THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th June, 1962.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., Esq., *(Deputy Speaker)*; Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism)*; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees)* and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Messrs. LOWE, BOXILL, MILLER and SEALY entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:–

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Resolution to place the sum of $2,332 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I – Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 5 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, of the lands described in the Schedule situate at Wilcox in the parish of Christ Church in the Island of Barbados for the following public purpose, that is to say, for a road diversion leaving from Seawell Airport along Wilcox Road to Highway No. 7.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Replies to Parliamentary Questions are ready as follows:-

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 12/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, on the 23rd January, 1962;

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 31/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, on the 20th March, 1962.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 29/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 6th March, 1962, is now ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply later in today's Session.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SMITH: I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the cost of labour for reaping canes has considerably increased over last year, and peasant cane growers have had to meet these increases to reap their crops;

AND WHEREAS no increased price for sugar canes has been paid this year;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call on Government to assist Peasant Cane Growers of the Island with payments from the Price Stabilisation Fund.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Premier:

Is it the intention of this present Government to give increases on the pensions of persons who have retired from the Barbados Civil Service?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government state when it is proposed to bring the necessary legislation before the House?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to make such legislation retroactive, to date from the same time as the increases to members of the Civil Service?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:

How many candidates for election to the House of Assembly or Political Parties, if any, chartered buses from the Transport Board during the last General Election Campaign?

2. Are any monies due and owing to the Board by any person or persons who chartered such buses?

3. If so, how much is due and owing by each person or Party?

4. If these amounts have been paid, on what dates were they paid to the Board?

Mr. LYNCH: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism:

Will Government consider as an urgent priority the repair of the following roads in the parish of St. Michael: Spencer's Gap, Baxters Road; Rock Gap, Baxters Road; and the Garden Land, Country Road.

Mr. COWARD entered the House and took his seat.

12.25 p.m.

EXEMPTION FROM STANDING ORDER No. 5

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that all the Items of Government Business on today's Order Paper be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Deputy Premier:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63, No. 2

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of $140,200 which is a revote, being part of the provision made during 1961-62 to pay salaries, wages and allowances at revised rates under Supplementary Estimates 1961-62, Nos. 30, 32 and 33 (Resolutions 85 of 1961, 87 of 1961 and 88 of 1961.) I do not think that, in the circumstances, this Resolution being merely a revote of the amount for which we are now asking, it is necessary for me to make any further statement. However, I will be pleased to answer any questions which hon. members may care to ask in the matter. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH and Mr. WALCOTT rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph caught my eye first.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I notice that this Resolution is a revote of this money and I would like to know from the hon. member in charge of the Resolution if this revote, or any part of it, is for the purpose of paying teachers. There is a big dissatisfaction among the teachers who are asking me and other politicians the reasons for their not getting their increases in the same way as other Civil Servants have got theirs. I was not in a position to tell these teachers the reasons for that, because I did not know what is responsible for it. I would like to know if this money, or any part of it, is for the purpose of paying these teachers and the reasons for their not being paid when the other people were paid.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be appropriate at this stage before I begin to deal with this Resolution, to mention that we are extremely glad to see the Hon. Premier back and restored to as vigorous health as that in which he was, and, as has been stated by him, more vigorous health than when he left Barbados. We are very pleased to see him back here because we had extremely disturbing news about his health and we are very glad that, even in these circumstances, it was at the point where the Premier could get the maximum and most efficient medical attention which one would expect to receive in a big metropolitan area such as London. I am very pleased about that and I am sure that all hon. members of this Chamber are very glad to welcome the Premier back here because in these things health is a common denominator and we have to share in it either in one way or in the other. We would like the Hon. Premier to know that we are all glad that he is back here and we would like to offer him our sincere wishes. I am sure that we will not do anything which would militate against or aggravate the Premier's position where his health is concerned, but this is one of the occupational hazards which he has to endure. In dealing with public affairs, that does in some way impair one's health. However, I am glad to see that the Premier is back here and I hope he will continue to enjoy good health. *(Cheers)*

In connection with this Resolution, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that there are certain sectors of Government employment to which I would like to see proper attention given in this salary revision whenever a thing like this takes place. I was very unhappy about instances in which some of the persons employed by the Government were unhappy about their position as to drawing their retrospective pay. There was a little skirmish at the abattoir and the people who work at the Public Works Department were becoming a bit restless. That is quite understandable. A man who is working for cents per hour will not feel pleased to know that another man who is working for dollars per month gets hundreds of dollars by way of back pay and he who is only getting a few cents in back pay does not get it at once. I hope that the Hon. Premier will see to it that all of these outstanding arrears are completely liquidated and that the people are restored to normalcy. I say that because the community loses when you get this industrial discontent. When a man who is working in the road or at the abattoir does not get his back-pay and he feels that the other people will get theirs, his attitude is going to be that he will do less work. A discontented workman is not a workman going at his maximum.

12.35 p.m.

For that reason, I say it is not worth it, because you lose more. When it is given to him, he does not ever appreciate it because he feels it has come so late, and as you know, to give early is to give twice.

I should also like to draw to the Premier's attention that in Barbados we have a peculiar way of employing people. Some people work for the Government and some work for what is known as Local Government, but these things are tied in. I do not like the idea of some people in the Northern District Council giving the impression that they do not know these people who have been promised money, but I have spoken to the Chairman of the Northern District Council about it. This is nothing to do with the Resolution as such, but it is complementary to this Resolution in that such persons employed by public authorities are paid wages that are in agreement or consonance with what the Government is paying. Some of them have been to me and maybe some of them have been to other politicians, but it is true that the new politicians are not always aware of or know how to handle public matters, and when their constituents come to them, sometimes they are on the wrong beat and maybe give wrong advice inadvertently in order to please them.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in it a little longer, and I can put these people on the right track by telling them I am sorry about it, but that we will take up the matter when the time comes, though we cannot do anything more than that at this present stage. I would like the Premier to investigate these matters. I will say more on Local Government when we deal with the Local Government Amendment, but I think this is a question of wages.

I would also like to draw to the Premier's attention that the Government employs people in road-making and gives out a contract to a contractor to supply stones for

the Highways and Transport Department. Many of these rock blasters have been to me, because they feel that it is grossly unfair that the rates given to them in the contract were conditioned by prevailing circumstances prior to any Government re-arrangement of salaries, and when the Government re-arranges the salaries, with respect to the Fair Wages Clause, which is in the Agreement, and which should automatically operate in their favour, they find that they have to go cap in hand to the contractor to find out what is their relative position in the new circumstances as a result of the change in wages. I think that as a condition written into Fair Wages Clauses, there should be an automatic change where the Government itself has made broad changes, and that these changes should be subject to review either through the Labour Commissioner or if they have any representation in a Trade Union, through the Trade Union.

