THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th February, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker)*; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, *(Minister of Development, Trade and Labour)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. E. W. BARROW, B. Sc. *(Premier)*; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism)*; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)*; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Social Services)*.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting of this Chamber of the 6th of this month have been printed and circulated and unless any hon. member objects, those Minutes will be confirmed. *(A Pause)*

There being apparently no objection to the confirmation, these Minutes now stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Customs Duties (Machinery and Equipment for Remoulding, Retreading and Recapping Tyres) Order, 1962.

The Customs Duties (Materials for use in Remoulding, Retreading and Recapping Tyres) Order, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Resolution to place the sum of $12,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62 Part I-Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62, No. 42, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Resolution to place the sum of $158,023 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62, No. 43 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of providing a playing field at the Alleyne School.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: A Bill to deal comprehensively with the subject of Customs.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: A Bill to exempt the Barbados National Trust from the payment of stamp duties, registration and recording fees and Local Government rates.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: A Bill further to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932.

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 those money Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

QUESTIONS

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:

Is the Government aware of the dire plight of certain residents of Leeward parishes, i.e. St. Peter and St. Lucy, who have been given notices to quit certain spots where many of them have lived all their lives and whose houses in many instances are in too dilapidated a condition to remove, to wit Heywoods, St. Peter, Clinketts, St. Lucy?

2. Will Government give its most urgent consideration to the question of either properly resiting — on equally attractive seacoast sites in case where the land has already been sold — the homes of such tenants, or — in the case where land has not been sold — will Government earnestly consider entering into negotiations for the purchase by Government of such land whereby tenants may remain in occupation thereof, or if Government is able to offer in the same area any of its own land suitable for such purposes, will it make same available to such evicted tenants?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it the intention of the Government to continue 23rd February — Federation Day — as a public holiday in view of the dissolution of the West Indian Federation?

Mr. G. V. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Honourable Minister aware of the dangers experienced by pedestrians and vehicles in traversing Rock

Hall Road in front of the Almshouse, in the parish of Thomas, due to the fact that numerous branches of trees overhanging this highway, thereby make the road mossy and slippery after a rainfall?

2. Will the Minister therefore take immediate steps to have such situation remedied in order to avoid a major catastrophe?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to deal comprehensively with the subject of Customs, was read a first time. 12.20 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to exempt the Barbados National Trust from the payment of Stamp Duties, registration and recording fees and Local Government rates, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill further to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1952, was read a first time.

LEAVE TO GIVE NOTICE OF AN ADDRESS

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of an Address.

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

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of an Address in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of the Legislative Session 1961-62.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:— To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62 No. 41

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Supplementary Resolution for the sum of $19,688 under various Heads of the Estimates. These Heads will be taken separately as usual.

HEAD I — GOVERNOR

Head I — Governor — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head I stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head I stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XV — POLICE

Head XV — Police was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head XV stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head XV stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXI — SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE

Head XXI — Science and Agriculture — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXI stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head XXI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIII (5) — DISTRICT HOSPITAL SERVICES

Head XXIII (5) — District Hospital Services — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head XXIII (5) stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head XXIII (5) stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXV — PUBLIC WORKS

Head XXV — Public Works — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIX — MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous Services — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the note to this Item "Entertainment of Visiting Service Personnel", states this: "Due to the unusually high number of Warships which have visited Barbados since the opening of the Deep Water Harbour, the vote for the entertainment of Visiting Service Personnel has been exhausted...." I have always been worried about this entertainment for Visiting Service Personnel. We are not living in the old-time days when these officers come here and the members of the local population look for husbands for some of their daughters. The days for that sort of trapping are over. When it comes to this entertainment for these officers, let us see that Barbados gets down to something which is more in keeping with the content of the population. I go to some of these parties and I must say that I am against this idea that when you have Visiting Service Personnel here, you see only a sprinkling of the population looking like me, and then you see a whole mass of the minority of the population being invited to such parties. I cannot allow public funds to be expended in this nonsense. Even in the United Kingdom, people in the House of Commons are getting up against the spending of money on Royalty for the sake of spending money on Royalty. Whoever is responsible for this type of entertainment should have their attention drawn to the fact that there are people who are living in Barbados, who are desirous of meeting everybody who is coming here. If there is going to be any entertainment, let these people understand that they are coming to a country which has a majority of black people in it and not a majority of white people. That sort of nonsense must come to an end if you are entertaining these people at public expense; otherwise, we will have these Naval Personnel

people playing basketball or table tennis at the Y.M.C.A. I still have the feeling which I have expressed in my bones.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make it clear to the hon. member who has just sat down that the money for which we asking here has nothing to do with the entertainment of Naval Service Personnel at the public expense. It is not within the competence of the Government of Barbados to dictate to Her Majesty's Government how their entertainment allowance should be spent. This is a matter which, I suggest, the hon. member should take up with one of the Conservative backbenchers in the House of Commons.

12.30 p.m.

That is the proper place at which the capital of the very Government Departments and even the spending capacities of the Royal Family in matters like that could properly be investigated. It is the duty of the Government of Barbados and the Organisations which assist us in matters of entertainment to extend a certain amount of hospitality to those people who in time of riots and civil commotion are responsible for protecting the life, limb and property of the inhabitants of this country. If through no fault of our own we have an invasion, as it were, of War-ships at Barbados - I do not mean in the military sense, but we have had an unexpected number of visits - it is natural that with all the games which have to be played with different clubs and the drives which have to be given to Naval Personnel so that they can get their land legs again we should vote what is merely adequate. If the member looks at the Addendum, Note 6, I believe, he will see that the vote is for entertainment of Visiting Personnel; it is not a vote for the entertainment of local residents which has been exhausted. It is just as if the members of the Mess Room of a War ship decided that among their personal friends they want to invite to cocktail parties representatives of the Legislature as being the people who reflect a cross-section of this community. We cannot dictate to the members of a War ship or members of a Mess Room that they should not have certain people at cocktail parties. I entirely agree with the hon. member that where a single penny of the expenditure of the Government of this Island is involved we should not only discourage but stamp out any discriminatory practices which may arise, but in view of the fact that this money is not for the entertainment of people on board the War ship, I hope the fears of the hon. member will be allayed.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir. My fears are not allayed because the hon. member did not get it quite clearly. This is money we are spending. I do not know what the hon. member is telling me about somebody having a Party on board the ship. No Mess-room people are paying for this; this is taxpayers' money and my taxes are included in this $800. We are voting money from the Barbados Treasury, and any money we vote out of the Treasury we have to make a comment on it. I am nothing to do with whether the party is in the Mess-room or concerns the Chief Steward. I do not care if you are playing football, cricket, table tennis or the like; this is money you wish because you have these ships coming here and you entertain the personnel on them. I am making a statement; so do not tell me to go and ask anybody in the House of Commons. The Hon. Premier must not give those answers telling me to go and look for Conservative backbenchers. I will tell the Premier that when he replies, he should choose language that he really means, because if he chooses language that he does not mean and is making fun, we can make one big lot of fun; if he is being facetious and is telling me as a member of this House that I must look for Conservative backbenchers in England if I want to ask that question, I do not want that ignorant reply given to me as a rebuttal.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give me an opportunity, I can reply to him. I cannot address the hon. member; I have to address the Chair, and I was merely indicating to hon. members, depending upon their persuasions, that there are avenues in the United Kingdom whereby any alleged discriminatory practices on the part of any Department of Government of the United Kingdom can be questioned. As far as hon. members on my immediate left are concerned, they can write to the Conservative backbenchers; and then when I come to the hon. member, he can approach the higher echelons of the British Labour Party. I was not addressing the hon. member when I said Conservative backbenchers. Obviously, he could not address the Government. If you are Conservative, you cannot write a letter to the Government, you have to ask a Labour Party member to do that; but if you are affiliated to the British Labour Party, you approach the hierarchy and that is what I expected the hon. member to do.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am a serious man. All that is a lot of words which I do not go in for, because I am too much of a busy man. I am speaking on this Resolution which deals with entertainment of personnel. I am different from the majority of Barbadians. I am not afraid to say that in Barbados there is still this attempt, when you have entertainment for such persons, only to pick out a few as in the old days. I made the comparison that even today this type of criticism is made in the United Kingdom. There is no point in the hon. member telling me that I am bringing Royalty into disrepute in this debate, because even in the United Kingdom they have been questioning the money spent on Royalty. There is no point making that kind of comparison and telling me I had better go and ask these people, because if I did not know what to ask, I could not have been here for seventeen years. I know what to do and that is why I am here; so I do not want any advice as to what I should do or should ask in England.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the entertainment of people for which we give money, I am not going to sit idly by and allow the entertainment to go on as it went on twenty-five years ago, as I said, when somebody was looking for a husband for her daughter. I want to say that when it comes to the entertainment of personnel, it should reflect the substance of the community in which we live. I am not asking Government or anybody about that; I am saying that it is purely a matter for the Government to do as they please, but do not tell me I must go and ask somebody in England or in the British Labour Party. I never go cap in hand asking the Labour Party or the Conservative Party to do anything for me. I do not have to ask if they spend money on Royalty, but I am drawing the comparison that if we are entertaining Her Majesty's ships - we are not voting against having entertainment - we want to see the entertainment spread as wide and far as it possibly can be. What is wrong with that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I can speak on a matter of this sort with a mixture of feeling like most members of this House. I carry no chip and I have not got to ask any favours; so if I have to say anything, I say it. If my friends or foes are offended or pleased, it is a matter entirely for them. The Item in the Resolution for $800 is perfectly all right. I see nothing wrong with the question of entertainment which is set out quite clearly as follows:-

"Due to the unusually high number of warships which have visited Barbados since the opening of the Deep Water Harbour, the vote for entertainment of visiting Service Personnel has been exhausted. Several other warships are expected to visit Barbados before 31st March, 1962, and supplementary provision is required to meet the cost of entertaining Service Personnel during the remainder of the current financial year."

