THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 20th 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, Industry and Labour);* Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E.St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism);* Mr. W. A. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P., Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, *(Deputy Speaker)* and Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees).*

Prayers were read.

Messrs. YEARWOOD, LYNCH, and GODDARD entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that in the Minutes of the meeting of the 13th February, 1962, certain errors and omissions were discovered by me. I have given direction that those errors and omissions be corrected and therefore I am not at the moment seeking confirmation of those Minutes. I shall therefore ask the House to allow the confirmation of those Minutes to be deferred.

Hon. E. W. BARROW, Messrs. WALCOTT and BOXILL entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:–

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Resolution to place the sum of $15,974 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 the Regulations entitled "The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1962", made by the Governor on the 5th day of February, 1962, under the provisions of subsection (2) of section three of the Pensions Act, 1947 (1947-20)

A Bill to amend the Consular Conventions Act, 1952.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Resolution to approve the lease by the Executive Committee to Mr. E. C. Jones of a room of approximately 477 square feet in area, situated at the Terminal Building, Seawell Airport.

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 in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that lands abounding on Bryan Highway, adjoining Welchman Hall in the parish of St. Thomas, have been purchased by small landowners with the agreement that six (6) feet of the said land should be left by each owner to permit Government to construct a road of twelve (12) feet wide?

2. Will the Minister therefore initiate immediate steps to have the road constructed in order that these peasants might be permitted to have the lorries drive up the said road to load their canes and to ease the inconvenience which they are experiencing this reaping season?

12.15 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:

Is Government aware of the valuable services rendered by the Choir for the Animation of the Sick under the direction of Mr. Harold Rock in rendering musical programmes at Infirmaries and other institutions for the sick and infirm throughout the Island at its own expense?

2. Will Government urgently consider the provision of an annual grant to the said Choir to assist in the defraying of its transportation expenses to and from such functions?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Consular Conventions Act, 1952, be now read a first time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 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 Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1961-62 No. 42

Head XIII – Legislature, was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head XIII - Legislature, stand part.

You will see, Sir, that in the Estimates for 1961-62 the sum of $6,000 was voted for Government hospitality. This is the usual figure which was voted from year to year within recent times. During the course of this financial year, however, we have had the visit of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Rt. Hon. Harold Macmillan; we have had the visit of the Secretary of State for the Colonies during January this year; and on the 26th of this month it is proposed to hold a Conference of the Chief Ministers of the Windward and Leeward Islands in relation to the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation. We are close to the end of the financial year and this vote of $6,000 has proved to be insufficient for the purposes of Government hospitality, and we are therefore asking for a supplementary vote of $1,500, some of which, I might say, may have already been committed, in order to see us through until the end of the financial year.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would be able to give us a breakdown on this because the last part of the Resolution reads as follows:-

"The Conference between the Governments of the Windwards and Leeward Islands and Barbados at the end of February will also give rise to expenditure from the vote."

I would be glad if the Minister would give us a breakdown. In other words, I would like to know how much is expected to be spent on this particular Conference, because the Hon. Minister is asking for $1,500, and I do not know how much had already been spent and how much is expected to be spent. I would like that information if he can give it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it would be quite impossible for me at this juncture to tell the hon. member how much money it is intended to spend for Government hospitality during the period of seven days that we expect the Ministers to be here. I would like to assure the hon. member, however, that it would be nothing like the expenditure for the opening of the Deep Water Harbour.

If I may give him some indication why we have to ask for this supplementary vote, the present position at the 23rd October, 1961, when this Government was not in charge of the expenditure of that vote, was that they had spent $4,981. This means that for November, December, January, February and March, the surviving five months of the year, there was a sum of, roughly speaking, $1,100 available for hospitality as against $5,000 for seven months. In addition to that, the commitments in connection with the visit of Mr. Maudling estimated then were $739.75, and at quite an early stage it was obvious that the amount which had been granted in the Estimates of 1961-62, long before the elections even took place, would have been insufficient to meet the normal hospitality even without the conference of the Eastern Caribbean Federation.

I do not think that the hon. member would really like a breakdown of this vote. When he asks for a breakdown, I wonder whether he means a breakdown of what we are going to spend or what has already been spent.

12.25 p.m.

I can supply him with the information on what has already been spent, but I cannot tell him the complete breakdown of what is to be spent. For instance, Government Hospitality also includes the provision of transportation for some delegations to and from conferences. It does not mean, therefore, that we are spending $1,500 on wining and dining Ministers. As a matter of fact, $1,500 is not for only conference purposes but for other purposes connected therewith which may arise from now to the end of the financial year. If the money is not spent it will remain in the Treasury. This is for Ministers and other personnel who may be visiting the colony between now and the 31st March.

Sir, that is as much as I can tell the hon. member: and if he compares the position now with what took place earlier, he will see that $5,000 out of $6,000 was spent to the end of September. I do not think therefore that he can accuse this Government of extravagance. We are asking for $1,500 to carry us through from 8th December to the end of the financial year.

I also would like to inform the hon. member, even before Mr. Maudling's visit was projected, before there was any such conference contemplated, that on the 21st October the last Government asked for the sum of $1,500, which is the same $1,500 that we are asking for now. They intended to spend $1,500 in addition to the $6,000. Between 20 and 25 persons will be visiting here in February this year. I suggest to the hon. member that he ask the former Minister of Social Services what that $1,500 was to be spent on.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Hon. Premier has said but I would like to warn him against this. It is his Government's desire to economise as much as possible, and I hope that they would economise as much as possible; but I do not want this vote to be cut to a point where entertainment is drastically reduced, particularly at this time of the year when visitors come here and they should be treated. In a few days Ministers will be coming here and although we do not wish to entertain as some other colonies have done in the past, let us also entertain them graciously as other people show their hospitality towards us.

The sum of $1,500 for entertainment is a very modest sum nowadays. I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that what is allowed by law to the Mayor of Bridgetown for this purpose is just $600 and one big cocktail party would exhaust that sum. Just $600 is allowed us to entertain visitors in keeping with the dignity of the office of Mayor. That sum can be spent in three evenings.

Sir, I am very glad to know that the Government is conscious about this because it is not easy to pick up money in Barbados; but do not let it be cut to such a point that it will prevent your giving entertainment to persons who should be entertained.

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

HEAD XL – WATERWORKS

Head XL – Waterworks – was called.

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

Hon. members will see from the explanatory note that as a result of the drought in the early part of 1961 and the operating of a new pumping station at Hampton and other booster stations, the water pressure in that area was increased and as a result repairs had to be made to the old mains.

The amount now sought to be voted is $11,300. I would like to inform hon. members that if they notice under the Head "Repairs to Mains, Meters and Hydrants", it does not mean that this Government is buying meters. The word "meters" is there only in the context that repairs have to be done to them. This Government is continuing the policy of installing meters in places where there should be installed. This money is not sought for buying meters but mainly for repairs to water mains.

I beg to move that Head XL stand part.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I presume that Government will have no opposition to the replacement of a

meter in a person's house if it is faulty and needs repairing. I think that what will happen is that one would be replaced and then the faulty one repaired at leisure. I do not know if the Hon. Premier can tell us how many meters are in stock at this moment.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member wants to know how many new meters are in stock. I am afraid that I do not have the file on this. I will get the answer for the hon. member at the next meeting of the House. There is nothing in these files which would assist the hon. member or myself in respect of that matter. As far as we know, we appear to be well stocked with meters but they are not to be paid for out of current revenue.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is bad to go by rumours sometimes and I do hope that rumour is a lying jade. Just a few months ago when we were contesting the elections, we got it from outside, inside and all around that the Government had imported meters here, and we also got it from a fairly substantial authority that there was some motive possibly ulterior to the general publlic for getting these meters.
12.35 p.m.
As to this vote which you have here for $11,300, the note in connection with it says that as a result of the operation of the new pumping stations at Hampton and other booster stations, the pressure on some old mains in the area was increased; and as a result the amount of inspection and repairs to the mains had to be increased beyond expectation. I should like to ask the Minister something more than that. I understand that communications have passed between the last Government and the people from whom they imported these meters as to sending down somebody here to repair these meters. I also undertand that this is a matter which the Waterworks Engineer turned down, members of the Cabinet also turned it down and one particular man at the Waterworks got this matter pushed. I also understand that they were told that there was a man on the spot who could repair these meters and there was no necessity for sending these people down here. People have also complained to me that certain people could get their services installed and certain other people could not get these services installed. Some of these people got their services installed before they started to erect their buildings. Furthermore, if I may say this, there were persons in the Civil Service, some of whom were candidates in the last General Election, who had a lot to do with this matter. If there is anything in the files you may as well clear the air once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, I have every reason to believe that some of these things are true. Will the Minister tell me if the Government had to send down to the Waterworks Department a direction whereby people had to sign an agreement so as to prevent these who applied for water services two or three years after others had applied, from getting these services before those who had previously applied for such services? We say that the installation of meters is an absolutely unnecessary expense, Five Year Plan or no Five Year Plan. We recommended that the expenditure of half million dollars on the installation of meters be scrapped. I want to know if it is the policy of the present Government to carry out the policy of the Five Year Plan of the last Government to have a meter attached to every water service. The last Government proclaimed that they intended to attach meters to all water services from 1962, and that was to be done whether a house was a 2'x 4' house or otherwise. At one time it was rumoured that it was the Leader of the House who wanted these meters installed. I want to know if it is the policy of this Government to carry out what was said by the last Government.

I am not saying that I object to meters being installed in places for industrial purposes. People who must water their gardens and things like that must have meters. The Private Secondary School buildings should also carry water meters, but I do not see how you could go to the back of Martins Bay where there is a person who is sending his child to a Secondary School and, because of that, you must attach a meter to the water installation. I want to know if the Government is condemning the proposal of the last Government. This was a very sore question during the Elections and this is the first time that the people have had an opportunity to hear about these meters. Let us hear once and for all if it is the policy of this Government to carry out what the last Government said in their Five Year Plan.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like all hon. members to know that this Government will not be guided by any evil tradition or practice of the old Government. *(Laughter and Cheers).* I can assure you that we have new vision, new ideas and good work to be done; we are only waiting for the opportunity to carry out this work. I remember that there was a widespread talk during the last Election campaign about the expenditure of $500,000 in meters which were brought into this country. We have proof that the meters are in the island, that there are thousands of people who have put in applications for the installation of water in their homes, and because of these meters these poor people are still suffering in that they have not yet received their water services. Some people have paid their money in advance but the water has not yet been installed. I am sure that this Democratic Labour Party Government is going through every Government Department in this island and whatever is evil we will rectify it and do what is right for the people of Barbados. That is our policy, our mind and wish; we will do justice to the people of Barbados.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter, it is unfortunate that I joined this Committee a bit late and therefore I did not have the opportunity of hearing the hon. senior member for the City in his discussion relative to the policy of the last Government. That is not now before us, it is true, but from time to time we are free to discuss these matters. As I say, it is unfortunate that I did not hear the Minister either. Reading from the note to this item, it is set out that the long drought in the early part of 1961 caused heavy demands to be placed on the distribution system particularly in the parishes of St. Philip and Christ Church. Several miles of an old main had to be repaired and brought back into service. I do not know that it is necessary to debate the decision of the last Government as to what is set out in the Five Year Plan, but the truth is that all Governments have the responsibility to supply water for the population. We will treat and regard that as an essential service. We want to decide, whether it is the present Government or the past Government, that water should be utilised to the best advantage.
12.45 p.m.
Now back to the question of meters. In the United Kingdom and the United States of America people are supplied with meters, and in the United States of America an arrangement is there for 50 gallons of water per person in a home, and two or three persons in a family are allowed 100 gallons of water per day. Now there are occasions when Government has got to say "no", and with water in Barbados, when the time comes to say "no", you must say "no". We were up against that in the last drought season, and you will remember that there were advertisements in the Press appealing to the country for safety in the use of water in large quantities. In the United Kingdom and in the United States of America they found it necessary over a period of years to limit every single person, and in Barbados we want to be careful. There is nothing wrong if you put in a meter for a private supply, as the hon. senior member for the City said, for someone, say, in the Orleans or in Chapman Lane who may have a family of two or three, but in other areas you do not want to appear to be discriminating. The Minister is bound to come up against this some time, and if one of the officials of the Executive of the Waterworks Department is seen in an area, you may see a tank full of water because of the tremendous volume of water which is misused in the watering of gardens and canes. If you think of the amount of water used in some of the commercial centres in the City, it will be necessary to say "no" if you want to preserve water at all times so that it will be available to the inhabitants of the Island. Therefore you have to be careful about this, and the Government was never afraid of it. You are not afraid of the electorate though you may be criticised, because you want to have water available to the 230,000 souls in the Island.