I do not like workers in this small community to get the feeling that they are supplying stones which the Government is using to make roads, that their wages were conditioned by factors prior to the revision of salaries, and now that salaries have been revised and workers like themselves have received an increase in wages, their contractor is bound by a contract through which they cannot get any adjustment. I have pointed out already that the Fair Wages Clause operating here should operate in the same way as the Fair Wages Clause operates in the United Kingdom, in that it should always be a Clause which is subject to review whenever changes come about in the particular industry. I feel sure that these are consequential matters; they are not new matters; but I think it is necessary that the Government should be made aware of these things, because as I have said already, these little discontents in labour create a psychological effect on the workers, and therefore damage productivity as well as the man's outlook on the reason why he is working.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that these points which I have made will be considered by the Government, because in each case they are matters which are consequent upon the salaries revision that causes them to arise.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, allow me to thank the hon. senior member for St. Peter for the very kind remarks which he made. I am indeed grateful to the members of the House who sent me messages while I was in hospital, and I am glad to say that I am feeling as fit as the hon. member has described.

In answering the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph about the teachers, perhaps I might give him a break-down of the amount which we have asked for for the payment of arrears. The total amount outstanding on 31st March, 1962, was $129,065.15 which covered the supernumerary teachers, relief teachers, Post Office (Temporary) Staff, Health Centre Staff at St. Philip, temporary staff at Public Market, people who work at the Abbatoir, Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department. There is also another Resolution dealing with the Abbatoir, and the Public Works employees engaged on the new Hospital which is the subject of the $50,000 Resolution which we hope to deal with next. But in the list which I have just read out, there was no provision for the salaries or the arrears due to Headteachers, and that was due to the fact that the Estimates had not been submitted at 31st March from the different schools and the Education Department to the Financial section. The total amount therefore was $129,000 as I have said, and after these amounts had come in for the allowances for Headteachers and there was a revision in the amount asked for for the relief teachers and supernumerary teachers, the total amount is $135,600, and we are therefore asking for $140,000 just to be on the safe side.

When this amount is voted, this will now take care of all the Civil Servants including the unestablished staff who have not received their arrears of salaries. The Headteachers' allowances come to $1,300; supernumerary teachers - $35,000; Relief Teachers - $27,000, making a total of $63,000 for the Department of Education. The Acting Staff of the Post Office is to be paid $950, Health Centre - St. Philip, $1,250, and there are two amounts for the Department of Agriculture, one for the Department proper of $200, and $500 for the Public Markets; Highways and Transport, chiefly unestablished staff $9,400 and the Public Works Department, $60,000.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter questioned the failure to pay the arrears of the unestablished staff when the arrears of the permanent employees of the Civil Service who work by the month had been paid some time before. Well, this is very easy to understand because the unestablished staff work by the hour chiefly and their pay sheets are much more involved than the pay sheets of a person whose salary is fixed by law and whose salary for next year is already known — as a matter of fact, whose salary until about 1965 is already known — because we do not intend to give them any salary revision between now and the date of any election. We do not intend even to set up a Commission to inquire into salaries between now and the next election; so we can work out their emoluments for 1965 right now if they want us to.

When it comes to the unestablished staff, these are people who sometimes turn out to work two or three days a week and sometimes five and six days a week or five and a half days a week, and the analysis of the wage sheets of the unestablished staff is a much more complicated matter than working out the pay vouchers for members of the established Civil Service.
12.45 p.m.

There is absolutely no attempt on the part of the Government to victimize anybody, but the whole reason is that these workers are much more numerous than workers in other departments. There are nearly 29,000 people in the Unestablished Staff, and as I have said, they do not work throughout the year or even sometimes for a full week. I do not think there is any other question to answer.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is only one thing which I should mention. So far as I am concerned, I am not in any way of the opinion that it was a matter of victimization, but as you know, you do not have to victimize a hungry man for him to feel that some injustice has been done him if something is to come his way and he has not got it and somebody in a better position than he has got his.

The explanation of the Hon. Premier is very understandable to me. However, he can very well understand what the position is, because Civil Servants have received their backpay before Christmas, and Whitsuntide will soon be passed and these poor casual workers have not received theirs yet. You really cannot tell these workers: "well, yours will take a little more calculation." Their attitude is that you can give them some now to carry to the shop.

Sir, I am not dealing with the contract but I think the Government's policy here should be declared. In any Fair Wages Clauses where people work on contracts which are unconnected with Government features of work — for example, a Fair Wage Contract that deals with something that took place in printing, if the Government changed its wages, it does not necessarily mean that you should change your wages in printing; but if you had a change in which you took the rates of pay upward for people in certain branches of employment, then, for people working by a Fair Wages Clause, you should do it also for them. I say that on behalf of the rock-blasters because they are members of the Barbados Workers' Trade Union and this matter was raised by them. I told them that I would raise it with the Minister or the contractors. I think it should be a matter of policy of the Government as a whole because the people who are rock-blasters are working for the Government road-making programme. The Government should see to it that the rates of pay of these rock-blasters should bear some relationship to the conditions and rates of pay which apply to other people who are working in the Department of Highways and Transport and other parts of the Government Service. The Government should bear in mind that if the Government had owned a quarry and were employing rock-blasters, those rock-blasters would be subject to the same treatment which other people in Government's employ received. That is why I am saying that the Hon. Premier should give this matter very careful consideration.

Sir, I am not dealing with any contract. I have heard all about the contract, the contractor and contractors. I do not want this argument injected into this matter. Nor do I want the point indicated that I am for one contractor as against another. It is immaterial to me who receives a Government contract as long as you are carrying out the conditions which Government has set down in the tender. I am not anyone whom you can come and ask that I get a contract for you. There is nobody who can pay me any money to get a contract for them. I have never promised anybody in my constituency that if he votes for me, I would get a contract for him.

I am raising this question purely on behalf of the workers. I have not promised the workers anything because as a matter of fact if you are not a member of the Barbados Workers' Union, I do not promise you any industrial representation. The politicians promise the people industrial representation. I do not promise any such thing. In the Barbados Worker's Trade Union we operate in the way of giving industrial representation to the people who pay their dues.

Sir, I think instructions should be given that the rock-blasters' Fair Wage Clause in the contract should be amended or should be reviewed in the light of the review of workers' wages that has taken place in Government service. I say that without committing them to any specific amount. Government should review it in the light of what they think is fair even if a Resolution has to be sent down later to redress these workers in the light of the argument which has been put up in favour of these rock-blasters.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in connection with this Resolution for $140,000, as soon as I heard the name "rock-blasters" mentioned, it came to my affection because I was the first man who led a delegation in Barbados of rock-blasters who were not properly represented. I stopped my rock-blasters in St. Andrew from working because the contractors were getting all the benefits for themselves and the poor rock-blasters were not getting anything. I called on them to strike and I led the delegation myself. It seems to me that contractors so long as their bowels are full do not care whose are full. It is their duty when the cost of living has raised and people in other brackets get a wage increase — and they have the same opportunity as any other Government Department — to put forward their requests for an increase of wages for their rock-blasters.