Conditions have so changed from ten or fifteen years ago - or not as long as that. I remember in the last Government when it was thought that if you invited certain people of African descent, you had invited the nation.

12.40 p.m.

That, I have always contended, was wrong. I always felt that I was here to express the views of the people who sent me here. If the hon. member who spoke last could very well prove today that the spending of this money by Government in entertaining personnel of warships did not have what I would consider a sufficient number of local residents at such entertainments - to put it in plain common parlance, a sufficient number of coloured people - I would strongly object to the discrimination because I am not one of those people to say: "I do not mind the chauffeurs who are outside; I am inside here with my colleague on my left." I have demonstrated that. I have proved in this country that I have

been able to invite from the top to the bottom, that is to say, from His Excellency the Governor to one of my shopkeeper friends in Nelson Street, some white, some black, at the same party which I have at my house. That is how I like to see things done. I believe every living man who attempts to foster better relationships between black and white people is doing not only this country, but the world, a service.

Within recent years, I must admit that such relationships are not what they were 20 years ago. I have always said publicly on platforms that the question of my attending banquets and parties are things which I am not always moved to accept because I have always considered it in the light that had it not been for the people in the slum areas and in the lower walk of life, the only way in which I could get near to such public gatherings would be if I had the opportunity to drive somebody's car which was taking people there.

Therefore, Sir, I cannot join anybody in saying that this money is only spent on entertaining a certain class of people. I must confess that knowing certain members of this Government as I do, I do not believe that they belong to the graduates of Cambridge during the year 1925 who believed that so long as they went to Cambridge or Oxford they were far removed from anybody, even someone who went to London University, whether or not you were a person of a certain pigmentation.

As you know, Sir, this matter has been raised on several occasions on the floor of this House and I do not think, myself, that it is any reflection upon Royalty if you discuss it and express the view that we feel, if you are spending public funds in providing entertainment for visiting personnel on warships, in a community in which there are 240,000 people and 10,000 only are of European descent, that you should see a greater number of coloured people at such entertainments. Let me say here and now that I am one of those people who believe strongly - and I know I may be criticised for saying this; and I am not dealing with the article which I saw in this morning's *Advocate* on this matter - that it is a good thing when some people keep coloured people out of their clubs because when you let some people get into certain clubs, they look down with contempt on certain of their people, Everybody knows what has happened at a certain school in this Island.

Some people feel that I am associated with the hon. junior member for Christ Church socially. Some say to me that on some occasions when he has parties, he does not invite me. Let me say that there are some parties which I have to which I will not invite him. If I have a public party, I would invite him: but if I am having a personal party I would have it with my friends. That is the trouble with most of us when we have a little education. When we get a little education, we forget our friends.

Let me remind this House that although the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself are friendly, our views are as far apart as the moon is from the sun. On this question of voting this money for the entertainment of visiting personnel, I support the Resolution; but let me admit quite frankly that I do not believe any criticism can be levelled at the present Government on this question of this supplementary provision that is required to meet the cost of entertaining visiting personnel. I have had invitations. Some invitations which I have had, I have ignored. If some of us just want to get into this House of Assembly to receive invitations, I would say to those hon. members that they should look for work to do. I do not want the people to look at this question in the manner that because members of the Government on occasions receive invitations to attend parties at which there are white people, the members of the Government have become white people. You have a right to mix with people. As I have said, those people in this country who can get the two classes of people together and to mix are doing a service to this community.

Sir, I do not know what was the position when I was five years old, but twenty years ago it was a terrible thing so far as people of the two classes mixing at functions was concerned. However, there is a substantial change in the situation today and it is my view that it is going to change more and more for the better. I was amazed the other day when the Chief Justice of the Island could proclaim from the housetop that he was in a certain club and that he was a coloured man. I laugh at that. In my opinion it is a question of one's behaviour. Genealogically speaking, if I were to begin to trace the colour of some people who feel that they are white and are pure Europeans, a lot who open their doors would not open them. I also know that there is a certain lot of people who would not accept white people into their clubs because they consider that the culture of those people is not good enough. I will go further and say that there is not one club in Barbados that can boast of its having no coloured people in it. There may be some who may play that they are white, but I am sure they could not pass the test in places like America. However, Sir, I do not want to go any further on that matter. A friend of mine who is a very prominent business man in this country said to me that he had the devil of a time trying to get into the Barbados Yacht Club. Members of that club just said that they did not want him as a member, because when they first knew him, he did not have anything.

Sir, I do not object to the Resolution, but I counsel the hon. senior member for St. Peter to realise that a Government like this would not condone any idea of having money voted in this House of Assembly for invitations to visiting personnel and of its being spent in such a way that more people of a certain class are invited to these functions than the other.

12.50 p.m.

I get invitations and I do not go; I read them and put them down. If what the hon. member says is true, then you must make things abundantly clear. I have seen the position of the Hon. Premier who gave service in the Air Force; I have seen that hon. members of this House have been put away in the background at a function here. I will make a noise; the then Premier told me that I should make a noise about it because he was pretending that he could not do it. I have seen that members of this House have been relegated to the back position and you should see the position in front. I have seen the last Speaker of this House relegated to the position below that of the Commissioner of Police when Royalty and dignitaries came here. I had to raise a noise about it. But as long as you put the Prime Minister first and he could go on hobbling, he did not care whom you put after him. Anyhow, when I see that things are going wrong I will say that they are going wrong. We depend on the Warships.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. That is the very point which I was trying to make in respect of the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. This money is not to be spent on Warships; it is spent on Personnel on shore for their entertainment. The money spent on Warships is money from the British Treasury and it is a matter for the British Government whom they invite. I quite agree that if we are having public entertainment for the Visiting Naval Personnel, we should try to make it quite clear that we have people of African descent living in this island and it is those people who pay the bulk of the taxes of this island. I would not like anyone to leave here with the impression that we are voting money to be spent on any cruiser or destroyer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thought that objection was taken to voting money for the Visiting Personnel. I said that we should vote money to entertain personnel of the Warships: but if the hon. member feels that in the entertainment of the personnel of these Warships, whether it be at Government House or wherever it is, sufficient people of African descent are not invited to these functions, then I say that some criticism should be voiced.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I know something about this matter. The entertainment of the personnel of any Warship which comes here is done through the Y.M.C.A.; they see after the transportation of the personnel to the Garrison or anywhere else. There is an Organization known as the Naval Welfare League. That Organization carries on dances at the Barbados Aquatic Club for the Visiting Personnel and both coloured and white people attend those dances. I go further and say that this money is not all that goes to the entertainment of Visiting Personnel. The Naval Welfare League, through voluntary subscriptions - I am

proud to be a member of that Organization - subscribe also to the social end of these things. They will hire a bus or two from the Transport Board and send them to the Deep Water Harbour for the transportation for as many as 80 persons to the Crane Hotel; they will go up there, they will return after a pic-nic and the ladies will serve the food. That is money from voluntary contributions. What we have here is only to assist in the transportation.

This question has been raised here from the time that I have been in this House and on each occasion I have supported this expenditure. The criticisms are unfounded. There are ladies and gentlemen in this organization who help to entertain Visiting Personnel. It is a very worthwhile organization and it is unfair to say that discrimination takes place in the Naval Welfare League. I do not know of it; I am prepared to say that perhaps you should have more coloured people at these functions, but the members of this organization have to go around and ask the merchants to subscribe so as to help the social end of the entertainment of the Personnel. We have always voted this money and I will vote it without any criticism of the Naval Welfare League. When it comes to the Y.M.C.A. nobody could accuse that Association of discriminatory practices because there are more coloured there than white.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is amazing how these things can cause heat to be generated. The note to this item states quite clearly the following:-

"Due to the unusually high number of warships which have visited Barbados since the opening of the Deep Water Harbour, the vote for entertainment of Visiting Personnel has been exhausted. Several other warships are expected to visit Barbados before 31st March, 1962, and supplementary provision is required to meet the cost of entertaining Service Personnel during the remainder of the current financial year."

Mr. Chairman, it does not need anybody from Oxford to understand that this vote deals with the entertainment of Visiting Service Personnel. Do you think that we are repairing Warships? As to the last two hon. members who spoke, when you talk about a chip on the shoulder, suppose anybody says that! I do not care who says so. I have a Club of three persons, I am the Chairman of it and I have an original vote. My club is at Bank Hall and it is called "Gibraltar". As a matter of fact, I have both an original vote and a casting vote. *(Laughter).* I cannot see why at this stage, I should be worried about joining a club. I have never been black-balled from joining a club. I have my club at my home and therefore I do not think I should worry about any club outside. Joining a club outside is purely a matter of how I feel.

1.00 p.m.