Mr. Chairman, surely we have long passed the stage of the platform, and what is said here will go in the debates

and remain for history; but there are occasions when you have to be brutal, and with water you have to see that it is available. You will see in the Five Year Plan that the amount of water consumed in 1950 was 4.9 million gallons per day, and ten years later it was 11 million gallons, nearly three times the amount; so it is a question of distribution and making sure that people use it with a sense of value. I take it, Sir, that that information is on the files, and on the Government side it was a question of following the pattern of what is done in the United Kingdom and in all the big countries of the world. If you have an allocation and a meter rate, it would not cost any more because 50 gallons of water per person in a family is allowed, and in a family of four 200 gallons of water per day is more than you would require even if you have ten baths a day; but you want to protect this country against people using water in open gardens or in cane-fields.

I repeat with all the strength of courage and character I am capable of that there are occasions where you must say "no" to your community, whether or not you rely on it for a vote, in the interest of the majority of the inhabitants of the country. You may criticise the past Government and that has been happening in almost anything that has been debated here. What we must concern ourselves with is where we are going from here. You must look back because you must use that as a guide for the future; but to continue to ctiticise is beyond the public platform where there can be foul language and hot air. You are in Parliament where you have a responsibility, and whether you object now or later, you are bound to find the requirements; and where water is used for industrial purposes in large quantities, any Government must face up to the fact that it is its duty to provide water for every home and every inhabitant in the Island.

The question of the Government's decision as set out in the Five Year Plan was not to deny anybody the use of water, but to actually give more than you normally think you would require in a house. As I said, the average home in Barbados has three persons; that is based on the number of persons in the Island, and each person would be given 50 gallons of water per day. There would be no change in the rates for water at all; but if you require to use 1,000 gallons in addition to your domestic requirements, surely you should pay for it. There is nothing wrong in paying for an additional 1,000 gallons, because if you have to pay for it you would exercise greater care rather than go to sleep and leave the hose or pipe running knowing that you are wasting 2,000 or 3,000 gallons of water which somebody later in the year would require in the drought season. As I said, Mr. Chairman, we have got to face facts some time, and there are occasions when we want to be honest with ourselves. We may make it a political plank, but now that we are in Parliament and discussions are going on, we must get on with our responsibility, and there are occasions when we have to say "no". Whether the Government decides to do it this year, it does not matter; but sooner or later they will feel the responsibility and are bound to do it. We are concerned, Sir, with using water for irrigation purposes. The question is what are you doing by way of educating your masses. You go to a country on an election platform and say almost anything, but when you get back to the secret sitting of Cabinet, you decide that in truth and in fact you cannot do certain things. You are educating the community to demand these things, and whether or not it is political expediency for the present Government not to do it, it is a question for the future. You must feel this responsibility; and when dealing with water in a community such as ours, obviously every Government must be careful. There were a number of discussions at Cabinet level on the question of existing services and the maintenance of meters, and I will give you a breakdown here, if you give me an opportunity with regard to the meters in the Five Year Plan. We decided in 1963-64 to spend $250,000 on meters, and whether the Government decides now, next year or in the next Session, it is bound to come. Stark reality tells me it is bound to come. There are a number of meters in the Island; but it was a question of bringing a technician here. Where you want advice, the Company which supplied the meters would be willing to send somebody for six months at no cost to the Government; but if you develop or agree to expand the existing Department of Water services, you need expert advice; so it does not matter whether Government gets an expert or uses a local man here who is capable. It is not the use of a spoon or fork which a little child or an old man can use; you are dealing with a bit of measuring equipment, and whether you bring in an expert, it is Government's responsibility. Do not let us fool ourselves. We are in the Opposition and we are free to criticise this. You can quarrel with us from the platform, but when you come around this horseshoe and know that what you say will go in the Reports and remain in the debates of Hansard forever, you want to be careful of what you say. As I said, you can make all sorts of promises to the community which you think are useful, but you must know when you look at the finances of the country that you must have a limit to the country's resources.

12.55 p.m.

It is like using butter; you must be sure that it would cover the whole slice of bread. You are bound to see to that and what it will cost the country and to safeguard and protect the use of water.

It has been stated that the daily consumption has risen from 4.0 million gallons in 1950 to 11 million gallons in 1960, and it is estimated that daily consumption will increase annually by about 3/4 million gallons; therefore, it is necessary to continue to seek additional sources of supply. If you are conscious of the use of water, to say nothing of its use in industrial expansion, you will understand that this figure must jump from 11 million gallons now to 12 million gallons next year. You are not looking for money to dig the wells, but you must have the money to get the equipment for taking the water to the surface and to distribute it to the people.

What is wrong in helping these people protect themselves? History tells us that every year there is a period of drought and you know that during this period all sorts of things are done. I support the Government fully in this and I think that the Government should be given a free hand and should have the support not only of the Opposition but of the public so as to make water available in sufficient large quantities for the inhabitants of the country. I would have to ask the Government to do whatever possible to make that Department as efficient as possible because, like the Government, the Opposition has a responsibility so far as water is concerned.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, this is a good opportunity for me to say what has been the experience of the electorate in St. James during the past four years and I am happy that there is no question of water meters to be put on public standpipes. I know that this Government would like to see in every private home a water service, but everything in its time. There are many people who cannot afford to have a pipe in their house; therefore, I would like to see more attention given to placing standpipes in the various districts so that even those persons who now strain themselves to install a pipe in their homes and then cannot afford to pay the rates would be able to get their requirements without having to travel too far.

Sir, it is a ridiculous thing. If you go in a gap like The Garden, St. James, where you see about 40 or 50 houses, there is not a standpipe there to accommodate the houses. If a standpipe was placed for the use of tenants of villages where there are 100 houses, I am sure that many of those people would not have to strain themselves to get a domestic service installed.

I am hoping that a public standpipe will be placed in all of these villages because if a public standpipe is placed in every district it will ease the residents considerably. Now, I am saying this because these requests are sent to the Department. Those people who are in charge of that Department like the Manager, the engineer, and so on, are the people to whom the requests are made and I hope they will not be saying that the Government has not placed at their disposal enough money to carry out this work. I know that this Government will co-operate. I want this to be known by all those officers of the Waterworks Department that

in every place where a reasonable request has been sent in for the installation of a standpipe, they should start at once to install the service. I speak with particular reference to the parish of St. James.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I did not think it was necessary to refer to the question of public standpipes when I spoke just now. I thought the hon. member was aware of this matter. The last Government has probably trebled the number of standpipes in the Island. I did not think it at all necessary to make any reference to that. That has been the persistent desire of the last Government ever since it came into power. From the number of new standpipes which have been installed, it is clear that that has been the practice of the Government. I hope the hon. senior member for St. James did not conclude that we are going to ban the installation of these public standpipes.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Sir, I did not even hear what the hon. junior member for St. George was saying. I said that I am taking this opportunity so as to put a case for the residents of St. James and I speak also of the condition which has been existing for four or five years in many other parishes as well.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, my responsibility for people of St. George is equally as strong as any other member in Parliament for the people of his parish. Occasionally, you will hear mention being made of this parish and that parish, ignoring the other ten parishes. We are discussing the question of water supply which is the primary concern of the people of the whole island and not of a particular parish - and I repeat that I was discussing that about 100 times. I was thinking of all the inhabitants of the country although I feel equally as strong about the people of St. George as the hon. member feels about the people of St. James. However, the question being what it is, I must be concerned about the people who live outside of St. George also. Nothing should be construed to mean that it would make it difficult for the public to obtain.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, before I reply to the hon. junior member for St. George, I wish to say that I am glad that the hon. senior member for St. James has raised that point which he made because only Friday morning last, as Chairman of the Public Health Committee of the City of Bridgetown, I have had reasons for saying this to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and I want hon. members not to think that I am doing this for any kudos or to shower praise on him.

That Government took office between the 4th and 5th December last. Since 1959, the Bridgetown City Council was asking the Government to put standpipes in various districts and it was not until the end of last year that the Waterworks Department wrote the City Council saying that they will be putting in the standpipes which we asked them to put in. We had a tremendous long list at the Waterworks Department of pipes which we wanted to install, but it was the vindictiveness and narrowmindedness of the then Minister of Works that caused them not to be installed. The Waterworks Department, since this Government has taken up office, has written us a letter stating that by the 27th February they would have these standpipes installed - and you can believe me, Mr. Chairman, that there are only about four of them to be installed now. Since 1959 this matter was before them and the then Minister of Works told Mr. Parfitt not to install them until he had approved of them. Members of that old Government were just a worthless lot of people who thought they should spite people. They refused to install these pipes because they thought, when they did that, they were spiting the then Mayor of Bridgetown.

I would like to ask the hon. member this question. He talks about conservation of water. We have never objected to the idea: and I think for commercial purposes, that is to say, where people are selling water - and I know hon. members know what I mean by that - I would increase the rate. As a matter of fact, you have increased the rates already, because from the last valuation, all houses of a certain size must pay increased taxation and, therefore, you must get in more money from your water rates. I will tell the hon. member that immediately as you had a revaluation of the houses in 1958, the water rates went up on all houses in the country because the policy of rating a person for water is in accordance with the value of the house. Therefore, it stands to reason that the Government, as soon as that was done, collected more revenue by way of water rates.

1.05 p.m.

As soon as the Government revalued the houses up went the rates and the Government collected more money. Their idea was the conservation of water. When we had the greatest die-hard Government, you had people saying that you should not waste water. Of course, there were many lies being splashed about as to who should be in control. I will read from the Development Plan, 1960-65. I do not know the English language so well, but there are those sitting around this Table who know it. You have fourteen communal baths in Bridgetown and do you want to conserve water? How many houses have water installed in them? Within the municipal area you have 27,000 houses and how many of these houses have water installed in them? One in every fifty. Do you want to conserve water for watering canes? If that is so, then you should come out and say so. I want to say that you should inflict a tremendous fine on people who water their canes: but do not say what is set out here in the Five Year Plan. This is what is stated:-

"It is believed that a considerable amount of water is wasted or illegally used for watering gardens often to the detriment of soil texture. As a measure of control it is proposed to install meters for all water services. It is considered that this will reduce the amount of water now used, and consequently the cost of providing it....."

Does that passage mean people who are using water for gardens? Mr. Chairman, it is the ambition of every housekeeper that, as soon as she can get a few dollars, she will instal water. I saw the report of a scholar which came before us; this was the case of a little girl. I spoke to her mother; this little girl was in the Fourth Form of one of our leading schools and the child herself came to me. I said that I would not allow the friends of this little girl from Queen's College to see her going to the standpipe to fetch water. The Five Year Plan states this:-

"As a measure of control it is proposed to instal meters for all water services....."

If the answer which has been given by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is the answer to the question I have asked, I can see that. If it is the policy of this Government to install water meters in all homes, then I condemn them too. This sum of $500,000 which has been provided for the purchase of meters would go a long way towards sinking other wells to get water. You do not want to deny people the use of water. You are suggesting the expenditure of $500,000 - half a million dollars - for the purpose of putting water meters in the homes of people when you have people who have to walk half a mile in order to get water. I would like to ask this question: Would putting meters in people's homes be of any benefit to these people who have to walk this distance for water? I contend that the proposal to spend this half a million dollars in this way is on account of the fact that you are just bankrupt of ideas.

I have been told on good authority that it is not a question of a shortage of water only; it is a question of the pipes being connected to the wrong wells. In Barbados you have a population of 240,000 persons, and the great majority of the population have to go to standpipes in order to get water. You are conserving the water for whom? For the majority of the people. I repeat that nobody would disagree with the Resolution which is before us today; it is a very simple Resolution. The note states:

"The long drought in the early part of 1961 caused heavy demands to be placed on the distribution system particularly in the parishes of St. Philip and Christ Church. Several miles of an old main had to be repaired and brought back into service. The operating of the new pumping station at Hampton and other booster stations also increased the pressure on some old mains in the area. As a result the

amount of inspection and repairs to the mains had to be increased beyond expectation."

Mr. Chairman, any reasonable human being is bound to vote for this Resolution, but I take this opportunity of asking this question. The item under this Head "Waterworks" is "repairs to mains, meters and hydrants." I am asking this Government if they are pursuing the same policy as the last Government. This is what is written in the Five Year Plan:

"Five hundred thousand dollars have been provided for the purchase of meters."

I am saying that this half a million dollars should be provided for the purpose of sinking more wells. The ex-Minister has himself said that the water is there: but if you are putting meters on these installations, I am asking if that will stop people from using water. At one time a Minister said: "I was not in the island." Another said: "This is not my portfolio" and yet another said' "I do not know anything about it." However, Mr. Chairman, it is my right to ask this question. If this Government says, like the last Government, that it is their policy to install these water meters in people's homes, then I condemn them as I have condemned the last Government. I am not afraid of doing that.

1.15 p.m.

Nothing the hon. member can say here can convince any member of the public of Barbados today that this was purely with the intention of merely maintaining or conserving the supply of water. What do you have to conserve? As Ex-Minister of Social Services, you should know how many houses there were which were fitted with water. But that has been the trouble.

