members of the crew of every ship has priority. The first charge on claims must be for the crew of any ship, not only a British ship.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other hon. member is disposed to contribute to this debate, I will advise the Hon. Proposer of the motion that the moment is appropriate for him to exercise his right of reply.
3.45 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, when I started my debate on this Resolution, I, more or less, knew all the facts; but it really looks as if you are going to be in here today very late. The Hon. Minister said that he does not know of any segregation in the Bahamas. We are not here to discuss segregation, but if he does not know, I know.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the information of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I did not say that I do not know of any segregation in the Bahamas; I never said there was no segregation in the Bahamas. I said that it was not as bad as all of that that justice could be taken away from the people.

Mr. BOXILL: Sir, I do not want to waste time, but it is fortunate that the Minister is a member of my Government. I am saying that these people were not charged as mutineers by any captain. These men were not on a charge of being mutineers by the Magistrate who tried their case. When you sign articles here, you sign that you should have British representation. But I am afraid to say that I have signed more articles outside of Barbados than I have signed here. When I was travelling to Curacao and Venezuela as a seaman I did not see any British Consul. The Colonial Secretary of the Bahamas.....

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, again I rise on a point of order. The ship was not in Barbados. I would like to make it clear to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that the ship was not in Barbados and the crew for that ship was selected in Barbados and flown from here and put on the ship at a Gulf Port; so they must have signed on before a British Consul unless there was not a British Consul within 50 miles, and if that had not been so, somebody violated the law.

Mr. BOXILL: I signed on here and I signed in front of a captain. That has happened many times. I have been a seaman for 20 years and 20 years is a long time. I know whereof I speak. What I know of maritime law is that if a ship goes on dock, it is the onus of the ship's agents to find accommodation for the crew. These seamen in the Bahamas were like canaries; whether these canaries go to the east or to the west it was nobody's business and they did not know where to go.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. At no time the "Catalina S" was alongside a dock. As a matter of fact, there is no dock in the Bahamas on which the "Catalina S" would go because there is no dock big enough.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. The hon. member is forgetting that I am an old sea dog too. Whether you are on dock or not, you are still on dock so long as the ship is tied up. He is taking the word "dock" literally. We mean tied up alongside. These men had to get whatever accommodation they could from friends or relatives. The onus was on the captain to find accommodation for these seamen. These men had their own lawyer, but as I have said before, nothing came out of that.

I am sorry that the Hon. Minister has left this Chamber. I do not know where he got his information from, but I want the House to know that whenever I come in here with a Resolution, I have already known the answer. I do not come in here with a Resolution for publicity. I had all the publicity when I was a young man as a footballer and a swimmer. When I come in here with a statement I want it to be taken seriously. Wherever the Hon. Minister got his information from, I want to tell him that it is wrong information. It is time that he do a little checking for himself. Let me tell him that the new dance, "The Twist", is getting out of fashion. These people will take things and twist them to suit themselves and I am not going to stand for it.

The Colonial Secretary of the Bahamas who should have seen these men refused bluntly to see them. Furthermore, the captain asked the police to arrest these men. As regards the Hon. Minister talking of signing an agreement, I do not care what agreement you sign and you do not like the working conditions, you can sign off. These are not the days of "The Bounty". When a man signs on a ship today and he does not like the conditions, he can sign off. Whether the man broke the contract or not, they are entitled to their pay. They should be paid from the time they signed on until the time they signed off. I am interested in these men because they were taken up from Barbados and signed on to work from here and therefore, we, as members of this Honourable House, should represent these people. I do not want it to be whenever I come in here that some Lord Gort can come and give the Hon. Minister information as he likes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of elucidation. I would like to inform the hon. junior mem-

ber for St. Thomas, that at 14 years of age I signed my first articles on a ship as a cabin boy and I have done nothing more in my career than a seaman except when I joined this Government. All my entire days I spent at sea; so there is nothing new in the maritime laws or the seafaring line that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas can tell me about.

Mr. BOXILL: The Hon. Minister said something of a ship sailing in 14 feet of water. I would never have made that statement. What I would say is that it is a hyperbole, and an over-exaggerated statement. It meant not 14 feet, but a lot of feet in water. I am saying that some sort of representation should be made to Harriman's. An amount of \$350 at Christmas time is money in any kind of language.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have already explained that when the agreement was signed with Harriman's, the crew was selected in the Island of Barbados until they arrived at the Gulf Port; but automatically as soon as the crew signed articles with the ship, the agreement made by Harriman became null and void, and therefore, Harriman's was exempted as soon as the crew signed articles with that ship.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: That is somewhat foreign to me. I came in here on the 2nd August from New Zealand on a ship. I signed my Articles here. The agents for the ship was Messrs. Robert Thom Ltd. When I joined the ship in England we had to sign the Articles of the ship but that did not nullify the agreement which I had in respect of my allotment. All the people who joined ships with Mr. Grannum had their allotments sent to them. I signed the agreement in Germany and there was no British Consul there. My allotment was still coming to Mr. Grannum. Is it that as soon as the men get aboard the ship, Harriman is no longer responsible? If that is so, that is foreign to me. Something is wrong. When the men sign here, the agent is responsible for them until they get back here unless they run away. I cannot understand this talk; the Hon. Minister is an old, experienced man in this business and he is allowing some sort of nit-wit to push these things down his throat and he expects me to accept them! You can tell that to the Marines; I am not a Marine, I am a real sailor. When you sign an agreement with the shipping agent here, that agreement stands until you come back here and sign off. On many occasions when Harriman & Co. sign on men, they are paid through the agency. You must sign the Articles of the ship whether it is from Ireland, Norway or Timbuctoo. The agents are those who employ you; they tell you what wages you will be paid and they are responsible for you. Harriman & Co. are therefore responsible for these people's money.