Mr. Chairman, a wage increase took place throughout the whole island of Barbados. It has caused much scandal upon the Government, whether it is this Government or that Government. That is what is causing all this trouble. Rock-blasters have to wait and see what the contractors give them because their voices cannot be heard anywhere. The only voice which can be heard is that of the contractors. The contractor becomes the mediator between the Government and the rock-blasters; therefore, their voices cannot be heard unless they make a strike. If you look anywhere in this island you will find that wherever there is a contractor there is confusion. Some contractors have semi-contractors under them and where you have number one contractor and number two contractor, the poor workers under them perish day after day because their voices cannot be heard. It is the duty of the contractor to put forward proposals to the Government or to any other owner for the rock-blasters who are working under him when the cost of living is raised and other people get an increase of wages. If they do not do it, then it is not the Government or the owner who is at fault; it is the fault of the contractors.

I think that it was sometime in 1957 when I led the delegation in St. Andrew for these poor rock-blasters because they cried out and could not get any relief. I told them to bind themselves together and they sent me to the Executive Engineer. I think it was a Mr. Nightengale who came down there to see me when I had about forty-five men and women lined up. He asked me what was their grievance. I told him that these poor people had run short of lubrication; they had reached the top of the hill and could not go forward. He asked me what I meant by that. I told him that from His Excellency the Governor back down to the lowest man had received an increase of salary or wage and back-pay, but these poor rock-blasters have not got any increase of pay or back pay: so they were unable to go any further. Their engines had run out of lubrication.

12.55 p.m.

The Government had to meet the request of the contractor, the contractor sent forward his proposals and the rock blasters got an increase of pay. That is how things will have to be done: otherwise the rock blasters will always be crying; they will always be crying if the contractors do not take up their cause and put it before the Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is a bit concerned about wages paid to persons who are involved in industries other than those which are under Government. Dealing particularly with the quarrying industry, the procedure is that when a person tenders for the supply of stones to either one of the Works departments, that person has to submit a form setting out the rates of wages which he intends to pay if the contract is awarded to him. The Government really has no control over the rates of wages paid to persons other than those employed by a contractor who is dealing with the Government. It is a matter for collective bargaining between the Trade Union and the employers concerned. What the Government can insist on is that even when there is no written contract or tender, the Government can use the offices of the Labour Department in order to satisfy itself that a person who is supplying, let us say, material, whether it be stationery or any other commodity — the Government Department, I feel as a matter of principle, should satisfy itself that that employer pays a wage which, in industrial relations, we call a wage which a good employer in the trade, industry or enterprise is paying.

We do have machinery to ensure that where contracts are awarded, the schedule of wages paid to every single category of employee in the particular business has got to be submitted to the Central Tenders Board. The Board cannot accept the tender of a person who is paying wages below what the Government pays for the equivalent work in that particular industry or any similar industry where there is no direct employment by Government or industry such as quarrying. We have to make sure that the time rates are in the equivalent position as in the quarrying industry. Whatever level of labour is employed, the Board has to be satisfied, and the Minister of Communications and Works has to be satisfied, before he accepts the recommendations of the Tenders Committee that fair wages are being paid.

I did not fully understand what the hon. senior member for St. Peter meant by wages other than where contractors are involved. The only explanation which could be given to that is where supplies are bought from the Government other than the award of the contract by tender. I would be glad for a little elucidation on that particular point.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, we are agreed on terms; it is a question of application. I do not mean contracts where the Government is buying stationery; it is not the Government's business to say what you pay the Clerks in your store because there is a Shop Order which applies to that. As the Premier has rightly said, in view of the fact that there is a Tenders Committee you cannot negotiate with a contractor. The Trade Union cannot negotiate with a contractor who is going to sell to Highways and Transport stones out of a quarry. If you have a contract and general wages go up by so much per cent, we say that it is fair to give a rock blaster a consequential increase which would change as a consequence of the other changes. The rock blasters are under contract with a contractor who has a contract with the Government for supplying stones; and they are the people who have to get out the stones. I have raised this mattter in view of the fact that these persons were requesting that their wages be reviewed as a result of the situation. I do not think it is an unfair representation; it is only keeping pace with what took place. This is in relation to the contract in which the Government has direct relations with the contractor and not a question of supply in the open market.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. member has been dwelling on this question of the rock blasters and what not, I will enquire something of the Minister of Com-

munications and Works. The hon. member who has just spoken is very interested in this matter of contracts and so on. But will the Hon. Minister tell this Committee if it is true that the Government has been for some time buying their own stones? I want to know if it is true that without any contract or anything having been signed, someone took charge of the Government's quarry and was quarrying stones and was selling them back to the Government. I want to know who gave that permission, whether it is this Government or the last Government. As you will realise, Mr. Chairman, I have asked this question very guardedly. Is what I have said true and if it is true, what steps have been taken to remedy that state of affairs? I am referring to the quarry which the Government owns at Bagatelle from which they got stones to be used in connection with the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. It has been brought to my notice that stones have been sold - I do not know if they are still being sold - from there without anybody paying Government for these stones.
1.05 p.m.

If that is so, it is a most reprehensible state of affairs. Will the Minister tell us how long it was going on and who gave them permission, and whether permission was given by this Government or what Government?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I may deal with the question of the hon. senior member for St. Peter first, this is an implication which as Minister of Finance, I view with grave alarm. As a person who has a nodding acquaintance of the law, when a person takes out a contract, both the person who is awarding the contract and the contractor should be in a position to know where they stand. The position of the Government is slightly different *vis-a-vis* its employees, because when we get a Civil Service with such spiralling increases - and I do not mean it in a derogatory sense - we find that every single sector of Government employment is affected, even although Government may not have any contract responsible for the people so employed.

Now as I understand the proposition as postulated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, it is this: we are building a hospital and we awarded a contract - I do not know whether this is the particular illustration he has in mind - to a local firm of engineers to erect the steel at the hospital. I am very glad to say that all the steel work was completed last Wednesday from the point of view of the Treasury, and from the point of view of the progress of the hospital. The tardiness of its completion is due to the tardiness in the British export industry and getting orders delivered with the promptness with which the European Common Market has been delivering goods to all parts of the world. That is only by the way. We naturally gave salary increases to the established and unestablished staff with the Barbados General Hospital now under construction, and that has now put the cost of the hospital up by some $2 1/2 million, and though I am not saying it has any direct relationship, the period within which the hospital should have been completed has already been miraculously extended; so it is a question of increase both in time and in the quantity of money to be expended.