My Party agrees with this Resolution, because it is to give more water and better service to the community. Is it necessary, in giving better services, to buy $500,000 in meters? You know that is a lot of money anywhere. You could dig a lot of wells and find a lot of work for people, because you are told that the water is under there. $1/2 million could dig a lot of wells and provide a lot of water, and I am asking the Government if it is their intention to pursue the policy of the last Government in putting in water meters for every little Tom, Dick and Harry who puts in a water service in his house.

Mr. Chairman, the irony of this is that the members of the last Government denied that meters were here and that this was only to be for people at the big hotels. I heard the man who was responsible for this, the ex-Minister of Communications, who should stay where he is for time and eternity, say that this was to check people like the Hon. Leader of the House, the senior member for St. Philip, who had services at his place and did not have meters. I am surprised that he did not say that of me. I agree that there are certain businesses in which people should pay - and I go even to the extent of including people who sell water, and by that I mean people who sell sweet drinks. I am not mincing any matters about that, but I am drawing to the hon. member's attention that immediately Government revalued property, up went the cost of water per quarter; so when you put in your Five Year Plan that you did not intend to increase the cost of water, you were only talking through your hat. You had already increased it by virtue of the law of the Island which said that in accordance with the rate on your house, therefore the water rate should be in proportion; and that went up immediately. It is true that it is the duty of the member to defend his Government in this particular matter, but I do not agree with him.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think it was unnecessary not only to create such heat, but to say a lot of things that could not be true at all. The question I would like to deal with first is the correspondence from the Waterworks Department, and Ronald Mapp saying that the normal installation of water supply is an administrative matter and never comes to the notice of the Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I challenge the ex-Minister to tell me that I am lying; I can call upon the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for the City - because I call names - when he says that it is nothing to do with them. I called names today on the floor of this House when I said that they were given instructions not to put in any services except those which were brought before the ex-Minister, Ronald Mapp, and I repeat that only last Friday we got a letter saying that they had had instructions and they would be finished by 22nd February. Is the hon. member saying that Mr. Parfitt is not responsible for writing us that letter? Is he saying that Ronald Mapp did not use his usual venom to prevent water installations in the Municipality because he disliked me? I object to your accusing me of lying when you know nothing of the criminal intentions of the last Minister. And I can prove a lot more things on the floor of this House.

Mr. MILLER: You have a Minister who is not likely to change the existing policy in operation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister will defend that.

Mr. MILLER: The policy of the last Government was that if a normal installation was required by anybody, it was handled at administrative level by the Department. It is only where a request was made by an individual for an instalment plan where he paid in part for the installation - which was very seldom - that the Minister would be expected to look at that. If there was an installation costing $200, he would look at that and give instructions for, say, ten instalments. You can say it over and over, but now this is a period which I remember only too well where money is in circulation as a result of the past Government; that is something no one would venture to deny unless he closes both eyes; but the number of persons applying for private domestic supplies was over and beyond the ability of the Department to cope with it. This happens all over; it is a problem in schools: and wherever there is industrial development, that is the problem today. The question was whether we should take any deposits from individuals for installations until we had cleared the backlog. There was nothing wrong with that. We have passed criticising and cursing the Minister; we are gradually outgrowing that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Again on a point of order, I am not talking about any private domestic services; I am talking about public standposts, and I will tell you that the Local Government authorities pay for the installation of public standposts - for your information, if you do not know it. I will tell the ex-Minister that, as far as I am concerned, it is people that matter and who should come first. Since 1959 we had applications for installation of water services and an advertisement appeared in the newspaper saying "apply today and have your services installed four days after." I challenge the hon. member to deny that; and that went on at the Waterworks Department. That was a question of bribing. I am not mincing matters and I must say that it was a question of bribing in high places.

Mr. MILLER: Is that a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City is developing his point.

Mr. MILLER: He cannot develop the point and introduce a debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He is only enlightening the House.

Mr. MILLER: But, Mr. Chairman, it is your responsibility to settle the tone of debate in Parliament. I do not want to interfere with your ruling, and as I have said, I always bow to the Chair. If you have a commercial enterprising lad who thinks that by advertising somebody will come and give him business, and you have a Minister operating in the Department.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I do not mind what you say about the advertisement; I am saying that the Government Department did it. It has been proved that that notice appeared in the newspaper, and people applied; and four days after, their services were connected. I say it was bribery and I can prove it. I can prove more bribery in it if

you press me; but you get here and play you are defending somebody when you did not know what was going on. If you want me to tell you more about bribery with the Minister, wait until the time comes.

Mr. MILLER: If I had the opportunity I would press you against the wall. Oh, how you would like to be able to prove something as bribery in a Government Department! It is all right to get up and say that in a debate under the protection and coverage of this Assembly.
1.25 p.m.

If you could prove one case, why don't you do so? We have been waiting for you to prove corruption. I say that it is undignified to use the protection and cover of this Assembly to make such statements.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking you to set a tone for future debates of this House. Elections are over and we on this side have accepted that we are in the Opposition. Where are we going? All day long you hear hon. members reflecting on the past Government. You hear hon. members talking of bribery and corruption. If that is so, why do you not send somebody to prison? Let the hon. member bring a case. Maybe, if the reporters were not in office, this would not have been discussed today.

Whom are you criticising? You are criticising the engineers and all the officials of the Waterworks Department. It is a sheer disgrace. You are in effect saying that members of the Civil Establishment are capable of corruption. The bulwark of our community is drawn from the Civil Service and hon. members are taking time off to criticise the men who are running the country for us. I repeat: where are we drifting? There are occasions, when you go on platforms, that you talk these things, and I come and listen to you and sometimes enjoy your tearing somebody to pieces; but there are some things which you want to preserve. You want to preserve the traditions and dignity of this Chamber.

If you are dealing with this matter, it is a question of whether it is necessary to have it. The money was spent in putting Hampton station in condition. The hon. member repeated himself about 42 times. It is a question now of distributing the water. The cost is not for getting water only, but it is a question of distributing. It is a question of expanding the existing service. Our responsibility is to see that water is spread throughout the Island. A Conservative Government of this Island of Barbados nationalised the water service which was then provided by two private suppliers so that the inhabitants all over the Island could have the benefit of it. The Conservative Government of that time nationalised two private suppliers of water because they felt it was unfair that they were not prepared to put up the necessary capital to put water in the remote areas of the country.

Mr. GODDARD: I rise on a point of order. The Conservative Government was never in this; therefore, the hon. member is not making any point there. We advocated it here today for the use of the community.

Mr. MILLER: The question is to increase the output by 4 million gallons a day. Sir, I regret to say that this debate is unnecessary. I can only repeat that we have the responsibility of putting it all over the Island. I know that the hon. member is not particularly anxious to read the recommendations which we have put forward in the last Five Year Plan. That is a public document; so hon. members should read it. If not now, eventually the question of having a good water supply during the drought season is bound to be the concern of the Government. We want to make more water available to the people. If you need to use 1,000 or 2,000 gallons, of course, use it; but you should say how much a householder should use, and if he wants to use over and above that amount, that he should pay for it. Why speak of all this bribery? Why bring that up? You blame the past Minister for all this. I want hon. members to rise above this. Surely, we can get above this. The tone of debates in this Chamber can be certainly much better than this and I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to see that this be put in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the hon. junior member for St. George has recently been converted to a position of responsibility. I have endured the accusations from his Party of being corrupt in running the affairs of the Municipality and a corrupt Vestry right here on the floor of the House. He is now trying to defend Mr. Mapp and Mr. Cox. Does he not think that the public of Barbados know that one of them bought a car and then rented it out to Mr. Jacobs at $20 a day? When members in power use their position to do these things, what can you say of them? Whom does the hon. member think he is talking to? You had better shut up and do not talk foolishness. I will run them out of here one after the other. You use your position and influence to buy a motor car and then rent it at $20 a day; and then when you make your money back, you turn it in. I am telling you what I know. The hon. member talked about corruption. I have endured all that talk for the last fourteen years by Cox and Mapp in here. I was accused by them of that on the floor of this House.
1.35 p.m.
You can go and ask Mr. Jacobs how much of the same Government money you voted for him to rent a car at so much a day. You are talking a lot of nonsense; you cursed everybody and whom you said was not dishonest was corrupt. Do not talk any nonsense to me. I know what I am talking about. If I allow my wife to buy a car and rent it out and put the money in my pocket, I am corrupt. I have nobody to please. I have reached the age when the only person whom I have to please are the members of my family. Mr. Chairman, I am coming out with another one now. I heard the hon. member say that I am trying to be Socialist and that I am jumping on somebody's band wagon.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. I have never said that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Have I ever tried to be a Socialist? Have I ever tried to fool the people? Do you think I am like those who are Socialist in mind and then they talk something else? Do not get up and try to get in anything about corruption so that it can be put in the Hansard or in the newspaper. If I felt that Mr. Parfitt was corrupt, I would say so. Sir Grantley Adams said that he was the most honest man in the island and then he said later on that he should have been out of the country ever since. Since this Government has gone into power, we received a letter saying that the applications which we put in for standposts in 1959 would be dealt with and every week we wrote until last December when I was told that the Minister, Mr. Ronald Mapp, had said "No".

Mr. Chairman, if you ask me to bring these things here, I will bring them here for the record. I am saying that no effort was made to help people. Are you making fun in saying that I am corrupt? I do not go along with any stupid talk. Go at Robert Thom and see what was paid for the car. Do not make me get vexed and hot because I will bring these things out one after the other.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is a vast difference between the shortage of water and the wastage of water. In the Five Year Plan from which the hon. senior member for the City quoted, reference is made to the wastage of water and the proposal was to install meters for all water services. I am perfectly sure that the installation of meters would not be any substitute either for the shortage or wastage of water, and we would have no intention whatsoever to use meters either for the purpose of correcting the shortage or wastage of water. The money which it is proposed to use in this direction or to stop the wastage of water could be used, as the hon. senior member for the City has said, for the purpose of developing more wells. I feel that if there is the question of wastage of water, the law would be the best thing to be put in force. As far as the wastage of water is concerned, I feel that everybody would appreciate an appeal made to them for their own convenience; they either save water or we will get down to the stage of using sea water.

The figures from 1958-61 show that there was a decrease in the rainfall over these four years. In 1958, we had a rainfall of 60 inches; in 1959, we had 55 inches; in 1960,

we had 47 inches and in 1961 we had only 45 inches. That gives an idea of what the position is. We have stations being put down at Codrington, Ashton Hall and at Crab Hill. If these stations were put down temporarily and I had $500,000 I would put them down permanently so as to relieve the water supply and not instal any meters relative to the shortage of water. If meters were to be used as substitutes for the shortage of water well, then, you could carry these meters into the Sahara Desert. *(Laughter)*

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that a Resolution for the sum of $12,800 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 affirmative without division

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

1.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The nest Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to amend the next Resolution which really on the Order Paper appears as a money Resolution. Owing to a slight error in the submission of this Resolution to the Legislature, it appears as a charge on the Public Treasury, while in reality it is not. I am therefore asking leave to amend the text of the Resolution itself and have this item appear as Order No. 2 to be approved by the House and to be dealt with by the House and not in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Have copies of the amending Resolution been circulated?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: They are being circulated now. The original Resolution before the House reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department annexed to the Estimates of the Island for the service of the year 1961-62 as shown in Supplementary Estimate, 1961-62, No. 43 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution, 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 this Resolution."

Now, Sir, as I said, owing to an error this Resolution should not have appeared in this form at all. It is really a Resolution to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department, and the Port Department, Sir, as you know, has a Port Department Fund and the expenditure incurred in the running of the Port is taken from this Fund and not from the Public Treasury; the Legislature, of course, has to approve the expenditure. We are therefore asking leave to amend this Resolution to read as follows:-

RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1961-62 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein....."

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, is there a further amendment? The text of my Resolution reads differently from the one the Minister has read out.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. junior member for St. Peter had been listening, he would have heard that I omitted in line three the words "annexed to the Estimates of the Island for the service of the year, 1961-62 as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1961-62, No. 43." All those words were omitted when I read the amended text and I am also asking leave to delete the sub-title "Supplementary Estimate, 1961-62, No. 43."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Hence, my query.

Mr. SPEAKER: A new Resolution has been circulated which also needs amending.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am grateful for Your Honour's information. I am therefore asking for leave to have this Resolution amended as suggested.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking for leave to amend the Resolution which was before the House to read as follows:-

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department."

I pause here to point out that the words "annexed to the Estimates of the Island for the service of the year 1961-62 as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1961-62 No. 43." are to be deleted so that the Resolution will now read as follows:-

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960 the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1961-62 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution 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 this Resolution."

And in respect of the Schedule I gather from the Leader of the House that he is requesting that the sub-Head "Supplementary Estimate, 1961-62 No. 43" be deleted.