Mr. Speaker, I will agitate for these poor, unfortunate men who joined the "Catalina S", I am stating emphatically that the ship was unseaworthy. They tried to change the registration in the Bahamas but they were refused. I hold an indictment against the British Government for allowing a ship like that to travel in these circumstances; with the coming of the next five or six days a period of a year will have elapsed since these things took place. If these men had joined the Union I would have been aboard the ship and there would have been "federation", as the people say, down there, because I would have seen to it that these men got their money. I am calling on the Government to make an investigation into this matter. I am not embarrassing the Government; but if they want to start something down there with Harriman & Co., I am ready for it. Let these people pay the men their money. I do not know some of these men, but the people have sent me in here to represent them. I have come in here to represent people, not only those in St. Thomas but to represent people who live in Barbados and who are treated unfairly by somebody else. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to say these things whether somebody likes it or not; I want the Hon. Minister to understand that when I come in this House and ask a question or bring forward a Resolution, it is not a matter of cheap publicity. When I ask a question I already have the answer to that question. I am

asking the Government to institute some sort of investigation into the manner in which these men joined this ship. I also want the Government to call on Messrs. Harriman & Co. Ltd. about the payment of this money. They made an agreement with these people and these are the people to whom these shipping agents owe this \$350.

The Hon. Minister of Communications did not remember to mention anything about D.R.; that is a stigma. The letters D.R. mean "declined to report", and when you get those letters in your book you cannot even join a landship down here. That is equivalent to a magistrate deeming a person to be a rogue and a vagabond.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. James is well aware of the fact that in no shipping office can any officer from any mercantile or any other association change anything which is written, signed and stamped by another Government in another port. The hon. member has said that he is here to represent the people; well, I am here to represent people equally as well; but when something is wrong, when people have gone wrong on something, I will not poke out my nose at somebody so as to make myself or this Government look foolish. If there is one man who will tell anybody that he is wrong when he is wrong, that man is myself.

Mr. BOXILL: The Hon. Minister has said that he will not condone anything that is wrong; but I will tell him that I will never come in here when I know that a seaman is wrong, and ask somebody to give him the right; I am not a village idiot.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of elucidation. I have carried out all the investigations that I could possibly carry out in this matter. I have not got the file with me here because that file is in the office of the Attorney General. I can defend this matter without the file because it is fresh in my mind. The Hon. Premier and I worked on this matter all along and we sent the cables. It was only when a lawsuit was pending that we could not do anything; we could not do anything in defence of the seamen when a lawsuit was pending in another country. It would have to be known that the law suit has ended before we could do anything in the matter.
4.05 p.m.

I would know much better than that, Mr. Speaker, but the file is at present still in the hands of the Attorney General of this Island who is investigating the matter; so I do not want the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to think that as a seaman I was sitting down in Barbados. Some of the crew of that ship sailed with me for years.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Minister through you if this D. R. cannot be erased as he is trying to make me believe, as though it is a birth mark. Why has the boatswain gone on another ship? I have already warned you and I am warning the House again that whenever I come here I come fully armed with my facts; I do not come here to talk for talking's sake.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, the discharge is not a loose leaf system any longer as it was years ago. There is a proper book and the pages are numbered; in it are written the character and ability of the seaman, if he is an A.B., O.S., or whatever may be his rating and it is signed by the master of the ship with his registered ship's tonnage. If that book contains a discharge with D. R., which is "Declined to Report", and the owner of that book took the leaf out, that leaf which is numbered would be missing, which automatically becomes a black mark against him. No Superintendent of ships in any part of the world could remove that unless it was with the consent of the master who signed it, nor is there anybody in the Shipping Office in Barbados that can remove D.R. from my discharge book or the hon. member's discharge book unless it was with the consent of the very master who had signed it. This is nothing I am wondering about, Mr. Speaker; this is something I have spent almost my entire life on, and I am not feeling for these things. I do not have

to refer to any books because that has been part of my day's work.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing that the Hon. Minister is not a judge because he has already condemned these men. From what I have gathered — he has not said it directly — he has implied that these men are guilty of breaking some contract. I do not care if they break a million contracts. I have worked with Shipping Companies that broke their contracts too. Some men came back home two weeks ago because the contract was broken; they could not do anything about it. These are no real contracts; you sign an agreement to work for a year, but if you do not like the ship you can leave; nobody chains you to a ship. From the way the Hon. Minister is speaking, I can see that these men are already convicted. A court in the Bahamas could not convict them, but one in Barbados is going to convict them. I do not care what you say; I am still going to agitate.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What the Hon. Minister says.

Mr. BOXILL: I do not care what the Hon. Minister says, I am still going to agitate if it causes me my life, because my life does not value me much when I am representing people. This is what I would call an unfair situation. The Hon. Minister has come here and told us that he has investigated this thing. I have no reason to doubt him, but I can call a number of people whom he has not asked anything. He has probably investigated this through the Shipping Office.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, I have just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that the members in the engineering department of that ship are personal friends of mine and they sailed with me for many years, and have told me the entire story. Only a few days ago, one of the men, Theophilus Paul from St. John, was in my home talking about the matter.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, this engineer who was in the Hon. Minister's home is God; he must tell the truth at all times. He is God and I am Boxill and I am not accepting that. I am saying here now that you can bring a million files, I do not read any, nor am I supposed to believe anything I see in a file either, because just last week I received an answer to a question I asked, which was completely different from the question I asked. In this case I am not going to back down. Do not worry to bring any files to me because I know there are always three sides to a story; your side, their side and the truth. If you and I got in a fight, I would walk about and say you struck me first, and you are going to to say that I struck you first. But then you have to hear from somebody outside. I am sure that the people who gave me this story have no reason to lie, because they did know that I would bring the matter here. The Hon. Minister is saying that when a D.R. is written in your book it cannot be removed; the book can be thrown away, though. The men cannot throw away the books because they are in the Shipping Office. These men have been victimised. I want to make it clear here — and I want the newspapers when they are printing to print the truth — that I am not for one moment condoning that people do not want to work and come back to Barbados and get on like fools, but I have every reason to believe the statements I got from these men. If they were all this good as he would like to make me believe, I would like to know why the Chief Engineer walked off and had the ship held up for his pay. Why didn't he try to see the Second Engineer?

I have a paper from the Bahamas which I forgot at home. The headline was "Cataline S again" and they went on to give the story and the Second Engineer said that this ship was a booby trap if ever there was one, and if the Second Engineer does not know, I do not know who knows; but the Hon. Minister has a tendency to pay too much reliance on certain people. I am the type of man who likes to look for myself. You cannot water-wash anything and hand it to me. I will say again that whenever I bring a question here, it is because I already know the answer. I only come here to warn the Government or this House about what is taking place; so do not give me any tomfoolery for answers. Sometimes when I get the answers I do not get up to thank

them because I am so annoyed to think that big old gentlemen would allow these things to be perpetuated all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to hon. members as big old gentlemen?