Mr. Chairman, the hospital is now going to cost over $8 1/2 million. Quite apart from that, next door to these men I see the predicament of anyone concerned with labour relations. You have a group of people working for a contractor. That contractor was awarded a contract to erect the steel at a fixed price. There was no Clause, as far as I know, in the contract giving him the right to come back and renew or revise the terms of the contract. This is where I feel the Trade Union should come in, because the Trade Union should be able to go to that Contractor and tell him that he must have calculated for a certain margin of profit when he submitted his tender, unless he was so anxious to get the contract that he submitted an uneconomic tender, ridiculously below that which anybody in his right senses would have submitted.

In my opinion, Sir, a contractor who was realistic would, for any project which would extend over a period of time in its operation, normally add on a percentage for wage increases, and I do not think it would be competent for the Government to go and invite the contractor to submit a new charge because Government salaries and wages have been increased in the mean time and because his workmen are grumbling. I think it is directly a matter for the Union. If the Union were able to extract 5% or 10% increase in wages from the contractor, the contractor would have to grin and bear it, and the Government would be under no obligation to underwrite that. I still feel that any competent contractor would normally have made provision in a contract extending over such a period to bear any possible increases in wages. That is something which is done, I understand, by the gentleman who goes up to represent the British West Indies Sugar Producers' Association when they are discussing the negotiated price of sugar in Great Britain under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. They always inform the British Ministry of Food and the Sugar Brokers that they have put in a certain amount for possible increases in wages in agriculture, and this is the kind of percentage write-up which a contractor who is business-like would normally put in his tender, unless he was cheese-paring on his estimate in order to take away the tender from somebody else who probably had a better business sense than he himself possessed; so this is the enigma with which the hon. senior member for St. Peter is confronting the Minister of Finance.

I am prepared to make a categorical statement on this. We are not un sympathetic with the workmen who have to work on the Hospital and other projects like that when workmen in the Government working alongside of them are getting better wages now. Let me give an illustration. Some workers get about 58 cents an hour, and some of them get 64 cents an hour. The contractors would pay a foreman 81 cents an hour when a foreman from the Public Works working next door to him on the hospital project is only getting 79 cents an hour, which is probably 3 1/2% more than the Government employees are getting; so very often we find that private contractors can pay a better salary or wage than Government. In some cases they are paying wages which are equivalent. In this case the workers have a legitimate grouse, but it is a matter which the Trade Union should take up and try to get some increase.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying what Government policy is, but as Minister of Finance I am not going to invite any contractor out of the blue to submit a new estimate so that Government could make sure that the workmen are paid more. I feel that the organisations which substantially represent the workers in the particular industry are the people who are most competent to deal with this matter.

The hon. senior member for the City asked a question. I do not know why he likes to ask me a question like that, but since the question of quarrying has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, I would inform the hon. member that I am aware of a very disturbing situation in which Bagatelle Quarry is, in my opinion, illegally occupied by a firm which includes persons who are not nationals of this country. They have been in occupation of this quarry from the time it was vacated by the Port Contractors, Messrs. Richard Costain, from whom I understand they purchased some equipment which the Government was advised it would not be economical to operate and therefore the Government declined to buy this equipment. The Government to which I am referring is not the present Government.

When we discovered that these people were in occupation of this quarry and indeed had been awarded Government contracts by the Central Tenders Board, and it was felt by some representatives - I think the question had been raised in here - that this operated as a hardship against the small quarry owners and lorry operators, we instituted an inquiry which is not yet complete. The extent to which we have investigated has disclosed that the occupiers - if you like to call them trespassers, it is all right with me - of the quarry were told by a former member of Government to go ahead and quarry stones.
1.15 p.m.

That is what the director informed the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and I had it checked.

As far as I am concerned, this is the way I see it. Anyone who goes into a man's property and takes away any of his products, the person who does that is like a man who entered not by the back door, not by the front door but through the window. I am saying that seriously. I think it very reprehensible myself that any responsible organisation should enter on anybody else's land and take away their products from that land, whether they be yams, potatoes or whatever they are, and then sell them back to the person who owned the land. That is the actual situation. It has been asked whether Government has been paid. Government has not been paid one cent for any stones which has been taken from the Bagatelle property. It is just like carrying away that man's bedding, his goods, his clothing, his ox, his ass and everything growing on his land. As I have said, when they say that somebody else who previously occupied the house told them to do so, that is no excuse at all.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I informed members of the Cabinet that I thought the Attorney General should take legal proceedings against those people because I think it is a very serious matter. I am not saying that I am glad the hon. member has raised the question, but I am not sorry that he has raised it at all. When I was sick in hospital in England, I lay on my bed and read the statement made by former Ministers of this Government. It is my duty to tell the people of the ways in which the last Government operated. There is a member here who was a Minister in the last Government and I challenge him to get up and say if what I have said is not true. Ask the Director of Quarry Products Limited whether the excuse which he gave was not that a Minister told him that it was all right; to go ahead and quarry the stones and sell them to Government but not to tell them that the Minister gave him permission.

A contract should have been awarded to the people. Quite apart, the Government is buying its own stones. I also understand that in another part of the Island the stone is being crushed by a stone-crushing machine owned by the Government and that material is sold to the Government as well, and it is well within the knowledge of certain Government officials. That kind of thing cannot continue in this Government because we will not have taxpayers paying for their own products. It is ridiculous.

Sir, I should say that they made an offer to pay back for the stone which they sold to the Government but I am not putting up with that until we have got a legal opinion. The Attorney General will be back here in a few days and I will speak to him about the matter and give the House a further answer when I get the opinion from him. I hope that answers the question. This Government does not have anything to conceal. We have this matter under investigation and we are only waiting for legal opinion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not want the Hon. Premier to make a categorical statement because unless you are speaking on a factual matter, I do not pay much attention to categorical statements. My position so far as the Union is concerned is this. I am immodest enough to say that there is nobody who can teach me how to present the Union's case; therefore, I do not have to go to ask anybody how to present a case. We know how to present a case and we know what in the final analysis we should do. Therefore, I make absolutely no apology for making this statement. So far as the contract is concerned for which a Fair Wages Clause should be inserted, there are Fair Wages Clauses in labour contracts in Barbados. I am not going to get involved in the other aspects with regard to the quarry business because I have not got that information. I am much too busy to get that information. I represent workers: and in so far as anything affects workers, I am going to raise my voice. As I have said earlier, there is nobody in Barbados who can come to me, or has come to me, and asked me to get a contract for them because I do not go in for that sort of business. Nobody can pay me any money or give me anything; nobody has ever given me any free living for doing that sort of business for them. I do not get anything out of anybody in Barbados. There is no contractor hauling stones, giving away stones, paying back for stones, holding back stones or anything of the sort who has given me anything. I am not in any stone business.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that this question has been raised with the past Government about the arrangement made for giving back pay to these workers. We asked how were they going to treat the rock-blasters. We asked that question because they were part of the Government's road construction programme although they were working under contract with a contractor. They were doing something for which the Government was paying. They were not paid by the Government but the Government paid for doing the job by contract. I have heard that the Department of Highways and Transport knows what the rock-blasters get for a wage. All I say is this. If you are paying a man $1.44 per cubic yard and you find that rate was made prior to rates which you are paying now, there is nothing wrong in agreeing that that rate should be reviewed. I told the Hon. Premier that.