When I ask these things, I am not asking them for myself, because I have refused invitations when the last Government was in power. I have not been to a function held by the last Government in the last three or four years, because I said that as long as the Prime Minister was the Prime Minister and the other people were there, I was not going to shake their hands; so therefore I am not accepting an invitation if you are a host or hostess unless I can come and greet you - you shake my hand and I shake yours, or you break my hand and I break yours. I am not looking for an invitation, but what I am repeating is that there is no point in Barbadians getting soft and silent on this matter. I want to say this: if you want me to put it differently, I have been to parties in which I am still satisfied today there is not enough spreading of this cake among people. What the hon. senior member for the City has said may be true. There may be some people looking for invitations. That does not apply to your humble servant; but in dealing with this vote there are instances where I see this practice going on, and there is no point in replying to what I have said by saying that there are some people who get in clubs and think that the clubs are only for them. There are some who get in the House of Assembly and think that the House of Assembly is only for those in here, and only after they realise it is not a club they get swiped out too. People react that way. But I am not dealing with the individual reaction of people. I am dealing with the matter where public funds are being spent. I do not subscribe to private people carrying on that way, but God help me if I would want to join the Barbados Yacht Club, because if I did they should put me behind a Yacht, tie a rope around my neck and sail fast enough to drown me; so far as joining clubs are concerned, that would not appeal to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the matter from the standpoint of where public money is being spent, and I am not accusing members of the Government of practising racial discrimination or saying that it is within their province or doing. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and what I have a right to say is that I am a public man, and any matter that affects the public weal I have a right to express it from this quarter. So far as I am concerned, it does not matter to me who is responsible for it or whom it offends. I do not like to offend people; I like to say what I believe is right. So far as I am concerned, I have not been offended by anybody by any invitation, because it is purely a matter for those who want to be invited. I feel sometimes that people say you have a chip on the shoulder when you speak about things and you do not agree with them. I have said in the House of Assembly already that invitations to dinners at Government House have always been restricted to Ministers and members of the Executive Committee, and I said that in protest over the Head of the Administration to show how things go and that some of the other members from other places can meet Governors or whoever comes. The former Premier asked if in England with 640 members of Parliament the Queen could invite everybody to Buckingham Palace.

Mr. Chairman, there is one unfortunate thing I would say, and it is that a lawyer-politician always tries to use the sort of cross questioning in the House that goes on in the Court against people who cannot talk back. Sometimes the Judges tell you you cannot talk back. I am not asking the personnel of a Warship to invite anybody, and this suggestion is not for the personnel of a Warship or Mess Officers. The hon. junior member for Christ Church talked about people putting up money and having a Welfare League. I was born and bred in Barbados, and I remember that a boy like me could only join the Sea Scouts if he went to Harrison College, but any white trash could join; so do not tell me about what happened. I know Barbadians and that is one of the reasons why the Prime Minister said on an occasion that I was one of the men against the Federal Capital coming to Barbados. I was and still am. I still have that feeling; so when it comes to Barbados, I still know that Barbados has its lily white attitude in certain things and that has not moved yet. It will move with some of us because we have the power to come and expose things. These things do not affect me personally, but when you live in this community you have to form fours and get together.

I do not want anybody to get the impression that I am levelling any criticism at any individual, and I want to make it quite clear that I do not make any apologies for my actions. I am not an apologist. Whatever I do I stand by; so when I make these statements I make no apology to anybody whomsoever for what I say. I say it and I do not care what anybody says; I stand by what I say, and all I contend is that wherever we spend public funds, I am using this as a means of letting all who are responsible for these things get clearly in their minds that at least there is somebody watching these things, and we say that when we are spending public funds it should be known in Barbados that we feel in a particular way that the people of Barbados have a right to enjoy some of the money that is theirs.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. senior member for St. Peter first began this discussion, it appeared to me that what he had in mind was that when there was entertainment of visiting Warships, the greater part of the people invited were people who were not manifestly coloured, and if that is what he meant at first, I agree with him. I think the fault is to be found in the fact that the local people who were responsible for supplying the list of invitees would pick up some old list used ten or twelve years ago at certain parties and send it to the Officer on Board the Warship responsible for extending invitations, and I do agree with him that that should come to an end,

because neither with visiting Warships nor with the people coming here from abroad as tourists do we want to convey the impression that there are no coloured people in Barbados worthy of being invited to little soirees on board a Warship. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago it was brought to my attention that a hotelier in this island who reconstructed his hotel with Government money actually told some tourists staying there that they should not mix socially with coloured people. It was drawn to my attention a few days ago and I was bitterly annoyed about it for the simple reason that whether or not Government funds had been used in the reconstruction or expansion of this hotel, this was the sort of attitude highly to be condemned by any hotel operator in this Island.

What this Government intends to make most emphatically clear in this Island, Sir, is that the coloured people in this Island must be accorded a new sense of treatment and must be accepted as equals in every sphere with anybody in the Island. We are not prepared to sit down and condone a condition in which a very small section of the population arrogated to itself the right to feel that so long as you are not coloured, you belong permanently to a special clique and that coloured people by and large must always be relegated to inferior status.

1.10 p.m.

Those days are gone forever. Fifteen or sixteen years ago on the floor of this House, I suggested that the Government of the day should have prevented every Government official in the Island from the Governor back down from participating in any club that imposed a colour bar and I went further and said that business places in Bridgetown should be compelled by law to employ a certain percentage of coloured people. Therefore, Sir, I was rather distressed to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter imply that it was a possibility that a Government comprised such as ours would even attempt to tolerate the division of this community into two separate classes based on colour or think lightly of allowing to be perpetuated the old conditions in which persons of culture or education did not matter at all but what was important was the colour of one's skin.

I want the hon. senior member for St. Peter to rest assured that in so far as we are concerned we are determined most strongly to oppose any attempt on the part of any person in this country, either as a native Barbadian or an expatriate in this country, who believes that the colour of one's skin is the determining factor in the manner in which you should be treated socially or otherwise.

There has been no justification for what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has described as "white trash" meaning that the particular colour of their skin would entitle them to election to a certain niche in this community, and it is high time that those who still feel that they are living in days which have permanently passed, if they are not prepared to tolerate the new trend in this Island, should leave it and go to some place like South Africa where at least for a little longer period they would be able to indulge in their racial and other prejudices.

The remark made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter has been so well explained by other speakers that there is no point in my going into the matter any further except to say personally that I would not like to see any large number of coloured people entertaining some of these visiting personnel in the manner I see them entertained by other people. The hon. senior member for St. Peter can rest assured that if any cases are brought to our attention by him, by any other member of this House, or any other responsible member of the community in which action is needed to be demonstrated in the most effective manner, this Government will take appropriate action because it believes that the days for racial discrimination are over.

I do not agree that merely because Barbados had the reputation for perpetuating a social system based on colour, that in itself is ground enough for denying this country the Federal Capital. That is a different thing entirely. The question is whether we can benefit by having the Federal Capital here. Such a thing as arguing whether a particular section of people by the colour of their skin or by financial means have any peculiar rights and privileges can be dealt with otherwise. Therefore, do not let us confuse the issues. The trouble in this country is that we had a coloured Government which had no sense of social direction at all to the masses of coloured people in the Island.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I really do not want to interrupt the hon. member but for him to say that the last Government had no social direction at all is unnecessary and unkind. The hon. member can probably remember - and I am sure that the House will remember it - that the last Government placed on the Statute Book legislation that racial discrimination should not be practised in public places. I think the remarks of the hon. member on this matter are unnecessary and unkind. It is not true to say that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, it was my intention.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not finished. Let me reply to the hon. junior member for St. George in the first instance. The last Government found itself in a position in which it could have given a new sense of dignity to coloured people of this Island: but by sheer incompetence, they did not do it. Secondly, what the hon. member does not know is that these two proposals of mine, one, prohibiting the participation by Government officials in the activities of any clubs or associations in the Island which imposed a coloured bar, and the other, to compel commercial places to employ a certain percentage of coloured people, actually reached discussion level with the Officer administering the colony at the time, but it was because of the stand taken by the then Prime Minister of the West Indies that nothing was done about those matters. Let him deny that if he can. It was because of the Leader of his Party that nothing was done about them.

Anyhow, the point is this. I want to assure the Committee and the public at large that the apprehensions entertained by the hon. senior member for St. Peter are completely groundless in these days, and he can rest assured that the matters of which he complained are matters to which we are devoting appropriate attention ourselves.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Government in reply stated that they have to reply in order to stabilise their own position.

1.20 p.m.

This was not an accusation against the Government. The minds of people must be emancipated intellectually; people must be able to listen to someone else and hear a statement made in which they do not have to make any defence. There is too much defence going on, that is to say, that if somebody says something which is true, somebody from the unknown must say: "I am the Great Redeemer." I am not accusing the Government of anything; I am not the sort of hypocrite who will feel that the Government would be responsible for something and be afraid to say that they are responsible for it. I am not made up in that way. If there is one person who has paid the price of not being afraid of anybody, it is myself, and I will continue to pay that price for my freedom and liberty.

I agree with what the Hon. Leader of the House has said. I did not make anything as a specific reference but we know the list which is used; when visiting Warships come here and we are invited aboard the ships, we know where the invitation comes from. Which captain aboard a ship would know Frank Walcott? He would only know me by a list which they have here. There is no point even in the original reply in connection with going aboard ships. When you go aboard a ship you are invited there by those who are responsible locally for issuing invitations. The hon. member says that he was distressed because I made a statement which would, by implication, give the idea that the present Government is perpetuating some of these things. Nothing I said would imply that, but as to the defence which was made, when the Premier says that this is nothing to do with Warships, that would seem to reduce me to the stage of being an idiot and that I do not know the difference between this entertainment and when you are spending money on a Warship. I must say that I am not in that.

In connection with what the present Government does in so far as its policy in relation to racial discrimination is concerned, that does not work. The hon. member knows as well as I do that this sort of thing has been going on in this Chamber for many years, and therefore when you raise the question, you raise it in its general sense. I can quote many instances even today but I do not worry with them. Even today I have in my bag a report in connection with the Development Board and when we come to deal with that in our Estimates, then hon. members will hear my voice in a louder manner than this, where people are paying money for practices which they want to carry out. A hint to the wise is sufficient. Things are going on in the community and therefore we have to speak about them. As to the capitalists, my voice cannot be prevented. At the time when we are discussing the Federation debate, it may be that I will express my views on that.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this expenditure because I have had some personal experience about this question of entertainment as recently as yesterday. It is true that we have had a long and devious excursion during the course of the debate. We went as far as South Africa and we passed as far as through the Straits of Gibraltar, thanks, Mr. Chairman, to your unlimited latitude. We do not usually entertain people in their own homes and I may say that entertainment is not limited to the provision of drink or sweet meats. There is a definite need for money for providing this entertainment. Only yesterday I was trying to arrange an athletic match between personnel from these ships ranging from the ages of 18 to 22 and the senior boys of our secondary schools. Much to my surprise while I was able to obtain the venue and the consent of the Headmasters to send athletes, there was no money available for transportation from the Deep Water Harbour to the venue of the competition, and no money even for lemonade and buns in the afternoon after the competition. It was drawn to my attention that such a vote and even a larger vote is necessary in connection with the personnel of these boats which patrol the seas and keep us safely here in Barbados. Personnel of these boats should be entertained.