Mr. BOXILL: Not in the least, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Venerable and honourable gentlemen would be permissible.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: What appals me most is this. I did not expect that because the Hon. Minister of Communications is a Minister or because he went to sea that he should feel that these seamen want to get somebody's money for nothing. An article appeared in the Press two Saturdays ago where I admonished seamen to be always on time and to give of their best because if a job is worthwhile, it is worthwhile doing good. For the 20 years which I have been to sea I have never been discharged from a ship for incompetence. As a matter of fact, I have never been discharged from a ship at all. That is a record; that is something to be proud of. So, Mr. Speaker, you will see that I am not getting up in here to air my mouth. What surprises me and appals me is that the Hon. Minister has taken that attitude. I do not know whom he has investigated, but whoever they are from whom he has got his information, they are wrong.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have not heard the Hon. Minister at any stage state that these men were wrong. The Hon. Minister of Communications at one stage said that he is not coming in here to defend people who are wrong, that if a person is wrong, you tell them that they are wrong and if they are right, you tell them that they are right. That statement can be taken to mean the owners, the master or anybody is wrong. He never in his statement said that he judged the crew to be wrong. He indicated on several occasions to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that while the ship was in the Bahamas this Government took an active part in the relief of the crew and they were brought here at the Government's expense. The matter was under the jurisdiction of the Courts and the Government is still holding a watching brief on behalf of the seamen whom he considers to be aggrieved.

I do not know what the quarrel is all about, unless it is a display of seamanship between the Hon. Minister and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I have no doubt in my mind who has the better qualifications, but they are both members of the House. They are not at sea any more.

Mr. BOXILL: I would like to remind the Hon. Premier that we in this House do not want his opinion right now. I do not want his opinion on this subject. When I want it, I will ask for it. I never said that the Hon. Minister was stating a fact; I said he implied. If you do not know the English language, come up at me and learn it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a direction to the Chair?

Mr. BOXILL: No, Sir. I must apologise to you for that. When the Hon. Premier gets up on a point of order, do not try to misconstrue what I have said.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to appeal to my honourable friend and I will almost say my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. Just as I have said earlier, I think we are spending too much time on this; to me, we are wasting the time of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that intended as a point of order?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir, it is a point of order. You will want to hear it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard enough of it to know that it is not a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: Will you change it to a point of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member want to make a point of elucidation?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir. With the permission of my hon. friend, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let it be borne in mind that you must elucidate some matter raised by that hon. member in the course of his speech which was made so long ago that we can hardly recall it now, as well as we would like.

Mr. MILLER: I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the Government to see that since we have had this display, we can save time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of elucidation. It would well appear that the hon. member is now playing for time.

Mr. MILLER: If you fail to give me an opportunity to make my point, you will not be able to determine the point which I have to make. Give me an opportunity to say what I have to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is making a point of order, let it be a point of order. If it is a point of elucidation, let it be a point of elucidation.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I believe we are wasting time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your appeal is not a point of elucidation.

Mr. MILLER: No matter how I get up, someone tries to make me sit down. It has been going on, if Your Honour recollects, as long as six months. However, Sir, we have been going on since 2.30 o'clock on this matter on which the Hon. Minister has actually said nothing....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a second speech. Let the hon. junior member for St. Thomas resume his speech.

Mr. MILLER: He gave way several times.

Mr. SPEAKER: We can save time if no hon. member tries to make points of order.

Mr. BOXILL: The hon. junior member for St. George should be the last person to get up and talk about wasting time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Thomas go back out to sea. (*Laughter*).

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am going back to sea but I am not orbiting. I hate to be like the hon. member who goes orbiting. How he has got back safely to land, I do not know. However, Sir, I do not want to prolong this debate. I want to make it explicitly clear in here today that I am not one of those people who want to condone a wrong and there is nothing wrong in my coming here to see to it that these seamen get their pay.

When the Hon. Premier got up and stated that this matter was now engaging the law courts, I want to know which law courts. As far as I know, it has not been taken up any more in the Bahamas Courts nor is it to be taken up here. Sometimes people have a way in making statements, thinking that they are making statements to two-year old children.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, without further ado, I think I have made my point crystal clear; I would like some sort of representation to be made in this matter. If it is claimed that this investigation is in the hands of the Attorney General, then it is the duty of the Government to inform the Attorney General that this is a very pressing situation and he should speed it up because you will be hearing more from me about this matter affecting the "Catalina S." in another way in the

near future. With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking that this Resolution be put to the vote or, in view of the ample ventilation which the matter has now had, is he asking that the Resolution be withdrawn with leave?

Mr. BOXILL: I am asking that the Resolution be put to the vote.

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

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m., of the clock when automatically the House reverts to the consideration of Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education:- To resume debate on a Resolution relative to the Report of East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962.

TRANSPORT BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:- To move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, at present provision is made in section five of the Transport Board Act, 1955, whereby the Board shall consist of a chairman and not more than four other members and whereby members of the Board shall hold and vacate their offices in accordance with the terms of their appointments.

It is proposed that the membership of the Board should be increased from five to seven persons, that there should be a deputy chairman of the Board and also that, in the absence of the chairman of the Board and also that in the absence of the chairman and deputy chairman, the members of the Board should appoint a person from among their number to preside at meetings. It is also proposed that under normal circumstances the term of office of a member of the Board should be three years.

This Bill seeks to make provisions as are deemed necessary to give effect to the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker, the Transport Board is the only Board that is not given a definite period for appointment; the Tourist Board, the Housing Board and other Boards have a limited amount of time for membership — either three years or five years, but with the Transport Board there was never any definite period for membership. In the case of the other Statutory Boards, it is set out specifically what are the terms of office of members and we think that the Transport Board should be dealt with likewise. This Bill seeks to regularise the position and set out a term of three years' office for the Transport Board. The Transport Board is comprised of five members one of whom is the Chairman, but we think that the Board should have a Deputy Chairman and that the membership should be increased from five to seven persons. Those are the sole reasons for the amendment to this Act. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time when, in relation to this Transport Board, the Government should let us know the real policy of this Board. The Hon. Minister says that the only reason for this proposed change is that the Board does not have the same stipulations as other statutory Boards. If you want the same stipulations as you have in the case of the other Boards, what is the necessity for adding more members to this Board? This Board has five members and there are other Boards, which are just as important as the Transport Board, and those Boards have five members; therefore what is the reason for increasing the membership of this Board? And at that, you are increasing the membership and paying the members. This is a Board in respect of which the members are paid. The Transport Board can scarcely get along its way and you are still burdening it with more salaries or wages or whatever you care to call them. The Hon. Minister has not told us how many abortive meetings there were throughout the year because of the lack of two more members.