So far as asking the Hon. Premier to invite anybody, the Premier is like any other employer. No employer invites you to come for money. No employer has ever told me to come in now for money. I am not asking the Government to invite the contractors to come in. I am pointing out that the issue as a consequence of this Resolution is that there are other people working, not directly for the Government but working with people who have a contract for the Government and, therefore, in those instances there should be a review for those people.
1.25 p.m.

You did not give everybody at the Deep Water Harbour; you did not give the divers. The people who worked down there had consequential changes because that was written in the contract. If that is not written in the contract, a Fair Wages Clause must be presumed to exist in any contract, and the fact remains that you should review a situation like that at any time in the light of these circumstances. I have raised that matter because if the Union has to raise it with the Director of Highways and Transport or the Ministry concerned, the Premier need not have any fear. The independent Trade Union has no fear; I would oppose the Government or private employer so far as the representation of the case is concerned. This is nothing to do with the Union as such; it is something which has some bearing on the Government policy because in the final analysis it is for the Government to pay out the money. If the Government feels that these are fair and just cases, well then, they should deal with them accordingly. It is not only a question of the Central Government but also Local Government. We have the Northern District Council and the Southern District Council, and when certain demands are made on them they will either accede to them or do the jobs themselves.

If we make certain demands for scavengers and the Councils say "No", well then, they will have to get somebody to do the job. I have seen in one of the newspapers that the Premier and his Party have been asked to join an Association. We know that you will soon have to come with the Trade Union money and pull somebody out of jail. As soon as you see banknotes becoming too high *(ASIDES)* the Queen cannot take any Birthday parade because they will have the Queen choking. *(Laughter)*. We have a Trade Union and we can see where the money is being spent; it is not spent in any house which I have built. I see a lot going up around me.

I do not accept any categorical statement on something which you have not reviewed. It is a question that, in the light of these circumstances, it would be reasonable to bring this matter before the proper authorities because the workers are poor men. Rockblasters are those who do the ordinary job and with whom anybody would be in sympathy.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this debate has been going on for sometime and there were some remarks made by the Premier which I could not sit and allow to go unnoticed. As to the contract for the erection of the General Hospital, if that contract was handled by a firm overseas or by an engineer appointed by the Government Department, it would have been an entirely different matter. The steel bought in the United Kingdom from private contractors has been delivered here within one year. We were given $2 million by the British taxpayers; we could have bought that steel cheaper on the Continent and have it delivered probably within six months. However, if the United Kingdom gave you

over $2 million towards the cost of the erection of the Hospital, the only other decent thing you should do would be to buy the steel from them so that the same taxpayers could earn some money.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Is the hon. member seriously saying that they could have got the steel cheaper for the erection of the Hospital? I should like to say that the working-class people in Great Britain as in America are bitterly opposed to the people of whom the hon. member is making so much. The two million dollars was given under Colonial Development and Welfare and that money was granted for the Hospital from 1949, as far back as that, when the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation wanted to erect the Hospital at Waterford. Because the C.D.W. had accumulated funds for Barbados, is the hon. member saying that that was Government's reason for buying steel in Great Britain at a higher cost than that at which they could get the steel from outside? If they were giving us the Hospital then I would say "Yes".

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there must be something sensational in the newspaper headlines, even if you have to retract it later on. It is not correct to say that this was from 1947; a direction was given when it was decided to change the present system and we asked the Colonial Office to give a further sum on the basis of building a new hospital.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I said that it was from 1949. Is the hon. member saying that the C.D.W. Organization did not offer the Government from 1949 money to the tune of $860,000 or thereabout? I said that my recollection is from 1949, not 1947, and furthermore, the hon. senior member for the City can tell the hon. junior member for St. George whether this is true or not. I informed the Secretary of State for the Colonies two weeks ago that as far as we in Barbados are concerned, we are not having them talk down to us like Primer standard children; and if they are talking about the little window-dressing which they give to Barbados, none of it was of any benefit or made any impact on the country at all. I told the Secretary of State for the Colonies when I was leaving the Conference room that he could take back every damned cent of the window dressings in Barbados. As to this pussy-footing Government which they have had which was always talking about the Colonial Office doing this and that, I want to say that I have heard the Chief Ministers of Montserrat, Antigua and St. Kitts tell them exactly where they got off. The money which they have given to Barbados is blood money which they have taken out of Barbados over a period of three hundred years. *(Cheers from the Gallery)*

1.35 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: The question of the last Government and about blood money is another matter. I could not agree with him more, and before he began to run for Parliament, that was the trend of public platforms. There is nothing new in that statement at all. The question of throwing back in little pennies and calling them Development and Welfare is something that has been going on long before any of us were sent to Parliament. That is what the British Government gave to almost every colony and it will continue to the end of time. In 1949 they gave an amount of money for revamping the existing hospital, and part of that money was used in building the new T.B. block until the last pussy-footing Government, as the member said, with the Treasury broke, decided it was not good enough and that we could not make a really efficient job of the old hospital by a revamp. Nowhere in the West Indies is there a building to compare with what is going up for the new hospital which has ten times the floor area of the Ministerial Buildings. I dare any Government of Barbados to venture a project like that and a project like the Harbour.

Mr. Chairman, it is all right to talk big, but it is a question of what you are doing in and for your country. What I said at the time was that the grant given by the British Government for the revamping of the old hospital was not good enough, and I had the last word in the decision of that $6 million project. I dare you to add to it and I dare you to embellish it; and if you live one million years that new hospital will stand. Six months have passed and you can lay claim to nothing. You have not got an idea, and you talk about the Treasury being bankrupt because you are bankrupt of ideas in taking the country forward. Time alone and the masses will tell you this.

It is dishonest to say that there is something wrong with the contractors not paying the existing wages paid by the Government to Public Works employees, and if you ask me if a contractor.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to take up the hon. member on two things. I asked him if he was serious in saying that they could have got steel cheaper, and because the British Government through C.D. & W. gave them $2 million that they had some conscience. How long has he a conscience? That is only by the by. Is he saying that they had to give the contract as a matter of conscience to the British Steel Industry? That is the most wicked and corrupt thing I have ever heard. I said nothing about the contract being awarded to people at the hospital based on the wages which the Government was paying at the Hospital. I quoted figures to show that within my knowledge the people who were erecting the steel were actually paying better wages, and I was dealing on an intellectual level with the arguments advanced intellectually by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. If the hon. junior member for St. George does not understand, that is his own deficiency, not mine.