The question that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of $19,688 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

1.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land situate at Gall Hill in the parish of Christ Church for the purpose of extending the playing fields at the Foundations Schools.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

"House of Assembly approve of the Executive Committee, of the parcel of land described in the Schedule hereto for the purpose of providing a playing field at the Alleyne School and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein."

A VOICE: That is the wrong Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg your pardon. That is the one concerning the Alleyne School of which I gave notice earlier today. I will read the one concerning Foundation Schools. It reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, of the lands described in the Schedule hereto for the following public purpose, that is to say, for the extension of the playing fields at the Foundation Schools, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to the Resolution."

Now the Schedule, Sir, delineates all that certain piece or parcel of land situate near the Foundation Schools, in the parish of Christ Church containing by admeasurement 8,857 square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on lands of Marjorie Weekes et al on lands of the Foundation Schools the property of the Executive Committee on lands of the Estate of C. F. Ashby and on the public road or however else the same may abut and abound.

You will see, Sir, in the Addendum that the title of this land is questionable; it is not what we describe as a good and marketable title, and therefore the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, are being invoked in order that the Executive Committee may take over this land to make it available for the purpose of extending the playing fields at the Foundation Schools. The other occasion on which we normally invoke the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act will be the situation in which the Government cannot agree with the owner of the property, whoever he or she may be, over the price to be paid for the land, and by using the machinery of the Land Acquisition Act, the person who is the vendor and from whom the Government is buying is able to ask that the matter go to arbitration and the matter is settled by arbitration usually to the satisfaction of everyone.

You will remember, Sir, that there is on the record of this House a Resolution whereby we placed, I think it was, the sum of $28,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to purchase land from the Rector of the parish of Christ Church in whom the major portion of the playing field land was vested. There were several lots numbered from "a" to "g" in the Schedule to that Resolution, which was passed some time in 1961. As a matter of fact, Sir, the wall surrounding the playing field has been almost completed, and the wall goes right up on the Gall Hill Road on the properties which extend from the edge of the wall to the corner of what used to be the old Girls' Foundation School on the corner of Gall Hill and Maxwell Hill Road. It is for the purpose of acquiring that stretch of property from the end of the wall on the corner of Maxwell Hill Road that the permission of the Legislature is being sought through this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that hon. members will want any further explanation. As far as I can remember, the prices agreed on in 1955 for the other lots of land which were acquired for the purpose of the playing field were 15 cents a square foot and 18 cents a square foot which with the present cost of land is very reasonable indeed. The Legislature is not being asked to vote the money for the acquisition of this land; the Legislature is merely being asked to allow us to invoke the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act so that the land may be taken over and a marketable title obtained.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed to see this Resolution today because for a number of years the Government has been unable to secure this land for the purpose of enclosing this school completely. For that reason we had an awful lot of trouble in keeping the public from walking across the playing fields and becoming a nuisance, and at this particular point we could not even enclose the field. What I would like to ask the Premier is whether this is the only piece of land to be acquired now so that the entire playing fields can be enclosed. I think there is another spot on which there was a mission house which was blown down in Hurricane Janet. I do not think that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has been able to agree with the owners, whoever they may be, on a price or on a title. If that is going to hold it up, I wonder if any progress has been made in that, because it would open up the entire front of the school and we would not be able to enclose that. Although certain improvements have been made to the playing fields both of the Boys' Foundation and Girls' Foundation Schools, they are still in a very bad state. Money has been spent, but not to the best advantage because of the open nature of the schools. You will remember that the Premier said it had to be enclosed completely before the playing fields could be properly attended, and I would like to ask the Premier if the acquisition of this land will complete the entire property of the Foundation School or if there is any more land to be acquired for that purpose.

1.40 p.m.

There was a piece of land in Maxwell Hill in front of the school which used to contain a mission house which was blown down in "Janet". I do not think that was acquired.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Resolution. I, myself have had the privilege and honour of having attended this school. Although the Foundation School is a new building, it is still the Foundation School. I also made my contribution to the games of that school and on one occasion while playing on the pasture I was lifted unconscious from the field because of a large rock which was on the field.

Sir, despite the fact of limited playing fields and the building which housed the school at that time and one having to play in the adjacent cemetery and to take one's lunch in the Chase Vault, that school has been successful within recent years in winning championships among the boy's schools in athletics. I think that it should be known to this House what this school has been able to do in the field of sport - in cricket, football and athletics - without having proper playing fields; therefore, it gives me the greatest pleasure to support this very worthy Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the hon. junior member for Christ Church. I was looking to see whether there were any maps in the files but I have seen none. As I have said before, in 1961, the sum of $38,500 was included in the Draft Estimates to complete all the land acquisition in relation to the Foundation School. The sum of $28,800 was for the acquisition of parish land and the rest was for the purchase of Lots A to G. Lots F and G were originally decided to be purchased at the price of 15 cents and 18 cents respectively and we have noticed that a decision was made in 1961 to pay 24 cents per square foot for this parcel of land which is Lot G.

All I can tell the hon. member is that from the notes which I have been perusing, it appears that by process of negotiations all the other lots must have been acquired because we voted money for them; therefore, Lot G is the only one which we have to acquire now. I cannot say positively that there are these spots of land: but even at the rate in which solicitors are supposed to work in Barbados, I do not think that there is any doubt that between 1959 to 1962 these spots were acquired. Therefore, there is no reason why this spot should not be acquired.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) (REGULATIONS)

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1961" made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the seventh day of July, 1961, under the provisions of section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 as amended by section 41 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the twentieth day of July, 1961.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Legislature to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 1961, which were made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 7th July, 1961, under the provisions of Section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act 1937 (1937-16) as amended by Section 41 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945-12) and were approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 20th July, 1961. The Regulations provide that any traffic sign found on or near any road shall be deemed to have been placed there by the Director of Highways and Transport until the contrary is proved.

The Regulations have been laid in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions, in cases of this sort in the Courts, the Director of Highways and Transport would have to be called in to give evidence that he placed that particular sign there.

Regulation 65 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations reads as follows:-

"No driver or other person in charge of a motor vehicle other than a motor omnibus shall cause or permit such vehicle to wait or remain stationary on any road other than 30 feet off or opposite the point fixed as a stopping place for motor omnibuses by the Director of Highways and Transport."

Regulation 71 (2) reads:-

"Any traffic sign placed by the Director of Highways and Transport on or near any road shall be deemed to be of the prescribed size, colour, and type and to have been lawfully placed on such road until the contrary is proved."

A submission in the Courts that in every case brought under Regulation 65, evidence must be produced to prove that the sign was erected by the Director of Highways and Transport has been upheld. It would be very difficult for the Director to produce such evidence in some cases. It has therefore been decided that Regulation 71 (2) should be amended to conform with the English legislation in an effort to make it unnecessary to produce such evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

1.50 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF BUILDING TO THE ST. JOHN AMBULANCE BRIGADE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to the St. John Ambulance Brigade of a building situated at Constitution Road, St. Michael,

near the Children's Goodwill League for use of a Headquarters for the St. John Ambulance Brigade.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:-

"This Resolution seeks the approval of the Legislature to the lease of a building, formerly used by the U.S. Workers Savings Organization as an Office and situated near the Children's Goodwill League, Constitution, St. Michael, to the St. John Ambulance Brigade on a Monthly basis at a rental of 25 cents a month for use as a Headquarters. The Brigade is to be responsible for the maintenance of the building."

This building was formerly used by the U.S. Workers Savings Organization as an office for paying allotments to the families of Barbadians employed on U.S. Farm work. After the Government purchased "Herbert House" in Fontabelle to house the Labour Department, this branch of the Department was removed there. The building which was formerly used is therefore not in use. An application was received on 17th April, 1961, from the St. John Ambulance Brigade which had no permanent headquarters and, being desirous of having such headquarters, they have approached the Government for the use of this building. In view of the value of the services of this organization to the island as a whole, the Government considers that the request of the Brigade should be granted and hereby seeks the approval of this House to lease the building to them at a peppercorn rental of 25 cents a month. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Mr. SPEAKER: The consideration of that Resolution brings to a close Government Business for the day. If hon. members desire to proceed with any Orders under "Private Members' Business", a motion may be made for the suspension of the sitting until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and I ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I find myself in this difficulty that there is no one to call upon to ring the Bell.

Mr. YEARWOOD, Mr. LOWE, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON and Mr. SMITH entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: A request has been made that I have the Bell rung but there was no one to ring the Bell.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that no answers to questions have been laid. We will now proceed to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to resume debate on a Resolution re loans to sugar workers. On the last occasion, the hon. Minister of Agriculture was speaking at 4.30 when Private Members' Business came to an end. The hon. member is now entitled to resume.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I was at a point where I was giving a resumé as to the actual establishment of these Reserve Funds as they were set up in 1947 when they were first introduced. I shall just rehearse briefly the point which I was making at the time. There are three Reserve Funds in the Sugar Industry. There is the Rehabilitation Fund which is purely for the rehabilitation of sugar factories and which is usually utilised every year to the exception of a few dollars for the functioning of the factories. That Fund is allocated to the factory owners in order to rehabilitate and modernise their factories, and it is a free gift to the factory owners.

Secondly, there is the Price Stabilization Fund which has a substantial sum standing to its credit and which was utilised to some extent - to the tune of $2 million - so far as the building of the new hospital was concerned, and also to the extent of $1/2 million for the establishment of the bulk shipment store at the Deep Water Harbour.