4.35 p.m.

If he had told us that through having five members there were regular abortive meetings, he would begin to convince me; but I do not think he can say that. They are not suffering from the paucity of members; it is only that you want several members on this Board. The Agricultural Credit Bank, which was formerly the Peasant Loan Bank and is responsible for a lot of money, does not have seven members, as far as I can remember. Speaking under correction, I do not believe that the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank has seven members, and even if they had seven members, look at the amount of money they are responsible for paying on. I do not think that adding two more members to this Board is going to solve the problem there. I would be more inclined to go along with the Minister if he wanted to put out more Field Managers to do some field work, but you are going to increase the members of the Board to go there, I believe, once a week or once a month to sit down and listen to or read the reports coming from outside. I wonder if these two members are going outside to do some field work, or if they are going to sit down as the others are doing at the moment. I do not see the necessity for adding two more members.

Mr. Speaker, if the Party that is in power wants to relieve the unemployment of their supporters so as to get two more of their supporters in a job, that is all well and good; but there is not the place to relieve them. You can relieve them by adding more conductors or drivers, but I cannot for the life of me see why you are adding two more members to the Transport Board. I do not know if it would be from the point of view of giving wrong reports, because only last Tuesday I sat and listened to some report given by the Minister, and when I made an investigation since then, I found out that it was right and it was wrong, because the Minister said it was a certain amount of money paid for the charter of buses, but he did not say from where. I thought it was from Bridgetown to St. Peter, but when I made an inquiry, it was from Speightstown to the particular place. It was from a point in St. Peter to another point in St. Peter, and I am sure that those members who cried "Shame" when the Minister read out the cost.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, will you draw the attention of the hon. member to the Rules of the House? If the hon. member wants to have a ding dong battle about the corruption of the last Government, he can have it; but, personally, Sir, if we are discussing the Transport Board, I do not think it is competent for the junior member for St. Joseph to get up here and criticise statements made by a Minister of a previous occasion, because he has not indicated which Minister he is talking about, and he is now making statements correcting the Minister's statement which is without foundation, and therefore we are going to start a side issue now on a matter which is not engaging the attention of the House at this moment. If he is so sure of his facts, let him bring a substantive motion criticising whichever Minister he is referring to; but I do not think Your Honour would be correct, although I do not think you are condoning it, to sit down and listen to the hon.

member making statements about something that was said in here before.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is seeking to ascertain the reason why it is proposed to increase the number of members from what it is, and is suggesting, as I understand him, as the possible reasons why there is this attempt in this Bill to increase.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: All I can say is that Your Honour might not be paying close attention to the remarks made by the hon. member, which is deplorable; but I have pointed out to Your Honour that the junior member for St. Joseph in the course of his remarks suggested that a Minister had made a statement which was incorrect in relation to another matter. I am suggesting, Sir, that if you allow that kind of debate to go on, it is going to start a diversion from the real object of this Bill, and it is not correct for the hon. member to make a statement like that or to make a counter statement when a Minister provided certain information not on the matter under discussion, but on another matter altogether; so I do not see where Your Honour gets this inference which you have elected to draw about what the hon. member is trying to do. I know he needs an interpreter most of the time, but I do not think it is part of Your Honour's duty to interpret for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard the hon. member say that the statement was right, and also that the statement was wrong.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier wants to be Speaker and Premier, why does he not try and occupy both chairs at the same time? He is leading up to that. He does not want any member in here to get up and say one word; they must only say "yes" to what he brings here. The Transport Board is before us now and he always wants to bully people into things.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member to withdraw that statement. I do not think Your Honour should permit in these days in 1962 the kind of debate that used to go on, say, in 1942 or 1952. I very much resent the hon. member getting up and saying that I want to bully people into something. I do not have to bully anybody into saying anything, because we have sufficient numbers. We know what we are doing, and we come here as a body on certain measures, having considered and brought in policy. If he wants to make any intelligent contribution to the debate, Sir, he is entitled to do so as a member of the House; but what I am pointing out is that he is in breach of the Rules and Standing Orders of this House when he gets up to make a counter-statement to a statement previously made by a Minister, suggesting that the Minister is either lying or misleading the House. It is true he has not indicated which Minister he is referring to, but he must stick to the matter under debate. If he wants to criticise a statement made by a Minister, he does not reply by making another counter-statement saying that buses went from somewhere else, because a Minister does not come in here in discussing a motion of this kind prepared to answer statements and counter-statements on matters which are not normally on the Order Paper. I do not want to say anymore. When he tells me I want to be Speaker and Premier at the same time, I know what I am competent of doing, and I am competent of doing both jobs. When I was in the Party to which the hon. member belongs, I did not want to be anything in that Party; I just wanted to get away from it.

Mr. SMITH: Is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Hon. Premier to say he is competent to do both jobs, I presume he does not imply at one and the same time?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I do not mean at one and the same time.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the Transport Board. What caused it to be a Transport Board is the title alone. It is true it does not transport sugar; it does not operate lorries; it operates buses and I am keeping strictly to the operation of the buses. What more does the Hon. Premier want? If he wants to twist, he can twist.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, will you ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark? There is hardly a debate or meeting of this House that the member for St. Joseph does not get up and accuse members of the Government of twisting and new dancing and that kind of nonsense, and if a person makes a remark, you should know the laws of defamation as well as anybody in this Chamber; and there is no defence in making a derogatory or defamatory remark to claim you only said it for so-and-so; so I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I heard the hon. member say was "if he wants to twist, he can twist." I did not hear him suggest that the hon. member had twisted, or would twist, or even could twist. He merely said if the member wanted to twist he can twist. Had he said otherwise, I would immediately have pointed out to him that he was acting *ultra vires* in so speaking.
4.45 p.m.