The hon. member is asking leave so to amend this Resolution, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXPENDITURE OF PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of this Resolution as amended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Hon. Minister of Communications to request that this amended Resolution as it stands be Order No. 2.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, that is what I said. When I began I asked for leave to amend the Resolution and that this Resolution appear as Item No. 2 on today's Order Paper

Mr. SPEAKER: Now that it is amended this is the appropriate time for the request.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that this amended Resolution be Order No. 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave that this amended Resolution be Order No. 2, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of this Resolution as amended.

Sir, the new Port Department commenced to function from 1st February, 1961 but did not go into full operation until July, 1961. In February 1961, the Legislature provided the sum of $60,000 for the purpose of financing its operation until the Department had collected Revenue to meet its expenditure.
1.55 p.m.
Thirty thousand dollars of this amount was drawn from the Treasury and has since been repaid. The Department is therefore operating on its own Revenue.

3. It has been found that the amount provided under the Items for which supplementary provision is now being sought cannot meet the requirements of the Department to the end of the financial year. When the Estimates of the current year were prepared it was not possible to estimate accurately the amounts required under the various items for the operation of the Port. The recent revision of salaries and wages has also increased the cost of services in the Port. The amounts required under the various Items are necessary for the reasons which have been set out in the Addendum.

The Port, Mr. Speaker, although commencing to operate in February last was not doing any particular service with the exception of loading sugar until July. That meant that the expenses were still going on with the operation of the dock and Port services and because of that, very little revenue came in at that time.

Now that the Port is operating, bunker fuel is being sold, and greater revenue is coming in, it will be much easier for the Port to operate on a financial basis than it has been on the first basis. Being the first time and not knowing exactly how much personnel would required, they also fell short in that category also.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Note No. 2 in the Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows:

2. The new Port Department commenced to function from 1st February, 1961, but did not go into full operation until July, 1961. In February 1961, the Legislature provided the sum of $60,000 for the purpose of financing its operation until the Department had collected Revenue to meet its Expenditure. Thirty thousand dollars of this amount was drawn from the Treasury and has since been repaid. The Department is therefore operating on its own Revenue.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour is now two o'clock and I declare business suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

This Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is Question Time. Are there any Oral Answers ready to Questions put?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir, there is one answer ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member indicate the Question?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The answer which I have is in reply to Question No. 19.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even though the hon. senior member for St. Peter who asked that question is not in his place, it would be of great public interest if the hon. Minister would lay the answer so that it would be known whether or not the 23rd February, Federation Day, would still be a public holiday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate that I really am acting on behalf of the Hon. Premier and he is now about to take his seat.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can ask leave of the House to postpone giving the answer to the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter as the hon. member is not in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are quite in order because the hon. member is not in his place.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I would be allowed to make a statement which is of pressing importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: There appears to be no objection.

STATEMENT *re* CONFERENCE
ON FUTURE OF
EASTERN CARIBBEAN FEDERATION

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform honourable members that the Chief Ministers of the Windward and Leeward Islands have accepted my invitation to attend a Conference in Barbados beginning on Monday the 26th February, 1962, to discuss the future of the Eastern Caribbean Federation. The Chief Ministers will be accompanied by their Advisers, and I have invited the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados National Party to nominate one of their numbers to be members of the Barbados Delegation. Mr. F. L. Walcott, O.B.E., M.C.P., has accepted my invitation to be a member to serve in a similar capacity.
2.35 p.m.

"The other members of the Barbados Delegation will be the Honourable Minister of Development, Trade, Industry & Labour, Mr. Crawford, the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, Mr. H. A. Vaughan and myself. The Permanent Secretary to the Premier, who is at present in London as a member of the Secretary of State's Working Party, will be returning to Barbados to act as a Conference Secretary.

The greatest possible degree of information compatible with considerations of security will be made available through the Conference office and the Government Information Officer for the duration of the Conference, and such proposals as may be made will be brought before the Legislature for debate and approval before any further steps are taken which may commit the Island to any form of political or economic association."

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I take it that there are no answers to questions ready.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that there is ready the answer to Question No. 19 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier would like to postpone the oral reply to this Question

until the hon. member who asked the question is in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Reply is in respect of Federation Day. If the hon. member who asked the question is unable to resume his seat before the end of this day's meeting, it will be realised that the public will be interested to know whether Federation Day will be a public holiday. It is a question of excursions being postponed until next year.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION *re* SCHEME TO AID OLD AGE PENSIONERS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business. The first Order of the Day under this Head is to resume debate on a Resolution relative to a scheme to aid Old Age Pensioners in the repairs of their homes. On the previous occasion, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph moved the passing of this Resolution and the motion was seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. The hon. senior member for the City was speaking at 4.30 p.m. of the clock when Private Members' Business came to an end. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place. Does any other hon. member care to contribute to this discussion before the hon. junior member for St. Joseph exercises his right of reply? *(After a pause).* As it appears that no other hon. member.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, in so far as the Government is concerned, I think that even the hon. mover of the Resolution himself will consider that our interest in the Old Age Pensioners is second to none, not even to that of the hon. mover of the Resolution. The Government stands pledged already to provide an increase in the amount of the Old Age Pension itself, and as the Hon. Minister in charge of this matter will doubtlessly explain, it is proposed as from the beginning of the next financial year, to provide an increase for the Old Age Pensioners. The Minister in charge of Social Services will, no doubt, explain also that the Government's decision further to assist the Old Age Pensioners will be conditioned by the extent of its financial resources.

This Resolution calls for the institution of a scheme whereby the repairs of the homes of Old Age Pensioners may be undertaken at public expense, either through the agency of the Central Government or through the Local Government authorities. The House can rest assured that this is a matter in which we have a very deep abiding interest and our policy will be influenced by the financial resources available for expenditure of this sort. I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is fully aware of the present financial position of this colony. Much as he and we would like to do everything possible to ameliorate the conditions not only of the Old Age Pensioners but of all sections of the community, I am sure that even the hon. member would have to admit that under the present financial circumstances and until such time as the Government can initiate measures to meet the overall financial position of the colony, many of the things which we desire very deeply to achieve will have to await the achievement of the financial position in which they can be implemented.

As a matter of fact, the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution is a member of the Party which controlled the Government up to about three months ago, and he would have just as much inside knowledge of the financial picture confronting this colony as we who are now controlling the Government would have, and he had that inside knowledge at an earlier time than we had it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the Hon. Minister say that the hon. member "would" or "should" have that inside knowledge?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I presume, Mr. Speaker, that every member of the Government Party was kept *au fait* with the financial position of the country, and he would not have been excluded from information which his colleagues would share.

2.45 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services, I think, Sir, is in a position to explain to the House the financial implications of the implementation of this scheme, and the House itself should be in a position to judge exactly how much further we can go at present in assisting this section of the community. At the moment, Sir, a certain amount of this work is being done by the Local Government Authorities. Hon. members can rest assured that the Government is only too concerned with all possible expansion of the work now done by the Local Government Authorities in this direction; and while we are not opposed to the matter in principle, Sir, we merely want to register the fact that this and other commitments of the sort and the speed with which they are undertaken have to be conditioned by the other commitments of the Government as well as by the extent of our existing financial resources.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is one of those Resolutions that even the Government is making an apology for. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Who is making an apology?) I will show that when I proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will continue to address the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, only when the Ministers' voices are so audible, sometimes as a matter of courtesy I feel like replying to them in a *sotto voce.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed without interruption from that Minister or any other Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will say that there is no need to make an apology for these things. You have to face them foursquare. Let us have a look at the text of this Resolution.

"WHEREAS the homes of many old age pensioners throughout the Island are in dire need of repair," presupposes that the old age pensioners own a home and therefore the homes are in bad condition. Anybody who lives in Barbados would know that there are thousands of people in Barbados who are not working or are unemployed - able-bodied people capable of working and they have no homes to be repaired. Some of them, even if they have homes, are unemployed and cannot draw old age pensions because they are not old enough. Now do not let us be sentimental about this. The Resolution then goes on to say:

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

Now, I want to say that the unemployed in Barbados are not even granted a pittance. No unemployed man in Barbados has of right anywhere to go and get money. Even if he is destitute, there is so much red tape to be gone through. Anyone over the age of 68 who can show that he is in straitened circumstances and has no income can get relief. The Resolution continues:-

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

Now I want to say that it is time that we in this Chamber get away from this pittance mentality and old age mentality and get down to fundamentals when we are talking about an issue. There is no point in anybody beginning to look at issues in Barbados unless he looks at them from a fundamental basis. Housing cannot be tackled from an old age pension basis. The Local Government or the City Council in Bridgetown gives assistance to old age pensioners; but if you go into Chapman Lane, you will see houses that are not fit for human beings to live in. If you want to see further evidence of houses not fit for human beings, you can go to Golden Square and see conditions stark before your eyes. There is no point in Barbadians not looking at this on a fundamental basis.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the position is this: Is the hon. member thinking in terms of slum clearance or talking about the houses of old age pensioners exclusively? The Resolution before us deals exclusively with the homes of old age pensioners, and therefore we hope that the hon. senior member for St. Peter will not allow his interest in the matter of slum clearance - which we all share - to condition his thinking on the matter which is before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sometimes I am a bit bewildered as to why people rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member refer to hon. members when he talks about people rising on a point of order?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit bewildered to know when hon. members rise on a point of order to draw your attention to anything that they mean. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a Resolution which in the main seeks for the Central Government to institute a scheme where the repairs can be undertaken at public expense of the houses of old age pensioners. Now you cannot speak about old age pensioners' houses in a vacuum unless you speak about housing in a broad sense, because how do the old age pensioners come to be living in houses which you now claim are in such dire need of repairs? What I am saying is that these pious Resolutions cannot be looked upon in isolation unless you look at the whole problem with which you are dealing. If the Hon. Minister is not listening to what I propose to say, I will remind him that I am not a Party man and I am not in the position of the Government; so I do not have to make any apology to the old age pensioners. I do not have to make any apology to anybody in the concept of any economic thinking. I have to look at it from a broad basis of commonsense, because if any hon. member comes here with a Resolution in a day and age like this and asks you to set aside funds to deal with old age pensioners' houses when you have housing in Barbados on a broad basis, you have to consider it very carefully; and if the hon. member asks if I am speaking about slum clearance, I mean that also. You in Government should make no apology that you are sympathetic to this; you have to be sympathetic to the whole idea of housing and not take out old age pensioners and say that you are going to do something for them even if you have the money, because those people who are unemployed can come to you and say they have not been working for the last eighteen months and ask what you are going to do for them. There might be others who will say that their grandfathers left a house for them, they have not worked for eighteen years and would like to know what you can do for them. That is why I say you cannot apologise for these things.

Mr. Speaker, this is housing we are talking about: and if you are talking about old age pensioners who are receiving a pittance, it means that you are directly saying that we should increase the pittance given to old age pensioners. The hon. member has brought this Resolution; but I do not think he had joined forces with those who were in here when we questioned what they were spending on old age pensioners; nor did he stand up and say he did not agree with them. He might say he was a Party man and it was a question of Party discipline; but conscience comes first. I only raise that point to let the hon. member see that we agreed they were getting a pittance and we asked the last Government to increase the amount, but I do not know if the hon. member's voice was as vociferous then as it is now, nor did he join forces and vote against the Government to show his disapproval of the pittance being paid. It is universally known, Mr. Speaker, that old age pensioners get a pittance.

2.55 p.m.

There is no question about that. It started as a pittance and it is still a pittance.

What I would like to say is that you should not embark on broad national schemes on any patchwork basis. The reason why the City Council gives relief to old age pensioners by way of repairing their houses is because it is predominantly there to administer poor relief. However, the disadvantage where these Councils are up against is that they cannot go in for any broad taxation, economic or financial policies which can deal with fundamental problems such as the clearance of slums, which is where these old age pensioners have to live.

Mr. Speaker, for old age pensioners to qualify for pension, it is inherent that they live in houses which need repair. If an old age pensioner lives in a house which is sound, that disqualifies the old age pensioner from pension. The Means Test disqualifies people who live in good, sound houses from drawing old age pension. The mere possession of a sound house is a disqualification of old age pension. Examine it; if you have a house which is of a rental value, you cannot draw old age pension. As soon as you are eligible to draw old age pension, you are outside the realm of paying taxes.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, in approaching this matter that hon. members should look at it from a national point of view. We represent everybody and not only the old age pensioners. I do not know if the Hon. Minister rose to say this. The Police Force, the taxation authorities, the slums and Barbados as it stands were all here before the Hon. Minister was in the Government. He did not bring them in since he became a Minister; therefore, do not mind the suggestion of my opening the talk on Chapman Lane slums. Because they happen to be Ministers, do not think that this is something which they hatched. As soon as you are going to deal with the question of housing, we have to be frank and open about it. We cannot look upon it only in the light of old age pensioners. We have to look upon it in a broad light. If you had a slum clearance scheme, you are not going to put old age pensioners to live in some area outside of this scheme because you would feel that they too should enjoy the benefit of living in those houses which you built for the people.