Thirdly, there is the Labour Welfare Fund which is administered by the Cabinet. As you will remember, Sir, there was a Bill here in the last Session when an attempt was made to change the nomenclature of that Fund. That is the Fund to which the hon. member is referring. The hon. member will realise that this Labour Welfare Fund has an incalculable amount of work or service to render in that the standard of housing in Barbados is of such that if that money were given away, as most us would like to see happen, by way of a free gift, then we would not have enough money to go around. In other words, there would not be a revolving fund in order to cater to the needs of thousands of applications to which this Fund is subject; so the money is loaned and not given and it bears interest at present at the rate of 2%.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had checked very carefully with some of his colleagues, many of whom are not here at present - but if he had checked with his colleagues who were left, the former Minister of Social Services and some of his other colleagues, he probably might have discovered that his figures as set out are not quite accurate in that whereas originally the applicants should have one-quarter, which is 25%, and the other three-quarters, or 75%, was contributed by way of loans by the Government, amendments have since been made to the Rules governing this Fund, and the Labour Welfare Housing Loan (Amendment) Rules of 1957 now only require an applicant who is applying for a loan to have the first 10%, and the Government loans, not 75% as it was originally when it was first instituted, but 90%. I think now that it has been brought to the attention of the hon. member that the Governments lends 90% and not 75% as was thought and that the applicant who is applying for a loan is only called upon to bring in 10% and not 25%, I think that will probably go a long way towards appeasing the fears of the hon. member who quite rightly is seeking a means of reducing the hardship of the average sugar worker and general worker who is anxious to take full advantage of this fund in order to supply better housing accommodation for himself and family.

While we are about it, Sir, I will give briefly one or two figures by way of statistics which should serve some useful purpose. Now the total loans since 1951, to say, March, 1961 which have been made by the Housing Authority, as it is called today, are 11,676 and the money provided was to the tune of $5,275,922. Those are loans which have been made to sugar workers. The loans which have been made to general workers which in reality started in 1958 were made to 1,351 applicants to the tune of $638,997. That gives an idea of the volume of work that the Housing Authority has been doing, and as I said, it must of necessity

Mr. SMITH: You will remember, Sir, that I said that since I introduced this Resolution, I checked with the Housing Authority and discovered that the qualification has been lowered, but the hon. member must say something and twist it his way. He wanted to tell me that I am afraid of my seat in St. Joseph. Can he take a seat out of my house in St. Joseph? What is he thinking? I live in the same house as he.

Mr. SPEAKER: You live similarly in a house just as the hon. member does.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, and if he came to my house for a seat I would kick him out!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may use no more force than is necessary.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has people around him who are hungry, but I am not hungry for his food. Now, Sir, in reply to the hon. member for St. Andrew, I said that if he had gone on he would see that the Resolution said "BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-quarter be reduced by 50% or in the alternative be waived". Why could he not have read that? The hon. member for St. John referred to the 50%, but he would see if he had gone further that it said "or in the alternative be waived." I was speaking when the hon. member got up, and I was arguing that if the borrower can produce a surety that this money will be repaid within a specific time and the employer agrees to stop it out in the same way as the P.A.Y.E. system, you should give the borrower the house. I am not asking the Government to do anything that is wrong or impossible; I am dealing now with waiving it and not with the 50%, because I have discovered that it has already been lowered. I am dealing now with the interest and insurance which have be to paid.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the Resolution I did not know about the interest charges and the insurance, but I discovered those things at the same time that I discovered that the qualification was lowered to 10%; so I do not want, as the member says, to run inside here with something without having the facts. Sometimes lawyers go into court without facts and have to withdraw their cases.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even occasionally without fees.

Mr. SMITH: Some of them go into court with cases and then have to withdraw; so if I have to withdraw this Resolution it would not be as bad. Some big shot lawyer had to carry someone to court all the way in St. Philip and had to withdraw the case. I did not go to Middle Temple or Jesus College or anything of the sort; so if he had to withdraw his case where he is a big top-notch lawyer, what do you think of me if I have to withdraw this Resolution? I am sorry the hon. member has gone out, but a coward generally does that; he lights fire and runs and leaves it.

Sir, these people have to do more than pay for the house, and if it is the intention of the Government to help them, they must do all they possibly can to help them. Now this money, as I have said, - I do not even know if the Hon. Premier knows - belongs to the people. It is taken from every cane-grower in this country to help them in the same way as the Rehabilitation money, and the same way you can give one section of the community this money free of cost and without paying any insurance on it, you could give these people also. If you give a factory owner $100 or $1,000 to buy a roller, when he buys it, it is his. If he had to look for the money or borrow it from a bank or solicitor to buy a roller, he would have to pay interest on it; but in this case he does not have to pay any interest; so you are making him a present of this money. Well surely, Sir, these people should be made a present of this money too, but it would not go too far and we do not want to stop the wheel of progress. We want them to pay it back in so that when John pays his money, Mary will be able to get her house. 3.10 p.m.

When the money accruing to the Rehabilitation Fund is gone in any given crop or any given time and a factory owner wants a roller for his factory, he has to wait until the next crop to get that money or he can take his money and buy the roller. I daresay if he can show the bill for the purchase of that roller, he can get the money from the Rehabilitation Fund afterwards, or as soon as they get some money accruing to that Fund. However, these poor people cannot get this money; hence the people who borrowed it would have to repay it.

I am asking that the interest charges and the insurance be abolished. It can be paid from the same fund, but it should not be added to the account of the borrowers. We are helping these people but not to the extent which we are helping the factory owners; and from my viewpoint, the factory owners are more able to pay than these poor people.

(Loud asides by hon. members.)

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind hon. members on my immediate right of Standing Order No. 29 (6). It reads as follows:-

"While a member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Mr. SMITH: Sir, since this new Session has began, every time I get up to say anything, I am hearing the remarks from hon. members on the other side that I was either dumb or my mouth was tied before. It is foolishness for hon. members to be saying that. Do you mean to say that I have come back in here not to represent people? Must I sit in here as a man who is dumb and allow the present Government to do as they like? I did not come in here on a stretcher; I was elected in the same manner as other hon. members. I have taken no notice of those asides before but to hear such asides this afternoon coming from the big "McGuffy", that is the top man, the Hon. Premier, well, it is time that I should say something. How did he know that I did not raise this question during the time of the former Government? I am sure that he would not expect me to give out to the public or even now to say that I raised this question with the last Government but did not get any hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps, in those days, the voice of the hon. member was one crying out in the wilderness.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, it is foolishness to say that I was in here all the time previously and I did not know poor people. I am bound to know poor people and more so than the hon. member.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has said that none of us is aware that he did not raise these issues during the tenure of office of the previous Government; therefore, his remarks as to why they were not raised then are inappropriate. The hon. member did not raise them on the floor of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Past discipline of the last Government was such that I envisage these questions could not be raised then by the backbenchers.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I raised all of these questions during my campaign. I spoke of them on nearly all platforms in this Island. I promised your constituents that I would have done this if I were re-elected. I went to St. John and I also promised the constituents of that parish that I would have done this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member promise that, if the people in St. Lucy did not return my colleague and myself?

Mr. SMITH: Oh no. I was not a candidate for St. Lucy but I told them that if I was returned - and they would understand that I meant for St. Joseph - I would bring forward this same Resolution and I have brought it forward this afternoon. I promised them that wherever I spoke; and whether it was the former Government or this Government, it was your humble servant's intention to bring forward these issues, I am not afraid of any person at all because I am prepared to work. If one looks at my hands, one would see that the palms could not have the colour which they have

unless they were used to hard work. That is why I am prepared to work. I made promises to the people of this Island that I would raise these questions and I am prepared to carry out my promises. The members of the Government can turn this Resolution down or do whatever they like. They think that they will be doing me harm when they turn it down, or that I may lose my seat; they do not know that they would be cementing me in my seat when they do that. I have the remedy when they turn it down. They do not yet know that one man can overthrow a Government.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is it too late for the hon. member to have his Resolution amended? Why does he think of our turning it down? Let him put it in proper shape first. He made certain wrong conclusions in the Resolution, and as it stands, it is not in order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I can clearly understand the hon. senior member for Christ Church. My interpretation of the Resolution as it is presently worded is that the second part cannot be entertained at all. It says:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-quarter be reduced by 50% or in the alternative be waived, should an intending borrower provide surety in lieu of the amount that he is required to provide."

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is willing to have this part of the Resolution amended: "BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-quarter be reduced by 50% or in the alternative be waived," and that complies with the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I gather that the hon. senior member for Christ Church was interested in directing the hon. member's attention to elimination of certain words in that part of the Resolution.
3.20 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I thought that the hon. member for Christ Church would be the last person to direct the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in what he should do in this matter in this sense. The Resolution quite clearly asks that the amount of one-quarter be reduced by 50%, which would be 12 1/2%, or that the amount be waived; but since the amount is now lower than 12 1/2%, you should not have to waive it. At least the 10% which exists at present should satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even this 10% the hon. member would want to be waived so that the intended borrower could provide a surety in lieu of the 10%.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that you could read that into the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: If those words are deleted, the Resolution would read:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-tenth be reduced by 50% or in the alternative be waived should an intending borrower provide surety in lieu of the amount that he is required to provide."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Let us put it in this way. Originally, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had been aware of the fact that the deposit was only 10% he would not have brought the Resolution. (Mr. SPEAKER: He might not have.) Now this 12 1/2% for which the hon. member is asking is even more than what the deposit now is. In other words, the deposit is even less than what the hon. member asked for originally. Therefore, I suggest to the hon. member that now he is made aware of the fact that the deposit is less than that for which he was asking originally, the alternative does not apply.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter for the hon. member.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member suggested that the deposit should be 12 1/2%. It is now 10% and the fact that it is 2 1/2% below what the hon. member is asking for, I am submitting that that is enough to satisfy his constituents and himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: The constituents did not come to the acknowledgement.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Then he should not have brought this Resolution at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House should not try to elaborate on his own point of order. The hon. member celebrates the 22nd year of his entry into this House and therefore he should be an adept on parliamentary procedure.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has said that if I knew that this amount was less than what was asked for in the Resolution I should not have brought it at all. I want to say that I have discovered since then that the amount has been reduced. If the hon. member had not raised the point I was going to raise it in my reply since I knew that the amount had been reduced; however, I could not say anything about that until the time came for me to reply. I am going to ask leave of the House to amend this Resolution by deleting the word "one-quarter" wherever it appears, and substituting therefor the word "one-tenth". *(Laughter from the Gallery.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be order within the precincts of this House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave also to delete the words "or in the alternative" occurring in the last paragraph of the Resolution. The Resolution in its third paragraph will then read:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-tenth be waived should an intending borrower provide surety in lieu of the amount that he is required to provide."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking the leave of the House to amend this Resolution.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, the hon. member must realise that he came in here with a Resolution which read entirely differently from the amendment which is now proposed.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has not proposed anything; he is asking for leave.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Therefore, we are going to oppose the granting of leave.