He did not say that the hon. member had twisted. Had he said so, I would have immediately pointed it out to him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think Your Honour would have pointed out anything to the hon. member. You probably feel that he is so dense that there is no need for you to point out anything to him. I do not consider any remark prefaced by the words "if" in any way detracts from its parliamentary answer. I say any statement is direct or indirect on an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier has said that because of what may be my opinion of one hon. member as distinct from that of another member, I would not attempt to point out anything because that member may be so dense. I was not pointing out anything to the hon. member. I use language which I feel that person would understand. May I suggest that we now proceed?

Mr. SMITH: This is the last time I am going to throw it out to the Hon. Premier that whenever he gets up in here and throws out his insulting remarks, I am going to give it to him hammer and tongs.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The only throwing out I would do is to throw out him and his colleagues from this House.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier would probably remember the experience he had when I threw him out of St. George.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed. Let us keep strictly to the motion of the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier would like to throw me out of St. Joseph, but if I think so, he would not even be able to enter that parish, except at night like Nicodemus.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed to address on the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SMITH: We are going to meet. What on earth is it that you are going to increase the members of the Transport Board for? As I have said, the hon. member did not say that there is a paucity of members there. They do not have any abortive meetings, and as the Board comprises of five members at present, if you want a Deputy Chairman, you can have one from among the five.

This is what I think brought the Hon. Premier to his feet. I believe he is only trying to make room for his unemployed supporters because you would be surprised, as soon as this is passed, who is going to be appointed up there. That is all. I would not blame them for it because if you help me, I will help you. The Hon. Minister has not convinced anybody inside here by his argument of the reason of making it seven members. You have the Housing Authority which is a big Board and I do not think that has more than six members. I know that it does not have seven.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have risen on this point of order because it does

seem strange that an hon. member in the course of his debate can impugn the integrity of a Minister of Government by saying that the Minister's motive is to find room on the Board for his unemployed supporters. I think that is a serious allegation on the Hon. Minister. It is quite unparliamentary, and I am at a loss to know how Your Honour controls this debate on the face of that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph clarify the point which he made to which I have been directed in the light of the observations made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy?

Mr. SMITH: Obviously, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy may feel that it is an aspersion cast on the Minister, but the question is that the Minister of Communications is doing his job. One Minister introduced it, but did the Minister do it himself off his own back? The hon. junior member for St. Lucy referred to the Minister. Did the Minister say the Minister did it off his own back? I said that the only thing which can make me believe — I am not saying to make other hon. members above here believe — and you cannot prevent me from believing because I am an idiot as the Hon. Premier has said. He said that I was too dense; so you cannot take anything I say too seriously. I would not take a idiot too seriously if I were an intelligent person. That alone would tell you that he is putting the shoe on the wrong foot. I said that it is nothing to make me believe, to make me Lloyd Smith believe, not the hon. junior member for St. Lucy nor the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. That is it Sir. I would like to know the reasons for the Hon. Minister asking the House to increase the membership of that Board.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again, Sir, I rise on a point of order. "By trying to make me believe", that is a reference which has nothing to do with me at all. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is acknowledging his faults because if he regards that there is collective responsibility and says that his reference has nothing to do with any particular Minister, the fault is all the more grave because he is impugning the integrity of the Government by saying that they are bringing in a Bill, the purpose of which is to find room for their unemployed supporters. I had no wish to rise, but you must know how grave is the case because I have risen. You tell the size of myself by the size of the thing that annoys me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. junior member for St. Joseph intend to impugn or imply that the reason for this amending Act was to find room to provide employment for the unemployed supporters of Government?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if you are really serious? Are you not making the hon. junior member for St. Joseph judge of his own case? As far as I know, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide two things: (1) whether the words are capable of a certain meaning, and (2) whether they bear that interpretation.

It is not for you to ask him what he said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must hear the exact words complained of.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let us get the procedure straight; do not let us have any blind spots.
4.55 p.m.

Let us get the procedure straight. We have a way of dealing with these things as well as dealing with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Hon. Premier is referring to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SMITH rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will give me a minute, if it is necessary I will ask the Reporter to read back the words which were taken down since I do not have the exact words before me; otherwise I will have no alternative but to ask the hon. member if, in what he said or

intended to say, he had any intention of imputing to the Government that they were providing work for unemployed people by bringing down this Bill.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. We are at cross purposes on this matter. Both sides are entitled to the impartial protection of the Chair. If we were at fault, we would not have expected Your Honour to ask what we meant or if what we said was what we intended to imply. We feel that an imputation has been made against the Cabinet. The hon. member said that he did not mean the Minister, and we are entitled to the protection of the Chair on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member tell me the exact words which were used, if he has taken them down? Otherwise, I must refer to the shorthand writer.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is astonishing, Mr. Speaker, that you should put that request to me. I have never known that an hon. member was asked by a presiding Officer in a deliberative chamber if he had taken down words that were used because they would be only taken down at Your Honour's request.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am merely enquiring whether the hon. member had taken down the exact words which were used; otherwise, I will get them from the Official Reporter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: At an earlier stage of this debate, I drew Your Honour's attention to certain matters arising out of the statements made by the hon. member, which are not unconnected with the general tenor of his remarks and the objection which has been made by the Hon. Minister of Education. Your Honour seems to be in some doubt as to whether a member can impute falsehood or whether he would have to make a direct allegation. I have never been in any doubt about this matter at all and I will tell Your Honour this at this stage. Since this is not unconnected with the matter which is now engaging the attention of Your Honour, I will draw Your Honour's attention to May's Parliamentary Practice, Fifteenth Edition and at page 438. The heading is: "Allegation against Members". This is what it says there: "Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of parliamentary language. Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a Member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate."

The same right to claim courteous treatment in debate is due alike between both Houses of Parliament; and abusive language, and imputations of falsehood, uttered by members of the House of Commons against members of the House of Lords have been met by the immediate intervention of the Chair to compel the withdrawal of the offensive words or, in default, by the punishment of suspension.

It will also be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference. These may be classified as follows:

1. The imputation of false or unavowed motives.
2. The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation.
3. Charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood.
4. Abusive and insulting language....."