What seems to me to be clear as a pikestaff is that we must get away from this plantation thinking. It is not inherent to life in Barbados today. We are living in 1962. Our thinking should be removed from the thinking of three centuries ago, and we should not be perpetuating a system which is part of slavery in which people were squatting in shacks. We must give the leadership to the future in which you must clear these towns and villages of slums; and when it comes to dealing with old age pensioners, you should tell the plantation owners that you are going to acquire all the tenantries and have them sited with a view to proper housing. You should not go in for this nonsense of patching up anybody's house and therefore perpetuating the same old way of life. That mental approach must cease.

When it comes to old age pensioners, you have to take into consideration how long after 68 years - which is the time that they qualify for pension - that they are going to live on this side of the planet. The average age for anyone to live after one becomes 68 years old is 12 years. If one adds two years to his life after one is 68 years, that person is lucky; therefore, if one adds twelve years to his life after that, that person is super-lucky. Tell me the number of people whom you know are living over 80 years. As a matter of fact, when you reach that age, you do not eat much food. When a person reaches the age of 80 years, he tells you that he is waiting on the grace of God.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any of us would be unwilling to examine these things in their right context. Housing is a sore problem in this Island. I do not think it is a question of old age pensioners *per se*. Old age pensioners need more money to exist on as such, but housing is the problem. It becomes a problem with older people because they are not earning any income. What are we going to do in our time to rectify this system of people living in dilapidated houses? One of the things which this Government must look into - and I am sure that they must look into it for their own credit - is this question of slum clearance - and they must do something about it in order to emphasise their new thinking. Tenement houses must go up in Chapman Lane.

It is within the context of this Resolution that I admonish the Hon. Mover of it to look at it as one beyond the scope of patching an old age pensioner's house and see that it is something for a national scheme. It is true to say that

some of the taxation collected by the City Council goes towards repair of houses of old age pensioners; but that money can only be fractional. The revenue of the City Council is something like $2 million. How much can these Councils do on the basis of housing within the problem with which you have to deal? Anything they do in this respect is only fractional. It is going to be a terrific problem in dealing with this matter for old age pensioners. You go into Delamere Land and you fix the palings of Mary Ann's house. You go in Chapman Lane and put on a few pieces of sideboard on Suzie Ann's house. A little later, Mary Ann tells you that you fixed the palings last time for her but the house is leaking now. This is a perennial problem if you deal with it in that manner. It is well, therefore, that Barbadians get down to fundamentals when dealing with these matters and the problem of the pittance which old age pensioners get. I wonder from where these old people come. They happen to be everybody's aunt, grandmother and sister, and you sometimes forget who they are.
3.05 p.m.
Some of these old people have members in the House who forget them and some members are ashamed of these old people. An old person would tell you that his cousin is a member of the House of Assembly, but he would not tell you that he is begging alms. It is purely a matter of a mental outlook that you get away from these things. In my view, this matter of old age pensions can be worked out on a sentimental basis until it is unrealistic; but in relation to housing, you have to look at housing itself and see how the old age pensioners can live in these houses. The time of lend-lease would wreck any Government because, as to the question of the annual repairs to houses, you would be spending money of a capital nature continuously. If you make any financial assessment of what this country is spending or has spent in lumber over the years, that would be sufficient to house the whole of Great Britain. We have been rebuilding houses for over 25 or 30 years. You go into St. Andrew or into any of the other parishes in Barbados; you will find a person who will tell you that his grandmother was born on this spot. The house in which his grandmother was living was a hiphouse, but now he has changed it into a gabled house; so that the house has three different features in the life of the people who lived in it.

I want to say that primitive man had more sense than we have, because he lived in a cave and he did not have to repair it. *(Laughter)*. In any case, we must understand that in constructing houses our people are giving the lumber yards money for wood ants. But this is not a problem which is beyond the capacity of the Legislature to deal with. This is not putting any blame on anybody; this is a part of our new era of thinking, because people looking like me and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph have to think in terms of rectifying something in which we were born. We were born in slavery and the type of legislator which we had then never wanted us to remove from that strangle hold; therefore, we will have to acquire land for housing schemes and for permanency so that when a grandmother dies, the son or grandson can inherit something in the way of decency; posterity can look forward to these things.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I am sure that when we go around the island we will be ashamed to see the condition in which some of our people are now living. I happen to be a member of the Poor Law Board and Guardians Committee for the past 11 years, and what I am saying here now I am saying from experience. We must agree that things in this island were not always rosy, and many of our people who have been able to obtain houses are unable to repair them now that these people are old. They have nothing to depend upon except the old age pensions, and a little help which some of them may get from the Public Assistance Committee in the area. Under the Old Age Pension Act, they receive a pension on attaining the age of 68 years, and if they are blind they will receive it at the age of 40. I am suggesting that the time has come when some consideration should be given to these poor people. We have quite a number of people who are totally blind, idiotic and infirm and they are incapable of doing any work. I am hoping that the Government will consider ways and means of helping these poor people and so relieve the Local Government Councils of that burden. I am suggesting that the Government set up some scheme whereby they will go through the island and see to these poor people and discover some method of relieving them, thereby lifting the burden off the shoulders of the Local Government Councils.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution asks that assistance be given to the Old Age Pensioners in the repair of their houses. It has me amazed as I think that, for the longest time, the poor people were suffering in this island of Barbados. As I look at this Order Paper today, I see many Resolutions of which notice has been given by members who were members of the last Government, and they are bringing these matters before the present Government. I would not say that these Resolutions are bad, but I know as a fact that from 1957 the good God of Heaven has blessed this island of Barbados and it has produced many tons of canes. We reached the highest amount of 204,000 tons of sugar produced in 1957 and since then we have been producing from 180,000 to 160,000 tons of sugar coming down in amounts. We have had more money in the Government then than in the past history of Barbados, and the old age pensioners were not considered.

The hon. mover of this Resolution has caused me to remember King Nebuchadnezzar; he never knew what was happening until the God of Heaven rent the kingdom out of his hands and sent him into the pasture to feed on grass for seven days until he knew that the Most High God ruled in the Kingdom of men. I want to say now that it is only now that the government has been taken out of the hands of the past members that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph knows that the old age pensioners are in this need. It is true that the present Government has many things under consideration for the help of our people.
3.15 p.m.

We are not going to leave our people to stand by the wayside and perish; it is not the intention of this Government. We have things under consideration to be executed at the earliest opportunity. We are not against any hon. member voicing his suggestions. We are not like the last Government and we intend to take out the best material for the benefit of the community. We are not going to wait until a man gets on his feet and like the last Government shout "Sit down, idiot!" We are here to receive any information that is good to help the situation.

It is a fact, Sir, that the old people of this Island have been neglected and oppressed, but this Government intends to do its best for the poor people of Barbados and do the things that are necessary for their welfare. We have under consideration today new hospitals and new homes for old people, and soon - and very soon — the houses of old people will be converted into new homes where servants will wait on them to supply them with their needs. We know there are people who do not like to leave their homes, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said. I remember that a man once had a fowl tied, and it was tied for so long that when he loosed it it would not move; so when people live in a village for a long time, they do not like to move out; but we intend to go through the length and breadth of this Island and look after the welfare of these people, and we intend to do whatever lies in our power to help them, whether it be the repairing of homes, the construction of homes, or moving them from one site to another. We have new policies and we hope to carry them out with the help of Almighty God.

Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member who introduced this Resolution to realise that it is not only the old people who are suffering in Barbados today; there are thousands of destitutes who are homeless and suffering also, and we must make a universal survey of the Island in order to give justice to every man who is in need of it. We know the contribution which they have made to the economy of Barbados and we are not going to forget them. We are aware of all the hon. member is bringing to us today. *(Cheers.)* We were aware of them not only today, but for a long time; but the last Government did not heed our suggestions. They were blind, but we can see; and I hope that the Good Master will give the hon. member sight to see what we will do for the future. The workbench has been set up and has not yet been

completed, and we are now fixing our plans. We are not going to take the money and build a market like that in Six Roads, which is a waste. We want the hon. member who has brought this Resolution to realise that we have all these things in mind and mean to do the best for the people of Barbados. A new Government has taken over and we are not going to be wasteful like the former Government. At the earliest opportunity, Sir, this Government is going to consider, not only the old age pensioners, but all those who are unable to help themselves. There are some young people who are unable to help themselves because they are destitute, but we know they are in the majority and we do not want to neglect the majority, because the majority are the poor: and if the poor did not consider us, my Party would not have been in power. There were many motions which we brought before this House which were neglected and I was often called an idiot. Now the idiot is inside and the wise are outside. If there is one loaf of bread to be distributed, I know that the people in St. Andrew have to get a piece too. I want you to realise in all you may say that a man's gift maketh room for him and bringeth him before great men, and therefore he is able to put forward his views. I want the members of this House to realise that the people of Barbados have sent us here, and the views of each man should be considered; so the Government in power should take out the best material and use it for the help of the people of Barbados. *(Cheers.)*

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, when I see this Resolution, I wonder if it is a genuine spirit for the good and welfare of the people, particularly the underprivileged of this Island only, or whether it is a subtle attempt in some way to embarrass this Government. I would like the electorate of this Island to become somewhat more mature, because maybe it is that when these Resolutions are brought before Government and may not be passed, the man and woman in the street who do not know the workings of Government — how it gets its money and the headaches it gives to the Government to devise ways and means and make priorities — may be inclined to think that when such a member brings in a Resolution or Bill which the Government rejects, this Government is not working in their interest. They are not convinced that this Government is stretched out. I doubt very much if many of the Ministers sleep at night in devising ways and means of making this Island a better place.
3.25 p.m.

I would like these people to understand not only what goes on in here, but also whenever a question is brought to the surface which seeks to do something for the welfare of the people and this Government does not see its way to implement it because of the limited resources of the country, that they will look at the thing wisely and have the confidence which I am sure they have to place in this Government.

While on this question, there is another question which is going to come up. It is a question of rented land. It is peculiar that now that this Government has come into power, there are some parties who are subtly trying to force the hands of the Government with respect to rented land. It is true that what is a man's own, he should be allowed to do as he wants to do with it. The reason why some of these landowners are asking their tenants to move off their land is because they know that this Government has the welfare of these people in their hands. Therefore, the landlords say that there are two alternatives which this Government must face. One is to let the tenants wander about, and the other is that this Government buy the land. It is premature, but I am sure this Government is going to be faced with that problem. However, we have the ability: and with the confidence of the people, we will be able to deal with the matter.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion. I heard a great deal of scathing reference made to the efforts of the City Council in repairing the houses of the poor.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think it is right for the hon. member to use the words "scathing reference". The City Council does repair houses of the poor, but you are only doing it for the few.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for the City made no reference to the hon. senior member for St. Peter or what he said.

Mr. WALCOTT: I heard no member mentioning anything in a scathing manner.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, I heard much mention of Golden Square and Chapman Lane and it was not a complimentary reference. It was not complimentary, so I designated it as scathing. The point is that we are not required by law to repair the houses of these poor people. We are required by law to send them to an institution if they do not have anywhere to live. The then St. Michael's Vestry and now the City Council have always adopted the humanitarian policy of repairing the houses of these old people. Doubtless, the hon. senior member for St. Peter would prefer to see these poor old people get wet until the financial millenium which he envisages comes about.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member says that I would prefer these old people to get wet. He should be the last person to making those references. What has he done in this Island to show that he has done something for these poor people? If that is going to be his exhibition, it would be an exhibition for fighters. The hon. member's predecessor was in here for five years and is now outside. Do not think that the hon. senior member for the City can bring you against the will of the people. The hon. member tells me that I will prefer to see these poor people getting wet. Whom does he think he is? He does not even know how to pay good wages to the people whom he employs.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member St. Peter has already made his point of order clearly and vociferously.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, I fear no battle of words with him. The hon. senior member for the City did not bring me in here. As to what I have done for the people of this Island, he is aware, as other members of this Chamber are aware. The hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke as if Bridgetown was the only city on the globe which has slums. I, myself, like him have had the opportunity of seeing slums in some of the wealthiest cities in the world. I have seen slums below 125th Street in New York. There are slums in every country. The hon. member must have seen Skid Row in Chicago. In Jamaica, you have people living on the North Shore Road in old motor cars and in shacks. You have Shanty Town in Trinidad; therefore, you will find in the two largest Islands which have withdrawn themselves from the Federation a huge slum area which we have not in Bridgetown. The hon. member seems to have been playing only to the gallery when he made those references to the Golden Square and Chapman Lane. We have to cut our coat to suit the cloth which we have. The houses of these poor people have to be repaired because long before the millenium which the hon. member envisages comes, these people would be gathered to their fathers. We have to repair their houses so that they can live in comfort for the balance of their time here. It is alright to build castles, but as to how this can be done immediately, is another question. All that is no help to these poor old people whose houses need repairs now. What we want is a factual approach, and the fundamentals which the hon. member is now telling this Chamber about would have to be considered in due course. I would like him to know that.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City would have to seek the leave of this House in order to resume his speech. I will ask hon. members of this House whether there is any objection to leave being granted, because those hon. members in seniority should set an example to the eleven new hon. members so as to make them feel that they have inherited a worthy tradition by being elected to this Chamber.