Mr. MILLER: There is nothing that could fall from the lips of the hon. member which I would fail to understand, but this is a bit of political dishonesty. You said that they could discuss the matter with the hon. senior member for St. Peter and that they were paying better wages. You know that is not true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member to withdraw that. He says it is not true. Will the hon. member quote the figures I quoted? If he cannot quote them, I would ask him to withdraw his remarks. Dealing with the question of buying steel cheaper from sources outside Great Britain, everybody knows that the Hospital was held up because from the time the contract for the steel was awarded, it was something like 2 1/2 years longer. I do not have the dates, but he knows it is not true to say that the steel arrived within a year of its being ordered, or it was only a year ago, and I say it is downright fraud of the taxpayers of Barbados to go and buy steel in Great Britain when you could have got steel outside cheaper than that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that at all, but that is the sort of thing you hear in here. I said that they bought steel through the British Crown Agents, but we could have got a better delivery of our steel if it were bought directly by the contractors. We knew at the time of the fluctuation of steel moving in the market and that we could have bought that steel probably cheaper on the Continent than through the Crown Agents, but as I said, it was for us to decide whether or not we could buy it in England. Elementary decency would tell you that if the taxpayers gave you $2 million — whether you wanted to throw it back at them and prove you did not need them anymore, it was a matter for the Government; but if the taxpayers in the United Kingdom gave you that amount of money, that is what any Government in any part of the world would have done. If the earners in England who would probably be producing some of this steel were making a contribution through their taxes to a territory like Barbados, the least we could do was to buy steel from them. If the steel was ordered through private contractors, we could have got a better delivery of the steel. Twist that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, is the hon. member seriously telling the members assembled around this Table, quite apart from anybody who may have heard — and I am not drawing Your Honour's attention to strangers by the Rules of the House — that I am twisting something when I say that he said here today within the last fifteen minutes, and the Reporter is taking it down — I know that his colleague from the "*Beacon*" comes here and filches the records of the House, but I am directing the Speaker to

deal with that; so I hope he does not get it changed — and even repeated it just now that they knew they could have got steel cheaper on the Continent, but their consciences would not allow them because the British taxpayers had given them $2 million? Is he saying seriously that he did not say that? Is he saying that he was talking about the Crown Agents when nothing about the Crown Agents was mentioned before at all?

Mr. MILLER: Why is it necessary to mention the Crown Agents when the steel being used in the construction of the Hospital was bought from the Crown Agents? Mr. Chairman, the steel is bought through the Crown Agents, and these are instructions given to Departments that wherever possible and convenient they should buy through the Crown Agents. If the contractors who were handling the construction work of the steel took two or three years after the agreement was made, it would have to be based on existing wages, and no Government could expect a contractor to put up wages by 100% anticipating an increase in wages by Government three or four years later. If the Government is satisfied that for two or three years there is a contract for so many workers to operate in the steel construction of the hospital, and you have given workers working in the same yard on the same hospital project side by side with the Public Works employees an increase, how can you ask the contractor to absorb this? There is a reason for everything you say and do, and it is impossible to ask this. What you are insinuating is that the Union should go and fight with the contractor. Are you telling me that because three years later you have increased the wages of workers who work next to the contractor's men, and because there is no written agreement, nothing should happen? The contract was made at a period when wages were at a fixed level. You have changed the wage level, and obviously it is only fair for Government to consider what they should do to make good to the workers who are working for this contractor.

Mr. Chairman, the other point of the argument is about Bagatelle Quarry. This sort of dishonesty you hear in here is what we are getting accustomed to. We take it and wait for the change. When Costain's was folding up on the Harbour, all the equipment was offered in priority to Government.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to sit here and hear anybody of a type like the hon. junior member for St. George get up and talk about that type of dishonesty. I made a categorical statement, and that statement is to this effect: that the people who now work Bagatelle Quarry have no legal right to be there at all; that they have been selling stone to Local Government Authorities and to the Central Government; and that the stone and the quarry both belong to the public of Barbados, held in trust for the public of Barbados under the Executive Committee Act by the Executive Committee of this Island.
1.45 p.m.

I also said that this Government carried out an investigation when they applied for a lease and asked them how they got in possession of this quarry and that the Hon. Minister of Communications and his Permanent Secretary were told — and they held the gentlemen downstairs until they came and informed me — by one of the Directors of the company that a Minister of the former Government told them that they could occupy the quarry and quarry stone but do not tell anybody that he gave them permission. If the hon. member aggravates me, I will start calling names and members too. Do not let him aggravate me on this matter now. That went on from the time Messrs. Costain gave up the quarry.

We have told them that it is no excuse for you to go into a man's house and steal his goods by saying that some former occupier of the premises told you to go ahead and steal the things. The Ex-Minister of Social Services is saying that that statement is a type of dishonesty, but I am saying that the dishonesty is in the hands of the former Government. I am only drawing an illustration to show the way in which they operated and there are other members around this table who had first-hand knowledge of the consideration although the consideration did not pass to the Treasury of this Island. If the hon. member aggravates me, I would tell him a lot more.

Mr. MILLER: If this is aggravation, I will press until the public of this Island throws him out of this Chamber. Aggravate you? You can call the Pope and when I say the Pope, I do not mean the Pope of Rome. You can call J. C. I repeat, it is dishonesty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To whom is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking to the Chair. Everybody knows that the member lacks miserably in character. He gave a speech in London in which he said that before a cent can be removed from the Treasury of this Island it has to pass both Houses of the Legislature.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: On what is he rising?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. Let the hon. member sit down. Are you going to let him get on like a jackass?

Mr. MILLER: I do not even want to call him a jackass.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said at the conference in London that as far as the law in Barbados is concerned, before any money is spent from the Treasury, it has to pass both Houses of the Legislature. There is no point in quoting law. That is the legal position but there is nothing to prevent you from breaking the law. And it is broken everyday by Ministers. That is why we have enquiries. (Mr. MILLER: Well, have an enquiry.) I will have a Commission of Enquiry and he is not going to like the results. What I said at the Conference had nothing to do with the practices of the last Government.

Mr. MILLER: Well, have an enquiry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member address the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to speak on the Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: What am I replying to? I am replying to what has been said in the debates on this matter.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George has said that it is dishonesty. This is in the files; it is not verbally recorded; I did not take the chance of a verbal conversation; I have it in black and white so that I can produce it to this Honourable House or any enquiry. I have it in writing where the operators of the quarry which was once operated by Messrs. Richard Costain stated in writing that the former Minister of Communications and Works...(Mr. MILLER: Call his name!) Everybody in the House knows who he was.....I have it in the records where a Director of Quarry Products said that he was instructed by Mr. Mapp, a former Minister, to operate the quarry and not to say anything about it until after the elections.