5.05 p.m.

I can go on, but I need hardly go very far down the list beyond No. 1 — "The imputation of false or unavowed motives" under which there are several examples cited here going right back to 1864, as far as I can see, and coming all the way down. I do not think after Your Honour has reappraised yourself of the substance of that passage of May's that you will have any difficulties of construction whatsoever. I never deal with authorities in these things, but if Your Honour deals in authorities, that is the authority.

Mr. SPEAKER: I on the other hand never rule without authority, but it is unnecessary and superfluous to refer to May's, unless our Standing Orders are silent. Where our

Standing Orders are not silent, they prevail. Standing Order No. 26 (7), under Rules of Debate, is obviously the relevant one in respect of the matter of which the hon. senior member for St. John has complained. That, as hon. members will recall, is the Standing Order which says "No Member shall impute improper motives to another Member".

Now I have received the official transcript of what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said, and it reads as follows: I quote: "If the Party that is in power wants to relieve the unemployment of their supporters so as to get two more of their supporters in a job, that is all well and good. As I have said — and that is what brought him to his feet — I believe you are only trying to make room for the unemployed supporters, because you will be surprised, as soon as this is passed, who is going to be appointed up there. That is all. I will not blame them for it because if you help me, I will help you."

The phrase or clause to which, in my view, the Hon. Minister of Education was taking exception, — and I presume it to be under Standing Order No. 26 (7) "No Member shall impute improper motives to another Member" — is, and I quote: "I believe you are only trying to make room for the unemployed supporters, because you will be surprised, as soon as this is passed, who is going to be appointed up there."

In view of the fact that exception has been taken to the remark, and in view of Standing Order No. 26 (7), and the imputation of improper motives, and the suggestion or expression that you are only trying to make room for the unemployed supporters because you will be surprised, as soon as this is passed, who is going to be appointed up there, I request the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to withdraw that expression.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully beg to withdraw that expression.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to continue his address on the substance and the meat and the matter of this second reading of a Bill to amend the Transport Board Act.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was making the point that I do not believe that we have so much business up there now. I believe when the thing was hot you did not want anymore, and now I can scarcely hear anything about that Board, you are going to increase the membership. Well now, Sir, the only way that I would agree to more members is if these two members would be two legislators, one from the House of Assembly and one from the Other Place, and not to be paid either. That is the only way I would agree to this, because I am sure that no sooner than we agree to this, it would not be any surprise to me if all the other Boards are increased also. We would not be able to say one word if they come back here after we increase this particular Board to increase the other Boards that have five members, because we have agreed to it.
5.15 p.m.

As I have said, Sir, the Hon. Minister has not given us any fundamental reason, or anything justifiable, to convince me that I should vote for it, although my vote does not mean much because they have the majority. However, the people would be able to know how the voting went. I repeat, you do not have any abortive meetings; at least, you did not say so. If you had abortive meetings or things were not working well due to the paucity of members, all well and good. The only reason which you gave was that you need a Deputy Chairman. That does not make it necessary to increase the membership because a Deputy Chairman can be selected from among the five. That is no point at all. The Hon. Minister has not convinced me of the need for the other two and I just cannot see it. As I have said, if the other two were going to do field work, I would have seen some reason because the work has to be done in the field, not in the office. I do not think members go out at night and peep around buses to see what is going on.

Somewhere in the Bill I see that it would be left to the Executive Committee to fix the remuneration of the mem-

bers of that Board. Now, the remuneration was fixed by the old Board. I do not know what is happening, but this Bill is only increasing the expenses of the Transport Board. Here it is, you are running a business which cannot pay or is giving you difficulty. I understand that in order for you to get the money to pay backpay to the drivers and conductors, you had to borrow the money.

Well now, are you going to increase the expenditure when you can do without it? You have other bus concessionaires who are running buses, and I do not hear them with so many Boards and so many directors and they are trying to pay their way. What do you want two more members for? I know there was a time when one of the members of that Board used to go out at night and spy, but you are not going to get anyone to do that now. You are not going to get a member waiting around the corners and checking on the buses. I do not know if you are increasing the membership of the Board to relieve two of the members to do that.

This is false economy; there is no necessity for it. There are few hon. members in here who would agree to it when the Transport Board wants finance and wants money to run it or to pay its debts. It would seem better to me that you put two conductors and two drivers on one bus than to increase the membership of the Board. You better put two drivers and two conductors on one bus.

Mr. Speaker, I could never vote for this Bill as it stands.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire what is the reason for the proposed increase in the membership of the Board; it may be that the more the multitude of counsellors they are, there is much more wisdom; or is there some other reason which has not been vouchsafed to us over here?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph queried if this Party was looking for jobs for the unemployed of this Party. The first thing I would like to draw to his attention is that we do not operate our Statutory Boards for finding jobs for people; when we put people on Boards we put them regardless of colour, class or creed. We put them for the intelligence which they can contribute to the particular Board. If you examine the composition of the Transport Board, you will see members of no one Party; you will see members of other Parties. We put people on Boards for what they can contribute to it, for the good of Barbados and not for Party.

The Transport Board handles anything to the amount of \$22,000 weekly which is over \$1 million a year. We just had an increase of wages to conductors and drivers and that has increased the expenditure to \$144,000 a year. That increase was negotiated by the Union.

Other Boards like the Tourist Board can have up to 15 members. We have completely stopped paying members of the Tourist Board and they used to be paid prior to this Government coming into power.