Mr. SPEAKER: Such leave may be agreed to or disapproved of; that is the option of any hon. member. Anyhow, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is asking leave to amend the Resolution by the deletion of the word "one-quarter" wherever it appears and the substitution thereof of the word "one-tenth" and the deletion of the words "or in the alternative".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, how does it read then? If he deletes "or in the alternative" this is how it reads:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-tenth be reduced by 50% or be waived."

There is no motion asking for leave to delete "reduce by 50%".

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no motion yet.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: There has been no request for leave to take out the words "be reduced by 50%; he has only asked for leave.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to read what the hon. member wants and I can only accept what the Clerk has read. The Clerk will now read the Resolution as it is now proposed for leave to be granted. Will hon. members listen carefully?

Mr. DEPUTY CLERK: "WHEREAS the sugar workers and general workers are required to provide one-tenth of

the cost of any house in respect of which a loan may be granted.

AND WHEREAS many workers find it difficult to raise the required amount;

BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-tenth be waived should an intending borrower provide surety in lieu of the amount that he is required to provide."

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is asking leave of the House to amend the Resolution that it may read as has been read by Mr. DEPUTY CLERK. Those in favour of the granting of leave so to amend will please say "Aye".

VOICES: "Aye".

Mr. SPEAKER: Any against the granting leave so to amend will please say "No".

VOICES: "No".

Mr. SPEAKER: As there is at least one dissentient voice, leave may not be granted. Leave therefore is not granted and the Resolution may not be amended. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph may proceed with his second speech.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am still saying that the insurance, interest and other charges should be waived from this Resolution because at present the interest.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When the hon. member says that the insurance and interest should be waived from this Resolution, what does he mean? There is absolutely no reference at all in this Resolution to interest and insurance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can only mean the Resolution which is before this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is no interest or insurance in writing, but it exists at the Housing Authority. They charge interest and there are other charges including insurance. Well, I am saying that that is too much on these people and creates a hardship on them by making them pay these charges when, as the hon. senior member for St. Philip knows, the Rehabilitation Fund is given out to factory owners without interest and without other charges and there is no repayment. I would like to know if it is fair that one section of these people can enjoy such privileges from the Fund as not paying charges such as insurance and interest and not even making repayments, and then those people whom we are representing must pay insurance, interest and other charges. I am raising this point, Sir, so that the Government if they care can consider it. If the hon. member goes to Country Road and asks if Lloyd Smith has an account there, he will find that I have none. If he goes to Manning and Company, the Cotton Factory or N. B. Howell, he will find an account for Lloyd Smith from Sugar Hill there; so I am not asking for relief from interest, insurance or other charges for myself or my children; I am asking for it for the people who helped to put us in here. Those are the people who are suffering, and if they have not drawn it to the attention of their representatives, some of them have drawn it to my attention and I have made a promise that I would see to it and do all that lies in my power to get them relieved of it. This was one of the planks of my platform and they have turned it down; but I am not going to die too early, and it will always be one of the first planks of my platform. You let the other people get away by not paying back, and by not paying interest or insurance, but you are asking the poor people to pay. That suits me more than anything else; so it is a matter for them to think of me and forget the people who put them here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member has said that it suits him better than anything else for these things to go on — this payment of interest at the rate of 2% on the part of sugar workers who obtain loans from the Labour Welfare Department. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member refers to that, he is referring to the existing interest rates which were imposed by his Party for the last seventeen years. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is suggesting — I want him to correct me if I am wrong — that what we should do is entirely to rescind the Regulations in this respect as imposed by the previous Government for seventeen years, and now remove all the interest charges on these loans as well as any other charges from the granting of a loan. Is that what he means? That has been going on for seventeen years, but he now suddenly wants it stopped because suddenly he has had complaints that it should stop and he is now bringing those complaints to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has directed attention to the point which he desired to bring to the notice of the Hon. Mover of this Resolution, and the Hon. Mover of this Resolution may, of course, in carrying on with his reply deal with that point if he thinks fit.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to do away with it on the whole, and I have said in my remarks that they can take it from the fund as a whole and not from the people.

3.40 p.m.

In other words, you deduct so much insurance from the fund and not from the borrower. I do not know if the hon. member was in his seat when I was speaking on the Resolution. What I said was that instead of the borrower paying it, the fund should carry it. That is what I was trying to explain. The insurance will have to be paid. I am saying that the same way that the factory owners are enjoying it without paying anything, there is nothing wrong to let the interest and the insurance come from the fund. You are doing this to help him.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. This needs clarification. The hon. member said that in the same way that other people are enjoying it from the fund. Enjoying what?

Mr. SMITH: The Rehabilitation Fund.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Rehabilitation Fund is not a loan. The Rehabilitation Fund is a free gift based on the tonnage produced by the factory concerned. The people who benefit from the Rehabilitation Fund are not borrowing one cent.

Mr. SMITH: The money accruing to that Fund and the other funds is got from sugar. As a matter of fact, it is one fund divided into three — the Rehabilitation Fund, the Price Stabilisation Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund. If it is a dollar taken out, it is divided among those three funds. I am saying that the money accruing to the Rehabilitation Fund, you are giving to the factory owners. You are giving this money away; but you are lending the workers in the industry from what accrues to the Labour Welfare Fund although that money comes from the price which you get for sugar. Those workers have worked harder than the factory owners. I know that you cannot give them this money but I am saying that you should help them as much as you can. You can only help them by not allowing them to pay interest, insurance and the other charges. That is what I want to explain. I do not know if the hon. member understands it. The people who stand to benefit from the Labour Welfare (Housing Loan) Fund are the unfortunate people because there are too many who want to build houses and to repair them. Politicians told them that they should not pay it back, but I am not saying that they should not pay it back. It should be paid back so that more people would be able to get help. However, I am saying that you should help those people by waiving the interest and insurance charges and also by waiving the 10 percent.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I would like to ask your permission to allow me to speak on this Resolution as I understand that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has replied. That permission has already been granted hon. members provided that the House has no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The position is this. It would be *ultra vires* for the Speaker to purport to grant such leave; but if the House granted leave, then the hon. [illegible]

permitted to speak after the mover of the Resolution has replied.

Standing Order 27 says:-

"The mover of a motion may reply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other Member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order."

I pause here to say that the phrase "Members present have had an opportunity" means that it is the duty of every member of the House to be present in the House from the beginning of prayers until the adjournment of the Chamber. Every member is deemed to be present and therefore he is deemed to have had an opportunity of addressing the House; but if through exceptional circumstances an hon. member has had to absent himself, he may seek leave of the House to speak after the mover has replied provided there is no dissentient voice and if he is not a Minister.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is seeking the leave of the House, for reasons which he has given, to speak. If there is no dissentient voice, such leave is granted. *(A pause)* No dissentient voice being audible to the Chair, the hon. member may speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank you very much for the opportunity. I want to assure the hon. mover of this Resolution that I would not have taken this opportunity if I were not in general in favour of the Resolution. I think that this was a Resolution, without taking any thunder away from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, which I had asked questions about in the former Government.

I think that there is logic for at least removing the 10% which the borrower is now called upon to provide under the Regulations to get a loan. I think that can be removed because if you are going to loan a man $800, I think that you should regard that fund as being put there to benefit agricultural workers.

However, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that he should have an investigation into the Housing Authority to find out if everything has been working well. It has been drawn to my attention - I do not know if it is a fact - that the Chairman of the Housing Authority has been granted a loan from the Labour Welfare (Housing Loans) Fund to purchase a motor car. I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would see if there is any substance of fact at all in the allegation. If the funds of the Housing Authority can be utilised for purposes which are illegal, then I think it is a matter which calls for examination.

3.50 p.m.