Is the hon. member asking leave to resume his speech?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir.

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

3.35 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the subject of this Resolution is something which, as I pointed out on the last occasion, is part of the Manifesto of my Party and therefore I am supporting it. This 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.

I started off by saying that I was bound to lend my support to this Resolution because it was part of my Party's manifesto, and I had gone a little further and pointed out that we thought it would have been a good idea to implement the terms of this Resolution. This Government which would not turn down suggestions from anybody, unlike the last Government, would be wise in implementing such a Resolution. However, on the last occasion, I think I was making reference to what the hon. mover of the Resolution had said; the hon. member mentioned that even a brute could see the necessity for implementing the terms of this Resolution. I am 100% with the hon. mover of this Resolution; but I cannot understand how it is that it is only since December, since he has been removed from among those 'brutes', that he has been able to see that a scheme of this sort should have been put into operation. Time and time again I have said during the consideration of the Estimates — and you can look up the record and you will find that it is so — that these people had given of their blood and sweat to this country in the days when we got nothing for our sugar. In England they took the best from us and gave us nothing for our sugar and so these people could not qualify for any old age pension.

I am surprised that the hon, member made reference to the Bridgetown City Council. In passing, I may say that this is nothing which the Local Government Act says we can do. Relative to those who worked for a period of years in the sugar industry, you have regulations which exist and which will debar these people from getting any assistance. It is my considered opinion that if the Government were to devise a scheme by which they could take some money out of the sugar industry — there are those people who have passed a certain age, those who, during the 1939 War, gave of their best, who have worked in the sugar industry and have given themselves a little shanty in which to live — if the Government were to set aside some money out of the Labour Welfare Fund for these people, that would be something which they deserve. It is only at the age of 68 years that this Government or the Government of Barbados will pay this old age pension to these people. I cannot see how people who merely use their brains must be able to retire at 65 years whereas those who work in the fields in the hot sun cannot qualify for an old age pension earlier than at 68 years. I believe that every member of this Government would like to see the number of persons who have these small houses; when you come to talk about Golden Square and Chapman's Lane — the hon. senior member for St. Peter has had as much experience as I have had in this City. As to the reference which the hon. member made, I would like to say that there are places in his constituency....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I said that these conditions obtained not only in St. Michael but also in the country and I think that we should call on the plantation owners to lease some of their lands in this connection. The Bridgetown City Council does not represent the country areas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is why I said I would not vote for this Resolution merely because it came from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is going to say....

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order. I think that the hon. member is referring to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am referring to both of them.

Mr. COWARD: I know that the hon. senior member for the City is acquainted with the hardships which are experienced by these poor, unfortunate people who have to go to the Poor Law Board for assistance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, but the hon. member cannot make a speech now.

Mr. COWARD: I am only making an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the hon. member will not follow the example of the senior members of this Chamber and go beyond his point of order.

Mr. COWARD: I would like to bring hon. members up to date with the facts. I would like to bring them up to date at this moment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph will realise that my association with him will not place me in a category of being opposed to giving assistance of this sort. I was really making my reference to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and I know that he will be able to take the fun which I may poke at him. Nevertheless, none of us could turn back this Resolution; it is just a reminder that those of us who are in the Opposition would like to see something done for persons other than those who can be designated as labourers and who can qualify or who are qualified under the Labour Welfare Fund to get loans. Although it does not say so in the Resolution, I am saying that there are a number of these other people not only in Golden Square and Chapman Lane, but they are scattered all over the island. Several of these people need public assistance but they do not qualify for it because they have not reached a certain age. Some of them are trying to eke out an existence as farmers and so on, but their houses are in such a bad condition that you can hardly do anything with such houses. Some of these people have passed the age when they cannot do any work and they do not draw any old age pension. I feel, as we have said in our Manifesto, that out of the Labour Welfare Fund, the Government should set aside a sum of money to be administered either by the Housing Authority or by the Government for the assistance of these people; but I would prefer the Government to take charge of this matter because I will have a lot to say about the Housing Authority and it will not be complimentary either.

3.45 p.m.

I am perfectly certain that if the Government went into the facts carefully, they would find that although these people are not today members of a Union, and although they are people who cannot contribute in any way by way of work, they have already made their contribution. When it comes to the Bridgetown City Council, I do not have to defend my colleague, the hon. junior member for the City. I am not physically able to defend him and it is quite possible for me to defend him in a battle of words, but I can let him take on anybody in a battle of words. The hon. member was absolutely right in what he said, and as a matter of fact, if in the Northern District Council they want to do something or make a recommendation to the Central Government in this respect for a grant, I am sure that will be considered, because in our Estimates in the City Council that is something we have been doing, not five or ten years ago, but fifteen years ago.

If I must blow my own trumpet, when I introduced this part of Public Assistance known as Poor Relief, of course I was severely criticised, and peculiarly enough I was criticised by some people who today proclaim from the housetop that they are Socialists. It was said that I was doing this to catch votes, but I would like to give this advice to members of this Government. From the time you enter this House, everything you do must be to attract the electorate to get back in here if you really want to be in here. You should never be ashamed to do something if it is for catching votes. Whatever I do from morning until night must be genuine.

You cannot be unpatronising to people today and try to catch votes tomorrow. You must be a genuine person. The only thing I have to say on the Resolution otherwise is that it is surprising..... Man, why don't you keep quiet?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not only keeping myself quiet, but I am trying to keep other members quiet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The only thing I have to say is that the appeal which the Hon. Mover of this Resolution made was an appeal which would have moved the heart of anybody. The hon. member represents St. Joseph. He apparently has shown to the whole world that he was the only man in the Labour Party — at least in that area — who could regain his seat with such a majority and also carry a colleague with him, though I have heard so much about somebody carrying somebody that I do not know which is right. But the hon. member, I am sure, would not take umbrage at what I say. It is his duty as he is in the Opposition, but it is so soon after his Government has been kicked out, overthrown, and ignominiously defeated for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to come in with a Resolution for doing this. We can understand other members of the Labour Party, the buffoon type, who would come in and play a game of this sort, but we credited the hon. junior member for St. Joseph with so much commonsense and sound reasoning. I would say further that the hon. members have shown so much sympathy that I wonder how he allowed them to shut his mouth up when his Government was here and he did not bring this Resolution at the same time. Whatever you consider my brand of politics, I feel in here that I have always had the guts and courage to express my views, but I suppose the hon. member in mentioning the fact that the brutes of his Party....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to my having said "the brutes" in my Party, but I never said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph refresh the hon. senior member for the City as to the particular context in which he used the word "brutes" to avoid any misquotation?

Mr. SMITH: I do not have to refresh the hon. member at all, because even if I opened his mouth and pushed the words down his throat, he would still say something different if he wanted to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I only meant that last week's Hansard has not yet been published.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member knows very well that physically he could not get anywhere near my mouth, but I want to say this to the hon. member. I appreciate Your Honour's intervention in asking the hon. member to refresh my memory. I am getting old but my memory is not so bad, and the hon. member did refer to the fact that the most hardhearted brute in this House....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I never said 'the most hardhearted brute'. In my closing remarks, I said that even a brute could see that this Resolution is one that is so long desired.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for refreshing the memory of members of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope I do not misquote the hon. member. He said in his closing remarks that even a brute would see that this Resolution was long desired. Now I take the hon. member's words. In the hon. member's Party there was a Minister of Housing. Was he a beast, a cow or a hog? I am supporting the hon. member's Resolution, if all the other members of the House vote against it; but I would like to say this: for fifteen years his Government was in power and for eighteen years he was a member of this House and made a valuable contribution to this House, and I would like to ask him if he is really saying that the Minister of Housing, Communications and Works whom he had to pick to pieces here a few minutes ago even as a brute realised that this was long overdue. I should like him to tell me the reason why he kept his mouth quiet, knowing that he had a Minister of Housing who was nothing but a brute and knowing that it was long overdue and refused to introduce it.

All I can say finally, Sir, is that the Government over there will realise the necessity to institute it and should not allow people to say that you have no heart or that you are a centipede. I could not come in so quickly with a Resolution, Mr. Speaker, and say that even a brute could see its necessity. I know the hon. junior member for St. Joseph well, and I know that the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing could not prevent him from bringing this Resolution; but I should like him to answer me this when I sit down: whom does he characterise as a brute? The man who led the Party, or the man who guided the destinies of the Party? I do not know how this Party runs, but I am told that inside the Party to which he had the honour to belong, if thirteen men said something and one man decided it should not be so, then you had to do what the one man said. Am I right in saying that? As a matter of fact, if I am not bringing any secrets out of school, that was the beginning of the formation of the other Party which formed the Government.
3.55 p.m.
I was a member of this House long, too. I am voting for this Resolution. Even when the Hon. Mover of this Resolution used to be in the Chair, he used to say all these things. It is not a question of my voting for it or not. The hon. member said that he would not back anybody. Anyhow, I am not among those characters whom he can characterise as a brute because on several occasions I made it clear what was my position on the matter. I am very much in sympathy with the hon. member. The hon. member had to tolerate those brute beasts with whom he was associated.

Mr. SMITH: I rise on a point of order. Sir, I did not have to tolerate any brute beasts. I do not want the hon. member's sympathy. I had no brutes to tolerate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said 'brute beasts'.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I think I heard what the hon. member said. For the hon. member to tell this House that he did not have to tolerate any brutes and now come in and say that you would have to be a brute not to see with this Resolution, what was his reason for bringing this? If the hon. member said that this Resolution is long overdue and even a brute would think that it is long overdue and he was not tolerating brute beasts, tell me logically what brutes then would it be? He said that he did not bring this Resolution as a sham. I do not believe he brought it as a sham. I honestly believe that he was so engrossed with those bunch of brutes that he could not very well bring it. The hon. member could not open his mouth then. He knew what would have happened if he had done so. (Mr. SMITH: What would have happened?) If the hon. member had brought this Resolution in here when he was associated with what we would term brutes, he would be chased out or cast into utter darkness. He would be relegated to the forgotten things down St. Joseph. The then senior member for St. Michael would have gone into St. Joseph and what he would have said about him would have been all sorts of things.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has a colleague with him now, and he has been dealing with people in his business for so long that the two of them surely can make a place for the Hon. Prime Minister of the West Indies when he comes back here to live. Be careful; I am not saying that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is going to do that.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. senior member for the City insinuating that you will have three members for the parish of St. Joseph?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Bridgetown, knowing the English parliamentary tradition, knows that a member may retire to give a candidate a seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, there is one assurance which we have from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and it is that he is not resigning to give the Prime Minister a seat. (Mr. WALCOTT: *sotto voce* Resign your seat for a man getting $800 now?) From you?

Mr. COWARD: Sir, I rise again on a point of order. What is the hon. senior member for St. Peter speaking on?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not take notice of anything which is not spoken to the Chair.

Mr. COWARD: I thought the hon. member was assuming that I was getting money from somewhere else.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph wants to know if the hon. senior member for St. Peter is assuming something about him. I want to say that I did not assume anything. If I say something, it would not matter to me what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph thinks.

Mr. COWARD: Again, Sir, I rise on a point of order. Before the hon. senior member for the City resumes his debate, I would like to make it clear here and now that I am not here for the purpose of getting money but to represent the people of St. Joseph. There can be no kind of money offered to me for me to step down for the Prime Minister or anybody.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, at least this debate has brought out something and it is that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is not going to resign his seat, no matter what happens, not even for the Prime Minister of the West Indies to get back in St. Joseph. I want the hon. member to know that that is going to be written in Hansard. The people of this country are very interested in that. We will only await what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has to say about that. We all know that he has been the most courageous man in the now defunct Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that he is awaiting a decision on his Resolution dealing with the old age pensioners.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think he means old age pensioners alone. We, today, merely await the declaration of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has been the most courageous member of the now defunct Barbados Labour Party to say whether or not he is going to resign to give place to the Prime Minister and I say that because he was the only courageous man to defy the now Prime Minister of the West Indies in running a candidate in St. Joseph when the Prime Minister said he is going to make him beg his bread. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has always been a friend of mine and if even he has to beg his bread, I would give him something.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, just to get it clear, which Premier said so? There are three: Mr. Norman Washington Manley, Dr. Eric Williams and myself. I never made such a statement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry that the Hon. Premier should be so suspicious; I meant the Prime Minister of the West Indies. The Hon. Premier does not have the courage to make anybody beg their bread.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a question of courage and it is a question of inclination. My experience is that whenever beggars beg their bread, you have to find the bread for them.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I have had enough of this. I am supporting the Resolution which has been moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Finally, I say that I hope the hon. member will soon make a declaration and come over to Macedonia.