It is essential that you have regular meetings of the Transport Board and it would be impossible to hold regular meetings if someone went out of the Island or somebody took sick. The present Board consists of someone with a knowledge of accountancy, someone with legal knowledge and someone with mechanical ideas, and I would like to tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph again that members of Party are not looking for jobs for anybody. People get jobs where they are competent of filling them. The present Chairman of the Transport Board is the ex-Manager of the Government Savings Bank, Mr. M. Clarke. Another is Mr. Armstrong, a solicitor. He is not a member of our Party nor is Mr. Clarke nor is Mr. Clifton White the Accountant. Mr. Applewhite is not a member of our Party; so you will see that we have selected people whom we think can contribute something to the Board. We are not going around the place pushing people in jobs, no matter who they are. We do not say: "You are one of us; so you have a job." There is only one member of our Party who is on that Board. If you are one of us, you will have a job on your competence to fill it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not going to ask him to withdraw those remarks because to ask him would be treason to him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to take up the hon. junior member for St. George on this. I was a member of the former Government Party. I do not regret that I have served as a member of the Barbados Labour Party because an Al Capone, a Dillinger, a Rasputin, can put nothing on me because I have been exposed to all the possible machinations to which I could be exposed, while being a member of that Party. Not only was it applicable to Boards, but I as a member of that Party with the late Mr. A. E. S. Lewis and with Mr. Frank Walcott who was also a member of the Party, when we asked for a telegram to be sent to the Minister of Food in England — we were members of the Party to which the hon. junior member for St. George belonged and still belongs — we were thrown out because we had the effrontery to ask for it to be brought to the notice of the Ministry of Food in England that sugar was brought down in Barbados contrary to our contract; and from that time, neither Mr. Frank Walcott nor I were ever put to serve on Boards, and I believe Your Honour also was thrown off a Governing Body. Furthermore, they extended it to the Works Department where no person having sympathy for the Opposition Party could hope to get a job.

We employ a man so long as he is capable.

Sir, I only rose to point out that their principle extended not only to their political opponents but the supporters of their political opponents who were not prepared to support corruption.

Mr. MILLER: I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier knows only too well that what he has just said is miserably untrue.
5. 25 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I made a statement of fact that, as a member of the Sugar Industry Control Board — Mr. Walcott, Mr. Lewis and I — we were thrown off the Board because we wanted it to be drawn to the attention of the Ministry of Food — I do not know whether we were thrown off the Board because we drew to the attention of the British Government something which was going on illegally. I make that statement and the Advocate would not publish that tomorrow.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is not that just an interruption?

Mr. SPEAKER: It was prefaced by the phrase: "On a point of order."

Mr. MILLER: The decision taken was accepted as the policy of the last Government, that at the end of the year no political appointments were made. You have members who were pushed off the Board.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We appointed members of this House of Assembly on that Board by law. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. James, were put on the Board in substitution of the names which I have just called. It was one of the Statutory Boards whereby members of the House must be members of the Board. There are members of his Party — the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was a member of the Board. Three Labour Party Members were taken off, and three Party men were put on. I was in here from 1950.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how you permit this type of interruption. It is given to the Hon. Premier.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The tendency of the Chair traditionally is to allow even greater latitude to members who are not of one's own Party than that which is given to members of one's own Party.

Mr. MILLER: That is something practicable which generally applies to the Premier and the Opposition; it also applies to members of the Government. Let this be known

to everybody in this island. We decided that we would make no further political appointments particularly to Boards. Now I am not asking you to imply improper motives. My colleague was asked to withdraw the statement which he has made. I am simply saying to the Minister that what he has said is not true. When the other Government was in power, the Minister never showed his interest in what was taking place in Parliament. As a matter of fact, I do not think he was in the country. It is not true to say that it was a policy which you carried out. Nearly every hon. member on this side of the House was removed from Boards because we decided not to put members of the House on Boards; that is what we have decided.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is telling a deliberate untruth because appointments to these Boards is governed by the Act which says what the composition of the Boards should be. That has never been changed in history; members of the House are elected to membership of these Boards. I was pointing out a case in order to show how far they were prepared to go. Up to the middle of this year, the Chairman of their National Executive was Chairman of the Housing Authority; so what is the hon. member talking about political appointments? We are not having any Government run by the newspapers or by the frothings of members like the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the course of his remarks I understood the Hon. Premier used the words "telling a deliberate untruth". It is open to the hon. member in respect of whom those words were used to take exception now.

Mr. MILLER: I am taking exception to those words. The Hon. Premier, less than a moment ago, used certain remarks to my colleague. This is the sort of humiliation and embarrassment which we are expected to endure Tuesday after Tuesday in this House. You are talking about running a Government but you are running it to ruin; we know that.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the intention of this Government is to select people for appointment on Boards regardless of class, colour or creed; we are selecting people having regard to what they can contribute to these Boards. We have Mr. Springer on the Transport Board and he had contributed a lot to this Board. When you compare Mr. Springer with members of the Labour Party, when you compare him with whom they had on their Board like Mr. Shepherd, there is no comparison at all.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. It is undignified for the hon. member to refer to a member of a Board by name like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is making reference to Mr. Shepherd. Would you like a blown-out debate and discussion on the Housing Authority? It is impolite and improper for the hon. member to call the name of the member who was Chairman of a Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing unparliamentary in mentioning the name of some person, who is not a member of this Chamber, as Mr. Shepherd, or even to mention that he was a member of a Board. According to the opinion of the Hon. Minister, the calibre of men now being appointed to Boards is superior to that of other persons, of whom he has named one who was formerly appointed on a Board. There is nothing unparliamentary about what the Hon. Minister has said, and accordingly he may proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the trend which this debate has taken. The former Government had the distinction of putting as a member of the Board the only undertaker who has gone into bankruptcy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Minister proceed with his speech, with the minimum of invalid Points of order being raised.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I think I have explained the reasons for increasing the membership of

this Board. The possibility of leakage must be lessened and there must be a quorum of three members.
5.35 p.m.

We have discussed this and made a definite decision on it. This was not a harum-scarum idea of coming here and putting on people as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would do if he had the authority to put people on.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Michael withdraw the remark he made about what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would do? I know the hon. junior member for St. Michael has no intention of imputing improper motives, and I am asking that it be withdrawn.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked if we were putting them on as political appointments. One can only insinuate what would be in one's mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member completed his speech?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I have given an explanation why we have increased the Board from five to seven. This Board handles over \$1 million a year in daily instalments. Most of the other Boards, the Tourist Board the Development Board, the Housing Board and others comprise seven members, and they give mixed ideas. If you can have some in accountancy, some in transport knowledge, some in engineering knowledge and so on, where one person can concentrate on one particular item, it will help us in each thing. That is what we have calculated for on all the Boards we have established — people of different calibres and different ideas for the benefit of the island.

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. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed. Clause 5 was called. It reads as follows:—

5. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act the provisions of section five of the principal Act (as contained in section three of this Act) apply to an existing member as if he were first appointed to be a member of the Board on the date when this Act comes into operation.