I rise to say that the 10% which is now being charged should be removed so as to give the sugar workers the opportunity of having their loans without any difficulty whatever. I make this statement, but this allegation is one which the Minister should examine if it is a fact. If it is a fact that the Chairman of the Housing Authority has been granted a loan by the Board, I do not think that the Board has any authority to do that, because the Chairman does not come under the provisons of the Travelling Allowance Act; I do not see how he could come under that. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to add my quota to the debate on a Resolution which essentially aims at giving loans to people in the industry. The question of the interest rate would not worry us because it is a nominal amount; but what stands in the way of the people more than the interest rate is the question of their being called upon to furnish 10% of the loan.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I have not yet spoken. I have risen on a point of order but I have not yet spoken in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister will recall that before the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made his second speech, I invited all hon. members who were present to contribute to the debate before the hon. member made his final speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Is a Minister not entitled to make a statement of explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion would have to be one which is critical of the Government, or reflecting adversely on or be calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or upon a Government officer. The Minister may only now speak if he will assure me that what he has to say complies with paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 27.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the acceptance of this motion would imply that the Government had not given any previous consideration to this matter and therefore the Government deserves to be criticised for continuing for two months what has been existing in actual fact for 17 years.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a question of a motion which is critical of this Government, not of a previous Government.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Resolution implies a question of this Government's perpetuation of the policy of the previous Government which has been condemned so strongly by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has definitely stated that the matter is now under consideration by the Government - both the policy of the interest rate and the removal of insurance premiums on the houses which are constructed with the money obtained from this source by way of loans. In other words, we cannot sit here and vote for this Resolution, because an affirmative vote would mean that the Government had been waiting for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to draw this matter to their attention, and they would not have considered it if the hon. member had not brought forward this matter. The House has been assured by one of the Ministers that this matter is under consideration by the Government.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. member would be right because this Resolution was on the Order Paper from the beginning of this Session. The Hon. Minister cannot say that it was the negligence of this present Government which was only waiting for me to bring up this matter for them to do anything about it. I would say that this Government had not yet warmed their seats when I brought in this Resolution. Wherever I spoke in the various constituencies I hinted at this matter and it was a question for whichever Government got into power. I could understand the hon. member's remarks if he were a member of the former Government; but to say what he has said, you could as well say that he should be blamed for the paying out of the Old Age Pensions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to commend the Hon. Leader of the House for his ingenuity in trying to get around paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 27, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has taken the wind out of the Minister's sails when he pointed out that he was not being critical of the present Government whose action he was unable to anticipate.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Making the allowance that the hon. member desired in some way to condemn the Government run by his Party for this matter, yet the matter cannot rest there. The hon. member has been told that this matter is under consideration by this Government. Since he has been gracious enough as to concede that this is not the fault of the present Government, after having been given the assurance that this Government will consider the matter, he should withdraw the motion.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot remember hearing the Hon. Minister of Agriculture say in this House today that this matter is under consideration. He could have said it, but I did not hear it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I did most emphatically state that the question of the percentage which was raised by the hon. member and the question of taking or charging any interest at all is now receiving the attention of the Government and Government policy will be enunciated at a future date by the appropriate Minister. Those were my exact words.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member spoke about the interest but he did not mention anything about the 10% down payment; I wonder if that matter is also under consideration?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I drew to the attention of the hon. member that this Resolution was not in order and I explained the entire matter as it now stands. I explained that the entire question is under consideration by the Government. The hon. member introduced this Resolution on the very first day on which this new House was convened; therefore, to which Government is the hon. member referring?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made it quite clear that when he introduced this Resolution it was not intended to be a motion critical of the present Government or to reflect adversely on or calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government officer.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was trying to establish that since the hon. mover of the Resolution himself made it very clear that he had no intention either directly or indirectly to castigate the present Government in this matter, since he has received the assurance that the matter is under consideration and since he himself has just said that he tabled this Resolution on the first day on which this House was convened, on having received that assurance from the Minister of Agriculture, I think that he should withdraw his motion at this stage.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of choice.

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

Noes: Mr. BATSON; Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOWE and Mr. YEARWOOD – 9.

Ayes: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. SMITH; Mr. MILLER; Mr. SEALY; Mr. LYNCH . . . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for the City assure this House whether he was or was not in his place when the question was put?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not even know what the question was or what was debated. I just walked through the House and heard Your Honour putting the question; so I do not know if the Public Buildings are to be blown up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not inviting the hon. member to make a speech. It is possible that the hon. member could come in the House and not know what was taking place, but I am asking the hon. member if he was in his seat when the question was put. Would the hon. member say whether or not he was?

Mr. MOTTLEY: You would have to ask the Clerk. I was not paying attention when the question was put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed by Mr. Clerk that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown was in his place when the question was put.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what the hon. member means when he.....

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter does not admit of debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will accept the assurance of the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member says he will accept, as indeed he has to accept, the assurance of the Clerk that he was in his place when the question was put. The hon. member must take his seat.
Mr. Clerk, will you please repeat the question for the hon. member?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know anything about the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown please take his seat? Mr. Clerk, please read the question for the benefit of the hon. member who was not paying attention.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, I do not know what is the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution is No. I under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. If the hon. senior member for Bridgetown is not in receipt of his Order Paper or his Notices, will he please refer the matter to me and I will see that he gets them?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will say that I have not got it here with me; so if the Clerk could read it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member on the left of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would not let him see his Notice, I will ask the Clerk to read the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think the Clerk should read the Resolution because the hon. member on my left is now out of the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Clerk please read the Resolution?

Mr. CLERK: The Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the sugar workers and general workers are required to provide one-tenth of the cost of any house in respect of which a loan may be granted;

AND WHEREAS many workers find it difficult to raise the required amount;

BE IT RESOLVED that the amount of one-tenth be waived, should an intending borrower provide surety in lieu of the amount that he is required to provide."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am looking forward to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown co-operating, not only that the work may proceed expeditiously, but in setting an example to the junior members of this Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That has always been happening and I will continue to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member would not deviate as from today.

The division was continued as follows:-
Ayes: Mr. MOTTLEY – 6

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, six hon. members voting for and nine hon. members voting against.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. As I recall, mention was made earlier today that the Select Committee has not yet reported; therefore I presume the hon. member is not seeking to proceed now.

Similarly, I gather that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not seeking to proceed with the third reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act in as much as that Bill was referred to a Select Committee which has not up to now reported.

Order No. 4 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George: to move the passing of a Resolution re teaching of civics in schools.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am not proceeding with that Order today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George is not ready to proceed with that matter standing in his name; and the next matter also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George who likewise is not now disposed to proceed.

Order No. 6 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Is the hon. member ready to proceed?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone that Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not ready to proceed now to move the passing of a Resolution re reduction of instalments payable by fishermen on purchase of their boats.

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph: to move the passing of a Resolution re scheme to aid Old Age Pensioners in the repairs of their homes.

RESOLUTION re AID TO OLD AGE PENSIONERS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this will take very long because hon. members are quite willing to say "no" to everything; so I will not worry to take up much of their time.
4.10 p.m.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the homes of many old age pensioners throughout the Island are in dire need of repair,

AND WHEREAS it is beyond the capacity of the said pensioners owing to the pittance granted them to undertake such repairs;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government institute a scheme whereby such repairs be undertaken at the public expense either through an agency of the Central Government or through the Local Government authorities."

Now, Sir, we have some very old people who are existing only on the small amount which is being paid to them from Public Assistance and Old Age Pension. Those people do not have any person whatsoever to help them repair their homes. These amounts which are being paid to them cannot even keep body and soul together and they are living in houses in which one would not put an expensive milch cow, because there are some milch cattle that are so expensive that you are bound to keep them in an expensive shelter and away from the rain or else they are liable to contract a cold, the result being that the owner is liable to lose that cow.

There are some old people who are living in houses which are not fit for habitation: but through no fault of their own, some of them have given all of their time to the wealth of the country and now they have no one to repair their homes. When I was on the Poor Law Board in St. Joseph we had many a complaint about this matter and we tried our best to help but we could not help as much as the people wanted help.

I feel that this is a question which Government should take into consideration. Government should help in this respect one way or the other so as to prevent them from living in dilapidated houses. There are some of these old people who would go to an institution and live, but there are others who would prefer to suffer and to stay out in the rain rather than go to an institution. I will also say that if every poor person went to the various almshouses, it would cost the local authorities a lot more than to repair their houses and let them live outside.

Sir, one may say that this is a matter for the local authorities. As far as the country areas are concerned, the local authorities are not in a position to repair houses for these people. In order to do that, they would have to carry the taxes sky high. In the country areas, there are only two sources from which to get taxation - from the land, and trade. I feel that Government should do something about it and my suggestion is that Government give a grant for the purpose to the local authorities or give instructions to the Housing Authority to repair the homes of those old people. Do not allow them to live in such dilapidated houses.

During the election time, all that you could hear coming through the loud speakers was "the poor people; you should help these poor people." There was never a night on which you did not hear that. The poor people have toiled day in and day out and have created the wealth of this country. Do not leave them out in the rain. We should concern ourselves with them.

Sir, I do not think I should say very much on this Resolution. Anyone who has a soul should be able to see with this Resolution. Anyone who has any love should see that this is something which wants remedying. Even a brute would see that this is something that needs immediate attention by this Government.

I now respectfully beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable to me to sit here patiently and hear those words coming from a member who has been a member of the Northern District Council for the past few years. He is asking that the Government repair the homes of old age pensioners.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion?

Mr. SEALEY: Yes, Sir. When I entered the Bridgetown City Council as an Alderman, I saw that the homes of poor people were being repaired through the Municipality and, as a matter of fact, that was going on for the past fifteen years. It is regrettable that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was in the House for fifteen years and has waited until now to raise the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this Resolution. If a motion is correct, it is correct. I made it clear to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that he lifted it fairly and squarely from my manifesto.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to a personal manifesto or a Party's manifesto?

Mr. MOTTLEY: My Party's manifesto. Sir, I think it is absolutely no trouble in my convincing this Government that this is a matter worthy of consideration because it has been preached year after year and election after election. It has been said that the jaws of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph have been loosened since the last election but I would say, whether that is so or not, that his heart was always in the right place, but Party discipline prevented him from doing such things.

Here it is, you have a number of people in Barbados who passed through the 1914-18 War when during that period sugar was sold from broker to broker. After the 1939 War, sugar was sold from Government to Government and therefore the prices were fixed. Therefore, unlike what some people think, that is, that the Barbados Labour Party got this money for them, the price of sugar was fixed year by year. A tremendous lot of people thought that the Barbados Labour Party got this money for them, but I hope that that Party has gone from us for a long time. We have always said that those persons who passed through the 1914-18 War bore the brunt of the day and got nothing. There was no Labour Welfare Fund in those days. I criticised the plantocracy and the mercantile community of those days because they made a lot of money and took advantage of the agricultural labourer.
4.20 p.m.