Mr. WALCOTT: Where is Macedonia?

Mr. MOTTLEY: At Gibraltar. *(Laughter.)* I personally counsel the Government to see that there is nothing wrong with the Resolution. Nobody can sit here and vote for this Resolution without letting the hon. member know that after all his years in here he has put forward this Resolution. I hope that in the hon. member's reply he will make it abundantly clear to the people of this island that he was not waiting until the brutes went out to get this Resolution passed, but that he was trying all the time with it and it was a matter of Party discipline that caused him to refuse to bring forward this Resolution. He waited until nearly all the brutes were out to bring in this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I think I can speak without any trepidation because the House is certainly in a good mood. I admire your tolerance as you listen to matters which were details a bit beyond the proper scope of discussion relative to what is before us.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have distinguished precedent. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. HUSBANDS: That is the part of being a good Speaker. If your predecessor has given a good lead, then it is fitting that you should follow. My colleague in his remarks has laid great stress on the propriety, and, in fact, the sanity, of looking at housing in a very fundamental way and, of course, he was tearing up the old methods and suggesting new ones. There is nobody sitting around this horseshoe who would disagree with the hon. member that it is his observation and mine, that in the course of the development of housing in Barbados, we have always followed a phased programme. We have had housing schemes which had for their object the promotion of housing for agricultural workers: we have had housing schemes which had for their object the promotion of housing for general workers and we have also had housing schemes which had for their object the assistance of Government employees. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with developing this idea of giving more assistance at this stage to the old age pensioners. It is my observation, that of the hon. member, and I believe it is that of every other member of this Chamber that we should proceed along this way; but I do not think that the Government funds are of such a magnitude that we can embark on this scheme which we would like to see implemented as soon as possible. I would like to see Government assistance given to these old people in parishes like St. Peter, St. Joseph and others, and we would include Golden Square and Chapman Lane, because if old or destitute people live in these places and they reside in homes which need repairs, if the Government have funds at their disposal to help these people, they will do so. I therefore leave it to the Government to find a solution to this problem.

I do not think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be criticised for his effort. As a matter of fact, certain speeches to which I have listened, would make one feel that the Election campaign is still going on. Some hon. members do not seem to think that the campaign is now beyond us; we are now here in the interest of the Electors and we can bury our campaign hatchets. Like the Party in power, when they were in the Opposition, they did their business well. They gave the Government no respite and that is how they should deport themselves. Now that there is this Opposition, it is right that this Opposition should let the Government know that there is an Opposition as long as it is prepared to be constructive.

It does strike me that when some hon. members get up to speak, certain references are made as to what should have been done and why some hon. member did not say or do this before; but there is no point in making recrimination of that nature. Which of us does not say or should not say something today which we did not say yesterday? To attach motives.... *(ASIDES)* the hon. senior member for the City should not make a speech sitting down.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear that hon. member. I was listening to the hon. member who is on his feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The last Government took pleasure in referring to what the Conservatives did or did not do, and why can't we refer to the fact that you were a Socialist and did not do what you should have done?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, that does not worry me; what worries me is that in Parliament I think it is a most regrettable thing.
4.15 p.m.
You can say whatever you like about any Government, the B.L.P., D.L.P., the B.N.P. or what have you, but as far as casting any aspersions that reflect against the character or the genuineness of one single member, that is something that I sincerely and very strongly deprecate. Government is a corporate business; when you attack a Government, you are not attacking an individual; but the hon. member for the City is an individual and I would not cast any aspersions

against him or attach any improper motives to anything he had to say today on any Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not attached any improper motives to what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has brought in here. I merely said I was wondering whether it was geniune — I do believe it was genuine — and I also said that he was rid of the brutes whom he was among and could therefore now open his mouth and talk.

Mr. HUSBANDS: As a matter of fact, I was not thinking of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph at all. I was thinking of the tone of the speeches I heard generally speaking on this Resolution, and not particularly the hon. junior member for the City's. Sir, I have much sympathy for this Resolution, and although I share the views of my colleagues fundamentally, I think sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. There are times when if you begin a patchwork system, I fear you would have to continue for some reasonable time further in a patchwork method, and so for that reason I will vote and declare myself in favour of this Resolution.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer some of the criticisms made by hon. members and also to point out some of the intricacies involved in a Resolution such as this. Indeed this Resolution necessitates great thought. We have first to consider the fact that there are approximately 10,000 old age pensioners in this Island. I would like to state that we are not diametrically opposed to any Resolution brought here by any hon. member who is in the opposite camp; anything brought in the interest of the community of Barbados we are willing to support, and not to repay hon. members on the other side — or some of them, at least — in their own coin.

When I read a Resolution such as this brought in by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I ask myself whether that member is yet a member of the Barbados Labour Party; and when I get the reply "yes" from myself, I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is aware of the fact that there is an Act called the "Heretico Comburendo" which provides that heretics can be burnt at the stake like Joan of Arc. When I refer to that, Mr. Speaker, I remember that in 1957 and as recently as 1961 proposals were brought to this Chamber in the interest of those same old age pensioners when one of my colleagues here asked to have the pensions increased to $2.40 per week, and at that stage, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph along with his colleagues who were members of the Barbados Labour Party did not show any sign of having the interest of these poor old age pensioners at heart. I wonder if there has been a recent resuscitation among that Party, and if there has not been, I wonder if there has been one as far as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is concerned. I would like to warn that hon. member here and now that he should be careful: otherwise he would suffer the same fate as Joan of Arc.

Now I say that this matter is a very intricate one when we take into consideration the financial implications. We are committed to the same old age pensioners already, and I crave Your Honour's indulgence to point out that proposals will be brought here whereby the old age pensioners will be receiving increments to their pensions by 1st April. Even that, Mr. Speaker, will show the hon. member that we are not unaware of the fact that these people need help, and it is our intention to give them as much help as possible, though we have got to think of the financial implications. To repair the home of an old age pensioner, taking into consideration the high wages paid today, lumber etc., we cannot think of spending less than at least $100 on a house, and there are 10,000 old age pensioners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph refer to the rosiness of the financial situation in Barbados right now, and that things were not as rosy years ago as they are today. I would like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to know that things are not as rosy as he thinks they are. They are far from being rosy and we have to contribute that unrosiness to the former Government. We are not against doing something for the people when we really reach the rosy stage which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph referred to, and you can rest assured that when we shall have reached that stage, we are going to do all that we can in the interest of the community of Barbados. A project such as this is one that I would say is a long-term project in as much as we have got to find at least $1 million with which to start, and when we go a little further, Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of other people in this Island who are.....

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister who is speaking that if he looks at the third paragraph of this Resolution, he will see that it reads as follows:-

"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 of through the Local Government authorities."

That is to say, I think the mover of this Resolution means that we have been receiving at the Poor Law Board quite a lot of complaints to repair their houses, and the hon. member is only asking permission from this House so that at Local Government level we might be able to institute a scheme whereby we can levy rates on ratepayers in the Local Government to repair these houses. We are not asking Government to do it. We want the Local Government to be able to do it, but we cannot do it as a Local Government concern. I just wanted to make that explanation so that the Hon. Minister would understand what we are doing. 4.25 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I am just only on a point of order because this whole debate seems to have proceeded on the wrong footing altogether. The hon. member is now saying that the Government is now being asked for permission to allow the Local Government to do repairs to old people's houses. That is something right out of the blue. The Minister has given the Government's point of view on this matter. This is a Resolution on which many hon. members have spoken.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph who is the colleague of the member who introduced this Resolution has got up and said that the Central Government is being asked permission for the Local Government to do repairs to old people's houses. This is something on which the Resolution has not proceeded and I am asking the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to get the Resolution in order before he comes to the House with it.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about to remind the Hon. Premier that it is 4.30 p.m. o'clock and therefore, Private Members' Business is concluded. We will now revert to Government Business.

Under Government Business, the House was dealing with a Resolution on the Deep Water Harbour. I now remember that the Hon. Premier asked for leave to reply to Question No. 19. This is a matter of urgency as to whether or not Friday of this week, Federation Day, would continue as a Bank Holiday.

STATEMENT *re* 23RD FEBRUARY TO CONTINUE AS A PUBLIC HOLIDAY

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, the position is that I asked leave to defer laying the answer to that question and making a statement instead as the hon. member was not in his place and, as an hon. member reminded me that it was of some public concern, I said that at the earliest possible opportunity I would make the statement.

This Government does not intend to encroach upon Private Members' Time, and that is why the debate was not interrupted.

Now, Sir, this is Question No. 19. The hon. senior member for St. Peter enquired 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?

I think what the hon. member meant was the impending dissolution, because technically the Federation has not yet been dissolved. It is very interesting that the hon. senior member for St. Peter should have asked this question and I think members of the public would be interested also, knowing what the position is.

That question was asked on the 13th February. Well, Sir, on the 5th February, 1962, the Administrator of St. Lucia cabled this Government as follows:-

"Grateful for your view whether February 23 should be observed as Federation Day. This Government does not propose to proclaim a public holiday."

On the 8th February, the Administrator of Antigua replied as follows:-

"*Status quo* would be retained in this territory until amendment to the Schedule of the Public Holidays Ordinance is effected."

The Government of Montserrat said on the 12th February — that is the day before the hon. senior member for St. Peter brought in his question:-

"There will be no official celebration on February 23rd which is a public holiday by law."

On the 17th February, the Administrator of Grenada on behalf of the Government said:

"February 23 will be a public holiday but there will be no celebration."

We cabled a reply soon after the 5th February to all the territories and it more or less answers the questions which has been asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The date of our cable was on the 9th February and of course, as the matter was not before the House at the time, until the question was asked, I could not make any statement on it. The telegram was addressed to the Administrator, St. Lucia, and other Administrators. It was repeated to the Governor-General of the West Indies. It reads as follows:

"From Governor of Barbados. February 23 is a public holiday by law in Barbados as Federation Day. There will be no official celebrations this year."

The law to which we were referring is the provision of the 1959 Bank Holidays (Amendment) Act, Chapter 10. By this amendment, the 23rd day of February was added to the Schedule which designates the days which are bank-holidays and until we repeal that law, February 23rd would therefore remain a bank-holiday.

Sir, as you will see, the Governments of the Windward and Leeward Islands having arrived at their independent conclusions, the *status quo* in each island being similar to that in Barbados, February 23rd will therefore be maintained as a bank-holiday this year. What will happen next year is an entirely different matter; but we did not intend to deprive the workers who are looking forward to having it as a day off or as a bank-holiday at this time of the year.

If we do have another bank-holiday in its place, it will probably be shifted to another day of the year and one which would not be connected in any way with the unfortunate episode in the lives of those people of the West Indies which is now known as the Eastern Caribbean Federation.

The answer to the hon. member's question is that although February 23rd — Federation Day — is to be a bank-holiday, in keeping with the decisions independently arrived at by the other territories in the Eastern Caribbean, there will be no celebration of the birth of the Federation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Premier for assuring the hon. senior member for St. Peter of the position.

The House will now resume discussion on the Resolution on the Deep Water Harbour.
4.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXPENDITURE OF PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: We will now revert to the consideration of Government Business. On the last occasion when Government Business was being considered, we were considering a Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when the time for the suspension of the sitting arrived, I was reading note No. 2 to this Resolution. This is what it says:-

"The new Port Department commenced to function from 1st February, 1961, but did not go into full operation until July, 1961. In February 1961, the Legislature provided the sum of $60,000 for the purpose of financing its operation until the Department had collected Revenue to meet its Expenditure. Thirty thousand dollars of this amount was drawn from the Treasury and has since been repaid. The Department is therefore operating on its own Revenue."

I am speaking under correction now. When goods arrived in this country, the importer had ten days' grace before those goods were taken out of the warehouse; but with the operation of the new Port, the time for taking out the goods is three days. In my opinion, that period of time is too short, if you are going to consider the small importer. The small importer is not always financially strong enough to take out goods immediately on their arrival, especially when the method of taking them out allowed this period of ten days before. The rates for the excess storage, and this is the warehouse, are $2.00 per ton for the first 72 hours, $4.00 per ton for the second and $6.00 for each period of 72 hours after. If you are considering the small importers, those who do not have enough money in the Bank which they can draw off at any time, and a period of this sort having to be complied with, the goods will be too costly. You would not be able in this way to compete with the large importer who already has the money with which to take out his goods. You may take out goods today and another boat may come in on you shortly afterwards, because the manufacturers always try to get the earliest ship to send down the goods according to the orders. You may be trying to space your orders so that you would not be caught confused, but sometimes all the orders come in one shipment.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order. I would like to know precisely on what item is the hon. member speaking.

Mr. SMITH: I think that this is the Resolution; it states here Part I - Current, Annexed Estimates, Port Department. This is a Resolution in connection with the Port and I am dealing with the Port. I do not know what the Hon. Minister would want.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking on the revenue of the Port.