(2) In this section the expression "existing member" means a person who is a member of the Board at the date when this Act comes into operation and was, before that date, appointed to be a member of the Board.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would just like to ask the hon. member in dealing with 5 B if I understood him rightly. This says: "There shall be paid to the members of the Board.....

I am sorry, Sir, that is the wrong section.

The question that Clause 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move that Clause 4 be recommitted so that the Minister can explain a point for me.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, Section 5B says that members shall be paid such remuneration and allowances for expenses as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may determine. Does this cover the actual fee for members sitting as members of the Board or is that a fixed fee already in some other Regulation? I am not quite *au fait* with the entire matter, but I have a recollection there is some Regulation which says that the fee for members of these Boards should not exceed so much for the Chairman and so much for the other members. I am wondering whether the Legislature is well protected from that point of view. The particular section I am reading says:

"There shall be paid to the members of the Board or to any of them such remuneration, fees and allowances for expenses."

If I recall rightly, these fees were set out somewhere in some Regulation at one time as \$20 for the Chairman for each meeting and not exceeding \$10 for members of the Board and so on. Would the Minister please explain that? I want to get that clear because this is being amended for members to retire after three years, and it is for the Executive to fix these fees. We understand over this side that it is something like \$25 for the Chairman per meeting and \$15 for members of the Board. I would like the Minister to explain whether this has not been fixed by some Regulation.

If the Minister has not got that information, I am not objecting to the passing of the Bill, but I should really like to have it for the benefit of the public, so that they can know what is being paid now or what was paid.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, at present the Chairman draws \$30 for each meeting and the other members draw \$15 per meeting, and there is a maximum of four meetings. They cannot have more than four meetings a month that they can get paid for, though they can have more than four. So the Chairman draws \$30, the other members draw \$15 and there is a limit of four meetings to be paid for.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.45 p.m.

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION re AMENDMENT TO NOTE TO RESOLUTION FOR ONE HUNDRED AND TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave of the House to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier today in connection with the provision of the sum of \$110,000 made under Head 9 — Miscellaneous, Item 3 — Staff requirements for Capital Works, as the next Order of the Day. Copies of this Resolution were circulated amongst hon. members.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to make a formal amendment to the explanatory note against Item 3 under Head 9 — Miscellaneous of the 1962-63 Capital Estimates whereby provision was made for \$110,000 for capital works.

I pointed out at the time when I made a Statement to the effect that the Note was not really part of the Estimates and so long as we did not depart from what the money was re-

quired to do, it could be spent for that purpose. The Note states "To pay salaries, travelling and other expenses of staff:— one Engineer, three Assistant Engineers, two Architectural Draughtsmen, one Accountant, four Clerks and one Stenographer."

The purpose of this very short Resolution is to add a few words which would make the employment of people under the capital works programme of this category listed here a little more flexible by adding the following words, "any such other temporary staff as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time determine."

I entertained some doubts at the time of my making the statement as to whether it was possible to amend a vote of the House merely by a Statement of a Minister; and after consultation with the Clerks of the Table, I decided that it would be better and certainly more constitutional to be done by Resolution. My opinion, independent of others, was that it is better to do these things by vote of a Resolution, and I now say that these words "any such other temporary staff as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time determine" be added to the note of Item 3 under Head 9 — Miscellaneous — and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur and if concurred in, resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business for today to an end.

ORDER NO. 4 OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS WITHDRAWN

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask leave of the House to withdraw Order No. 4 of Government Business which stands in my name from the Order Paper.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it would be proper if the House be informed, with your permission, of the reason for which I have asked leave to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I put it to the Hon. Member that leave was granted, no objection being taken. If he cares to add a word of explanation, he may do so.
5.55 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This Order is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land and hereditaments described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of providing for extension to the St. Leonard's Secondary Modern Schools.

This property is known as "Bel Air". Since notice of this Resolution was given, the Governor-in-Executive Committee was informed that the owner of the property is willing to accommodate the Government on the price which the Government had asked for and, consequently, there is no need for the compulsory acquisition of the property.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to ask your permission to make a Statement on the occasion of fixing the Order Paper for next Tuesday. I take it, Sir, that I can proceed to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Premier moving the adjournment of the House?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will make the motion for the adjournment after fixing the Order Paper.

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in fixing the Order Paper, there will first be the Money Resolutions of which

notice was given today, and then the other matters will follow. I believe that Private Members' Business will stand in the same order as it stood today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any applications under Private Members' Business which may vary the Orders as they stand today?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the time when any hon. member who wants any alteration in the Order Paper under Private Members' Business to apply for it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that Order No. 19 standing in my name dealing with the sale of the Church Village Girls' School, be made Order No. 2 at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the Order Paper under this Head, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking that Order No. 19 standing in his name be made Order No. 2 at the next meeting. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. *(After a Pause)*. There being apparently no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I really have more than one statement to make. In the first place, I have the honour to inform the House that the Right Honourable Duncan Sandys will be visiting this territory on the 27th December, 1962. While the Hon. Minister is in this territory, his time will be very short and he has a very crowded programme. He has agreed while he was in India to meet delegations simultaneously of parties represented in this Chamber and in the Other Place. I do not think that there is any burning, constitutional issue wherein members of Parliament will want to meet this gentleman in Parliament, but that is the only way a meeting can be arranged with the parties concerned.

I also have the honour to inform the House that there will be a meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers on the 28th December, I also have the honour to inform the House that I attended the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Great Britain as an adviser to the British Delegation in the United Kingdom in September this year. I also have the honour to inform the members of the House that, arising out of and consequential to my attendance thereat, I intend to deliver a statement at the next meeting of this House on the implications of Great Britain's entry into the European Common Market and the discussions which took place at that Conference.

Finally, I have the honour to inform hon. members that it is the intention of the Government, after the next meeting of this House, to adjourn the House until the 15th January, 1963, and we will be giving notice of several lengthy Bills. We hope to have the new constitution of Barbados — I cannot guarantee this, it is not a promise; but we are attempting to have the new constitution in its codified form, if "codified" is the correct term, as a written document presented for the consideration of hon. members, so that they may have a long time to study the implications before this House resumes.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 11th December, 1962, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 11th December, 1962, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.05 p.m.