Mr. MILLER: Is the Hon. Minister saying that that is in the files which he has there? (A VOICE: He never said that.). The Minister said he has it in black and white.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I rise on a point of order. If the hon. junior member for St. George seems to think that I am one of the members of this House whom he can bully or bulldoze, I would not use any privilege of this Honourable House to be bullied by anybody. Nothing like the hon. member can bully me in this House or anywhere else. I know him too well and he knows that. This is a matter of life and death and that can come any time.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know what the hon. member means by "life and death" or by "bullying".

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I mean just that.

Mr. MILLER: The Hon. Minister said he has it in black and white. I want to know whether he has it in his files.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise again on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. After the Hon. Minister came upstairs and told me what the Director of Barbados Quarry Products told him, I told the Minister not to let him leave the building but to go back downstairs and have it recorded. The Hon. Minister said that it is on the files and the full conversation can be had. Any time the Minister wants to liquidate the former Minister, he can do so.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question and the hon. member has not yet answered it. It is always based on a question of integrity. He went all around saying that he has somebody to send to prison. He went around saying to the people that if he gets in, he would go to prison and if he does not get in, he would go to prison. I ask the Hon. Minister to make a statement. All this type of appeal to the gallery we are accustomed to. All that has been said is just only the usual Tuesday headline; just something sensational and then you find that you fall down badly because of it. You surrender your manhood; but the people have a way of answering this and the answer will only be a question of time.

When the work was completed on the Deep Water Harbour, all this equipment was handed over to Government. That is what I know. The Director of Public Works was instructed to examine the equipment which was handed over by Messrs. Costain Limited and it included the equipment at Bagatelle.
1.55 p.m.

The Director of Public Works told us that there was a crushing plant at the Lazaretto and he did not think it necessary to advise the Government to buy the equipment. In the first place, the equipment which was operating at Bagatelle was second-hand equipment. The Government did not think it advisable to buy that equipment because there was no immediate need for it. A private firm arranged with and purchased that equipment from Messrs. Costain and applied to Government to operate the quarry. Royalties were agreed on; they have failed to collect it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I will call the hon. member an abysmal liar. If Quarry Products Limited.....

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement. The Rules of the House say that I should get up and ask that that statement be withdrawn.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I will go on.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the Premier's point of order.

Mr. MILLER: I am asking for a withdrawal of those remarks. The Hon. Premier must withdraw them.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I withdraw those remarks, I would say that he is Freddie Miller.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member must withdraw those remarks. He said that I am an abysmal liar.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, will you ask the hon. member to sit down?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. junior member for St. George take his seat?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member had better sit down because I will ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. junior member for St. George wants the hon. Premier to withdraw the remarks, he will take his seat.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will withdraw those words and I will say that he is Freddie Miller.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are not the Speaker; you had better sit down.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I rose on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is not the Speaker; he can only interrupt on a point of privilege.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am addressing the Chair on a point of order and the hon. member has to take his seat. I rose on a point of order for the benefit of this Committee. The Hon. Premier said that if he had to withdraw the words "abysmal liar" he would use the words "Freddie Miller". Sir, it is a breach of the Rules of this House to call an hon. member by his name.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Peter should realise that he is not now the paid lackey of the Barbados Labour Party; he is no longer Speaker; he is merely another member of this House and he has no right to dictate to the Chair. The sooner he realises this, the better it will be for him and he will recognise his place in this Chamber.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The hon. member has described me as a paid lackey of the Barbados Labour Party. If the hon. member can make no better description of me than that, if he thinks that he can refer to people like that, I am surprised to hear such words coming from the Premier whom I have never offended.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is what you think.

At this stage, it now being 2.p.m. of the clock, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.
2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The first Question ready to be dealt with is Question No. 12 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

ERECTION OF BRIDGE OVER FRIZERS RIVER

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government in view of the drop in the Highway leading over the Frizers River, consider the advisability of building a bridge for the convenience of the travelling public?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:

"As it is proposed to extend the Soil Conservation Scheme to an area including the Frizers River, Government does not consider it advisable at this stage to build a bridge over this River. The fracture in the concrete ford does not prevent its present use by either pedestrians or vehicles."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his reply; however, I would still like to know

if the Government considers the advisability of doing something whereby the position would be made easier for the travelling public in that area.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you ask the hon. member to repeat his question? I did not hear him quite well.

Mr. COWARD: I said that I would be glad if the Government would find it convenient to do something in order to help the travelling public in that area. Those who have to walk along the bridge when it has water during the rainy season cannot pass over it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member did not make himself quite clear in his first question. I thought that he meant that the bridge was not usable either for pedestrians or vehicular traffic. However, I will have an investigation made into what is causing the water to remain on the bridge whereby there is created a nuisance to pedestrians or traffic using that bridge.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. COWARD: I thank the Hon. Minister very much for his explanation and hope that very soon he will find it possible to do something in that area to help traffic.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Oral Reply is to Parliamentary Question No. 29/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the fact that there is no playing field in the parish of St. Joseph?

2. In view of the importance of out door sports to the youth, will Government seek to secure a plot of land from Lammings Plantation or any other suitable place for the purpose of a playing field?

3. If the answer is in the negative will Government say why?"

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:

"Yes, Sir. The provision of playing fields in those areas where the greatest need for such amenities appears will be considered in the allocation of any funds which may be made available for projects of this nature in the new Development Plan."

Mr. COWARD: I thank the Hon. Minister very much for his answer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Oral Reply is to Question No. 8/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:-

Will the Government consider favourably and establish a branch of the Unemployment Exchange in Speightstown in St. Peter to facilitate the workers in the Northern parishes of the Island?"

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour who is not now in his place, I rise to give the following Reply:

"There are at present 286 persons from the parishes of St. Peter, St. Lucy and St. Andrew registered with the Employment Exchange. Only seven vacancies were notified by employers in 1961, and so far in 1962, eleven vacancies, ten of which were for cane cutters, were reported. In the circumstances the Government does not consider there is need of a branch of the Employment Exchange to serve St. Peter or the Leeward parishes generally".

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, is the Minister aware that had there been facilities existing for workers in these parishes to register more easily than having to journey to Bridgetown to do their registration, there would have been more applications for such help?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think that what the hon. member must realise is that the Ministry of Labour is not really unsympathetic to the request as such, but has been advised by the Labour Department that from the point of view of convenience only, these people prefer to come to town as they do for other similar purposes, and because of that the Ministry of Labour has not as yet considered the possibility of establishing a branch of the Exchange in Speightstown.