Mr. SMITH: I read from the Addendum to the Resolution and I do not think that I would be out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that he was dealing with paragraph 2 of the note to the Resolution which deals with the revenue which the Port collects in order to meet its expenditure.

Mr. SMITH: I was saying, Sir, that the charges at the Port are too high and the period of grace is too short, if you have to pay after three days have expired. Sometimes a boat comes in and the Bank does not always get the documents from overseas. When the documents come in, a period of three days has already passed and you cannot get these

goods without the documents. The Banks are very co-operative; when the time is so short, rather than post out a notice, the Bank will telephone and say that the goods have arrived at such and such a time and the time has expired yesterday or it will expire today. I am saying that this period of three days' grace is too short and then there is the question of the excess storage. The amount is as high as $6.00 for each 72-hour period after the first two periods, and then for passengers' baggage there is $1.00 per article per day. When you are dealing with the small customer, you can see the advantage which is being taken of him by charging this excess storage when in truth and in fact the Addendum to this Resolution states that the Port is getting through very fine. In that case, the Port Department must be one of the lucky Departments of Government if it is getting on very fine. I understand that you have Port Contractors. I do not know if these charges are fixed by the Government or by the Port Contractors. The hon. member may say that I was a member of the last Government for all of this time and I should know everything; but before that happens I will say that I do not know. I am saying that this time is too short.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the new Port Department commenced to function from the 1st February, 1961, but did not go into full operation until July, 1961. I am saying that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should know more about who regulates these rates, whether they are regulated by the Port Contractors or by the Government; the hon. member was a member of the Government Party at that time. It was that Government which negotiated with the Port Contractors and those who made these laws and regulations. The hon. member should know about this matter more than anybody else.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is the same thing I was saying. I was listening to hear the Hon. Minister say that after I sat down. However, I do not know who is responsible for this matter. I have heard about Port Contractors but I do not know who fixed these prices. I would like to ask if because the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is a member of the present Government, they would let him know everything. If that is so.....

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: If the hon. member knew absolutely nothing about this matter, then he must have been only a figurehead in the former Government.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when I said the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, I made a mistake. I meant the hon. senior member, because the junior member is a Minister and he would know. If the hon. senior member knows everything that the present Government does, what is the good of his wasting time on evenings, and what is the good of wasting time and going to Government House before you become a Minister if everybody knows everything the present Government does? I do not know anything about these rates, because if I had known about these rates before, I would have raised my objection there and then. I do not know who was responsible for fixing these rates, and I only know about them now.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph mention my name. I want him to realise that I am not in the Cabinet with the Ministers and I was only voicing my opinion. I did not go to any secret chamber, because if I had he could never know anything I got from there; but I was only saying what my Party desired.

Mr. SMITH: It seems as though the hon. member has not heard what I said. The Hon. Minister said that I was a member of the last Government and should know these things, and I replied by asking him if the hon. senior member for St Andrew would know everything that was done in the present Government. I am not saying anything against the hon. member, but I know what is wrong with him, because he used to sit very near to me.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I would be very glad if the Hon. Minister would let this House know who is responsible for these charges, and whether these charges go to the Government or into the hands of the Port Contractors. I know nothing at all about the set up down there, and that is the reason why I am raising my objection now to these prices, because they are too high. Imagine charging $1 per article per day for passengers' baggage! You can imagine how much it would cost some of the passengers if they allowed their things to stay there at least two weeks, because sometimes they do not have the money to pay for them. You cannot break the Port and take out these things; you have to wait until you can raise the necessary amount to pay for them, and while you are trying to raise the amount, it is going higher by way of these charges.

I am therefore asking the present Government to go into this matter and not ignore things like these because they come from me. It is their business: but it is my duty to draw to Government's attention that three days are not enough time if you take into consideration the small importer, and I have given my reasons. Sometimes a small importer gets all his goods coming on one boat and he cannot get the necessary amount to pay for all. He would pay for some and the remainder would have to wait until he can raise the remainder of money; so these contractors, the Government or whoever is responsible should be more considerate and try to help, because the importers have to pay income tax and contribute to the upkeep of the Port.

Mr. Speaker, although the Port is running itself, you are still asking for money until you can get further, and it is the taxpayers' money of this country. I do not know the position of the large importers; they may have money unlimited at the Banks and may be able to write a cheque for any amount at any time; but the small importers are limited, and when they get to the limit they can write a cheque all right, but it would be returned. I am asking this Government now to go into the matter and see that the charges are too high and the time is too short. I feel that ten days would not be too long to allow importers' goods to remain at the Port until they can raise the amount. When goods come from overseas you have to pay for them C.O.D. As a matter of fact, you have to pay every cent of the cost to the Bank before you see the goods. When you try then to raise that money to pay to get the documents to remove the goods from the Port, surely some consideration should be given with regard to the length of time allowed for taking them out. No importer who is able to pay for his goods is going to let them stay in the Port, because he wants them to sell. They would only remain there if the money is not forthcoming at the same time to take them out. The sheds at the Port are large enough to hold Barbados - far less two or three packages for two or three small importers, and I feel it is hard and unfair to allow such a state of affairs to continue to exist down there by giving three days only. It should not be less than ten days in order to give the small importer a chance to get out his goods, and I hope the Minister will let us know who is responsible for these charges, whether the Government gets the money or whether the Port Contractors get it. I hope he will promise also that the length of time and the charges will be gone into thoroughly, and if possible extend the time to at least ten days as used to obtain in the old warehouses.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of members of this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I just wonder if there is any other hon. member who would like to speak before the Minister exercises his right to reply. There does not seem to be any. Let the Hon. Minister proceed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Sir, the amount paid per ton for cargo landed is $6 per ton. Out of that $6 the amount of $4.10 goes to the Port Contractors while the Government receives $1.90 for each ton of cargo landed.

With reference to the suggestion by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph of ten days' storage, I would like to say that with the cubic space of a warehouse at the Deep Water Harbour there would be no room to land cargo. If two ships came in and had to wait ten days for the removal of cargo from the warehouses, the Port would be completely blocked.
4.55 p.m.

It is completely different from previous days when individual merchants had their own warehouses all over Bridgetown. All the cargo landed from ships must go into two specific warehouses built on the Harbour, and to give any longer time it will be just lying around there and ships will have to go to another port because the ships will never be able to wait until the removal of the stuff from the warehouses is effected.

With reference to the removal of passengers' baggage, it is a reasonable distance from where the ship berths to the Customs shed. That is also under the jurisdiction of the Port Department and they have to pay porters for the removal from the ships to the Customs shed. That distance is nearly half a mile from the western end of the Port.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BELLEPLAINE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve 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. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks approval of the compulsory acquisition of approximately four acres of land situate at Belleplaine in the parish of St. Andrew for the purpose of extending the playing field facilities at the Alleyne School in that parish.

The Addendum to the Resolution explains that the land does not have a marketable title and we always resort to the Land Acquisition Act whenever there is any doubt about the title to land which we want to acquire. As a matter of fact, I understand that the Alleyne School has been occupying this land for a considerable period of time, probably three or four years, and the only reason that the land has not been paid for was due to the defect of the title. The owner, Mrs. Rock, could not find the title deeds although she has been in possession of it and has evidence of a possessory title.

We are therefore asking approval to acquire this land; the House is not now being asked to vote any money.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I would just like to add that for some time the Governing Body of that School had been asking the Ministry to expedite the acquisition of this land. The school itself has had some expansions done to it during the last two years and has therefore had to encroach on its grounds but, of course, this bit of land is being used as a playing field through the good graces of the owner and also for certain *ex curricula* activities like scouting.

The Alleyne School is a co-educational school and is likely to have over 300 pupils by September, 1962; therefore, the necessity for an extra playing field seems urgent. The plan of the plot of land is here and if hon. members wish to see it, they can do so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Hon. Minister would be able to tell us what is the amount of land of the present playing field which belongs to the Alleyne School. I remember as a boy that there was a very large playing field. I would like to know the acreage of the playing field possessed by the school now.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which is now before us is for the acquisition of a plot of land at Belleplaine for a playing field for the Alleyne School and I can assure this House that the building which has just been constructed has taken up a large portion of the playing field which then existed there; therefore, I think that the acquisition of this plot of land would be necessary to provide facilities for a playing field for the children. Right now, they have to infringe on the very plot of land which belongs to Mrs. Rock. I, therefore, think that it would be a good thing for this Government to purchase that parcel of land so as to increase the playing field at the Alleyne School. I think it is really necessary. I can assure hon. members that since the building has been reconstructed and has taken up so much of the land, the acquisition of this land for a playing field now becomes more necessary than it was before. This Resolution is therefore necessary and I ask hon. members to support it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, in answer to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, like the hon. member, I spent some of my boyhood days there and I am perfectly aware that there was a large expanse of land on which we could roam at that time. As a matter of fact, we could roam the whole of St. Andrew in that part without getting sight of any human habitation, but that does not mean that all the land as far as the eye could reach belonged to the Alleyne School. Nobody in those days worried about boundaries, particularly as regards land at Walkers and Lakes. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew will, of course, tell the hon. member, we having escaped from there at an early age, that in those days owing to the pillages of wind and tide there, there was really a lot of space around.

We can only arrive at the acreage of the land belonging to the Governing Body by a process of elimination. The Housing Authority having secured some other land down there in the immediate locality and having disposed of 200 acres, and two or three transactions having taken place to the east of the Alleyne School, and then of course, the present vendor of the site having sold off some of the land, my opinion is that there is very little land around the Alleyne School which probably belongs to that school. 5.05 p.m.

There is a note here to the effect that the new buildings which were erected a few years ago took up a considerable portion of the available land. As far as I know, there is no playing field area available other than this piece of land which the Government now seeks to acquire by compulsory acquisition. I regret that I cannot provide the hon. member with more specific information than that; the Hon. Minister has tried to look into the matter and he has tried to discover how much land there is down there.

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

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade Industry and Labour:- To move the second reading of a Bill to deal comprehensively with the subject of Customs.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a voluminous one. It has only been circulated to hon. members over the last week end and I believe that they would like a little longer time to consider the provisions of this Bill. I am therefore asking leave to postpone the consideration of this Bill until the next meeting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister thinks that perhaps all hon. members have not had a full opportunity to give this Bill the careful study which is expected they should give to it. There appears to be no objection to the postponement of this Order and therefore leave is granted the Hon. Minister to postpone dealing with it.

BARBADOS NATIONAL TRUST (EXEMPTION FROM STAMP DUTY, FEES AND RATES) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:- To move the second reading of a Bill to exempt the Barbados National Trust from the payment of stamp duties, registration and recording fees and Local Government rates.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Bill on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism who is now absent from the House.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Barbados National Trust was established about two years ago for the purpose of acquiring historic sites and buildings and preserving them for posterity and for the benefit of the general public of this island. I should say that historic sites have already been acquired; the Barbados National Trust has also purchased an area which is known as Welchman Hall Gully and already this is becoming one of the major tourist attractions in the island of Barbados. The Government of Barbados has assisted the Trust financially although it is not a Government-aided organization as such. Unlike the National Trust in Great Britain, it tries to stay clear of the heels of the Government; and being an independent Institution, it is dependent only upon revenue which it may derive from citizens and funds, from benefactors and members.

The objects of the Trust are clear, of a public, charitable and educational nature and the object of this Bill is to exempt the Trust from the payment of stamp duties and recording and registration fees on instruments drawn, made or executed by or on behalf of the Trust and also from the payment of Local Government rates on property owned or occupied by the Trust.

As I have already said, Mr. Speaker, this Trust is a non-profit Organization. The Board of Management of the Trust is representative of all sections of the community who are interested in projects of this kind. With those remarks, I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative with division.

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

5.15 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be read a third time.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill entitled "The Barbados National Trust (Exemption from Stamp Duty, Fees and Rates) Act, 1962, do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services to move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932.

THE MIDWIVES AND NURSES REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in moving that this Bill to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932 be now read a second time, I should like to point out that at a Conference held on the 5th September, 1959 by the Nursing Administration of the then Federal Area and British Guiana, it was recommended that nurses should have greater control over the management of their affairs in this Island of Barbados. It is to be noted that at that time the Nursing Council comprised seven members of which three were nurses and four doctors, and it was felt therefore that in as much as it was an Act re the Registration of Midwives and Nurses, they should have a greater voice in it and that the number should be increased from seven to nine members of which seven of the members of this Committee should be representatives of the nursing body.

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

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

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

5.25 p.m.

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That concludes Government Business for the day.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed for Government Business,

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave that Order No. 9, of Private Members' Business, which stands in my name, be made Order No. 2.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I hope you are aware that the Resolution with which I was dealing today has not been finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member asked to make his Order the second Order.

Mr. SMITH: I thought the hon. member asked to make it Order No. 1.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day fortnight, Tuesday, 6th March, 1962, at 12 o'clock (noon).

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

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

5.35 p.m.