That is what we said. They have contributed yesterday what those today benefit from, and we had asked the last Government to set aside a sum from the Labour Welfare Fund for the immediate repairs of these little houses in which these people live. If you were to take the period from the 1939 War up to now, you will find that people between the ages of 25 and 40 years can benefit from this Fund; but those who are between the ages of 60 and 70 years cannot say that they did any substantial work and therefore, according to the Regulations, they cannot get anything from this Fund. We have always argued that it is not enough for the Local Authority to make these contributions. It was something like 15 years ago when attempts were made to repair these old people's houses because these people would live and die in their own cottages, rather than go to the best arranged Infirmary. In the Municipality we have been able to spend annually an amount of money, which we could ill afford, to repair the houses of a few people. It is not a matter which the Local Government should look after. I heartily agree with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that you would either have to increase the rates on land or place those rates on property.

I think it would come with good grace for the present Government to set aside a sum of money from the Labour Welfare Fund to assist these people. I may say that there are those who have laboured and given of their sweat and blood to this community and this money should not be loaned at all. In some cases the houses of these people cannot be repaired at all. I say that a sum of money should be set aside and applied towards making these people live comfortably until their death. These people have suffered after the 1914-18 War and they got less than 18 cents a day for their work. It is about time, therefore, that, from the Labour Welfare Fund, those who have worked in this century in the industry but who did not qualify, purely because of their age and because of illness such as the effect of a bad heart and other ailments, should benefit from this Fund. It is not a matter of leaving things to the Local Government because they cannot find the money with which to look after these people. There are hon. members who have made their contributions, but nothing was said about it. The hon. member, who was a member of the last Government, did not see fit to bring out this matter or to bring it out publicly; now he has courage and sympathy and he has been able to regain his seat; he must have discussed this matter at one time or another. When the hon. member brings in a matter such as this, that shows what a reflection it must have been on the hierarchy of the Government of which he was a member. I believe that the hon. member is sympathetic with these people, not overnight, but he has been so years ago; but it shows the hard-heartedness of the brutes with whom he had to deal - and I use his own words - the people who had no sympathy for these suffering people. These old houses did not go up last week or last year. The hon. member was in here for the last 17 years and I believe he has sympathy for these people: but he could not convince the brutes with whom he had to deal, so that he could help their grantparents in repairing their houses. It may be said that the hon. member feels that he is now dealing with human beings and not brutes. *(Laughter).*

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I think that the hon. member is carrying this word "brutes" too far. What I said was that even a brute would see the need for this provision. I did not say "brutes". The hon. member wants the Government to understand that I was referring to members of the last Government as brutes *(Laughter).*

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made a clear explanation between the singular and the plural. I hope that the hon. senior member for the City will take note of that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Government Party was dominated by one man. Is the hon. member referring to the man who would say that even if Savage says that he would do something that man would do something else? Is the hon. member referring to him? Who is the brute? I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. George is not the brute. He was closely associated with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph for 17 years; whom does he threaten when he says: "When I am finished with him he cannot get a seat anywhere"? The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not suggesting that his other colleagues are brutes.

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, the time when Private Members' Business is completed automatically. There is no further Government Business on the Order Paper for the day and I await a Ministerial motion.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday 20th February, 1962 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

4.30 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I think it is appropriate at this stage that the House should get down to some commonsense basis and not perpetuate a system that is wasteful of man power. Members of the House of Assembly are presumably people of high man power, including the Ministers; and I cannot see in the name of conscience that it is a worthwhile Parliamentary exercise to be coming here every week and finishing business at 4.30 o'clock, and not having a system in which we could at least do public business in some fashion whereby we could really clear the Order Paper and proceed to perform our private tasks in other forms. Though we are members of Parliament, we represent our constituents other than in the House of Assembly. Some members are members of Committees, and Ministers can find appropriate time to devote to other business of Government; so this is only a perpetuation of a bad system.

It is now two months since we have met and this Order Paper from the Government has been cleared. I think it has been cleared on another occasion. Private Members' Business is not much, and it is really a matter of wasteful human expenditure to be coming here Tuesday after Tuesday just with this sort of thing. I think we should get down to devising ways and means of meeting modern trends. I think it is incumbent upon those of us who are the leaders of people to point the better way of doing business and not continue this old time system of just meeting every Tuesday for the sake of meeting just to pass a few pious Resolutions and really not get down to any serious business. If we do not have any business, let us adjourn for some longer time; but I do think it wastes everybody's time, and I do not think we should be the ones in Barbados, where people talk about higher productivity, to waste time when we can get down to proper Parliamentary procedure. I hope the Leader of the House will endeavour to have a more modern method of dealing with Government business and not merely a copybook method, so that we can be more effective in our Parliamentary duties.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must strongly object to the suggestion that we are wasting the time of hon. members coming here very Tuesday. What the hon. member does not realise is that we are doing in three or four hours what normally took eight hours to be dealt with before. Normally we would come here at 12 o'clock and at 6 o'clock in the afternoon were still discussing the first Resolution, merely because the Government Benches were not keen on supplying information when asked for, or in some cases could not supply the information required. We brought in four Orders here today and they have been despatched; and so the hon. member must realise that a similar Order Paper under the old regime might have taken until 9 o'clock tonight. But in any case, Sir, apart from that, we thought the hon. member had some vested interest in short working hours for employees, be they Government or otherwise.

Anyhow, the point is this: the Government has found itself with a backlog of old matters to be dealt with, files to be brought up to date and what not. That is what we are doing and we are clearing our desks for March when we

will be occupied more or less with the presentation of the Annual Estimates. But the hon. member ought to know that two months is but a short time for any Government to get down to its presentation in Parliament of the serious legislative matters contained in its Manifesto. Past experience would acquaint him of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I never asked the hon. member to get down to any type of legislation. It is not my business what type of legislation they bring down, but I have only asked whether instead of meeting every Tuesday to deal with this sort of thing, we could not have a better system of procedure for meeting. It is not my business what legislation they bring down; it is a matter for the Cabinet.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I presume what the hon. member means is to have a specific legislative session of three months a year or something like that. He is too experienced, Mr. Speaker, to expect a Government of our age to be able at this stage to say that we are going to institute a Parliamentary Session of thirteen weeks out of fifty-two or be able to project for some future date that we will meet at that time. In the meantime, there are matters that require urgent consideration. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that almost all the matters we have dealt with for the last six weeks are matters arising out of issues dealt with at some time or other by the last Government and not resolved. That is all the more reason for his adopting a more tolerant attitude and waiting for a little further time to see whether or not we will introduce a Parliamentary system, and whether or the number of matters we will bring here will keep us occupied from 12 o'clock in the morning to 12 o'clock at night. In any case, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that he will find that whether or not the Order Paper is longer or shorter than previously, and we sincerely hope to accomplish in two or three hours what customarily took nine hours in the Legislature before.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, like most of us who have suffered in here for the past ten years, has become so accustomed to these protracted legislative sessions lasting until sometimes 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock at night that he is surprised now that four times the amount of work is got through in a reasonably short time. As the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the Leader of the House, has reminded him, as a Trade Unionist he should be concerned with efficiency and short working hours rather than inefficiency and long hours, but I suppose that is a psychological hangover from the evil days from which we have emerged. I would like to inform the hon. member that as from after 31st March he will have an even greater interest in short working hours because the taxpayers, as he has so frequently urged, will no longer be called upon to spend $14,000 for feeding members of the House of Assembly. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has been the greatest protagonist of the abolition of the amount on which the public was called upon to pay, and in view of the fact that members will now have to sit here from 12 o'clock until 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock without any dinner unless they ask for leave to go outside to some place of refreshment, I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Peter will be very much interested in getting home at an early hour.

I would like to remind the hon. member, however, that like himself the members of the Government do not emerge from their couches shortly before 12 o'clock, but we start the normal working day even on Tuesdays at 8.30 a.m., and I think 8.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. is a spreadover which any Trade Unionist would not only approve of, but do everything to encourage. I do not want members to be misled by the fact that we do not sit here until 12 o'clock; we have no intention of sitting here until 12 o'clock except a national emergency demands it.
4.40 p.m.

Next month, we will be introducing the Estimates and hon. members will have ample opportunity to make long speeches on the various items so that we can get ourselves into rhetorical form again.

Sir, before I sit down, speaking on the adjournment, it has been brought to my attention that on the 30th January, 1962, the hon. senior member for the City in the course of a debate asked the Hon. Minister for Social Services certain questions relating to the regulations of Civil Servants. I would like to inform the hon. senior member for the City, first of all, on a question of procedure, that in my humble opinion a question of that kind should be given notice of and filed in the Speaker's office three days before the meeting of the House. I believe that question properly arose out of a debate which was then in progress. The second thing is that this is a matter which is constitutionally under the Portfolio of the Premier and not under an individual Minister.

It is very unfortunate that certain cheap sensationalism has been indulged in by the local Press on the motion for the adjournment. This matter has now been brought to my attention, and I want to assure hon. members that it is my intention to make a Statement strictly in answer to the question asked by the hon. senior member for the City. I appreciate the attempt of the Hon. Minister of Social Services to fill the breach which was created by the absence of the Hon. Leader of the House and myself at the last meeting of the House. We have now passed a whole week and I will make a Statement in due course.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday next 20th February, 1962 at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I formally adjourn the House, may I on behalf of all hon. members congratulate the Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, on this day having attained his 22nd anniversary as a Parliamentarian, as a member of this House of Assembly.

This House now stands adjourned until this day week at 12 o'clock (noon).
4.45 p.m.