Mr. HUSBANDS: With due regard to that answer, is the Minister aware that actually complaints have reached responsible people in that area that workers would appreciate such a facility for reasons other than given by me? Is the Minister aware that complaints are actually lodged with responsible persons in these areas that the journey into Bridgetown very often prevents them from registering at the Department in Bridgetown at a cost of time, bus fare, and the possible loss, in certain instances, of a day's work?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Ministry of Trade is not personally aware of that, neither however is it hostile to further investigation into the matter. If the hon. member would undertake to set out, perhaps in greater detail, the points which he has just raised in supplementaries, I can give him the assurance that the Ministry concerned will go into the matter more deeply.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I appreciate the Minister's reply, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Oral Reply is to Parliamentary Question No. 15/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government take steps to cause electricity to be made available to each and every home in the parish of St. John?"

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour who is not now in his place, I rise to make the following reply:-

"The Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour has begun discussions with the Company with a view to arriving at some satisfactory arrangements for the extension of electricity services in those areas which are not presently supplied."

Mr. YEARWOOD: I thank the Hon. Minister for his reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Oral Reply is to Parliamentary Question No. 16 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is the Minister aware of the expense that several householders in the parish of St. Thomas have undergone in wiring their homes with the expectation of getting electricity therein?

2. If the answer is "yes", will Government consider implementing immediately a scheme to cause Electricity to be placed at the disposal of residents in the parish of St. Thomas?"

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, again on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour I rise to make the following Reply:-

"1. The Minister is aware that persons residing in certain areas of the Island, including the parish of St. Thomas, have incurred expense in wiring their houses, but have been unable as yet to obtain a supply of electricity.

2. The extension of electricity service in any area is governed by the provisions of the Public Utilities Act, 1951. This provides however for such extension only if in the opinion of the Public Utilities Board the extension would result in sufficient business to justify the construction and maintenance of such extension.

3. The Ministry of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour has begun discussions with the Company with a view to arriving at some satisfactory arrangements for the extension of electricity services in those areas which are not presently supplied."
2.45 p.m.

WATER SUPPLY FOR AIRY HILL TENANTRY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next reply is to the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph — Question No. 36 — on 10th April, 1962.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the fact that in the district known as Airy Hill Tenantry, St. Joseph, where fifteen (15) peasant families live, there is no water supply, and that residents here have to journey about 400 yards to Airy Hill main road for water?

2. In view of the above, will Government consider the advisability of laying at least a four inch main, and run water into the area?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government say why?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to Question No. 36, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is as follows:-

Government is aware that there is no water supply in Airy Hill Tenantry, St. Joseph.

Consideration will be given to the laying of a water main in the Airy Hill Tenantry when the programme of work for the current financial year is being drawn up.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the Hon. Minister very much for his reply and I hope that the Government will soon take steps to remedy the situation.

SERVICES RENDERED BY CHOIR FOR ANIMATION OF THE SICK

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next is a reply to the question asked on 20th February, 1962 — Question No. 22/1962 — by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

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?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 22/1962, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on 20th February, 1962, is as follows:-

Yes.

The Government has given consideration to the question of assistance to the Choir for the Animation of the Sick and Incapacitated with the transportation expenses incurred in rendering musical programmes at Infirmaries and other Institutions for the Sick and infirm but regrets that it does not see its way in the light of the present financial position of the Island to grant financial assistance from Government funds towards this venture.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will have to thank the Hon. Minister for his reply. I really cannot expect something out of nothing; therefore, if there is no money, I will have to be satisfied.

CONDITIONS AT ST. ELIZABETH DISTRICT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next reply is to Question No. 28/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, on 6th March, 1962.

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the existing conditions at the St. Elizabeth district owing to the condition of one school which is out of use and the other school which has to serve the Boys for half of each school day and the Girls the other half?

2. Does Government consider these conditions as satisfactory?

3. If the answer to questions 1 and 2 are in the affirmative, will Government in view of the importance of education to the masses seek to relieve these conditions with as little delay as possible?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer to No. 1, is "Yes, Sir", and to No. 2, "No, Sir".

The answer to No. 3, is that the situation is a temporary one. The Ministry is investigating how best to relieve the situation on a permanent basis as soon as possible. The problem is to find suitable accommodation for one of the schools as a temporary measure, although it appears that the best solution to the problem is the construction of one large school to accommodate both boys and girls.

Mr. COWARD: I will have to thank the Hon. Minister of Education very much for his answer. I will be very glad if something can be done about it with as little delay as possible.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will just like to say this to the hon. member. There are two points about the matter. In the first place, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problem there involves the question of the acquisition of land which is currently being negotiated.

The second thing is that the Ministry had hoped, even in the time of my predecessor, to find temporary accommodation for one of the two schools. It was proposed to rent a house in the district for that purpose, but when the Public Works Department inspected the building which was proposed to be rented for the temporary housing of one of the schools, it was discovered that the fabric of the building was not strong enough. The floor could not bear the weight of a large number of children on it: so that became the problem.

The third thing I would like to say is this. As the hon. member is aware, it is not an easy thing to find flat land in

St. Joseph; and for the erection of a school in that area, we should need not only sufficient land for the building itself, but obviously some for a playing field as well.

The fourth point which I would like to tell the hon. member is that we have put in the Development Plan which is soon to be promulgated a certain amount of money for the acquisition of land for the purpose of erecting a St. Elizabeth School and, lastly, I think the hon. member should know that this matter is somewhat complicated by the fact that the authorities of the Anglican Church — the Rector and the Bishop — are involved in this whole measure of school building because one school building is currently used as a chapel.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you turn to Questions for oral replies, you will see Question No. 47, purported to be given notice of under my name. You will remember on the last occasion when this House met, the hon. member asked me if I wanted a similar question put as that by another member and I told him that inasmuch as I received certain information, I had intended to withhold that question temporarily. Yet, that question which I did not eventually put appears on this Order Paper.
2.55 p.m.

Further to that, one of the Dailies of this island, the *Barbados Advocate*, in one of its issues of last week, published this question when I did not ask it. No such thing as published is true. I asked that the question be temporarily withdrawn because I had intended to ask another question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will be done as the hon. member desires. The consideration of that question concludes matters relating to Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION *re* PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN ST. JOHN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business. On the last occasion the House was debating a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. John relative to the public transportation service in that parish. The hon. member was replying when Government Business was resumed. If the hon. member desires to continue his reply, he may do so.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, beginning from where I left off on the last occasion, I realise that I had heard a number of false accusations made by members on the other side of the House towards me and I realise that in the interest of the public I will have to make it known that those accusations were false. On the 29th March when I first introduced this Resolution, I strictly emphasised that the route about which hon. members held me up last week, that is Route 7, was the very best one which is now being operated in St. John. I emphasised that and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph took it very dishonestly at length and said that I was trying to infer.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Is the hon. member referring to me as being dishonest? I ask that that remark be withdrawn.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that could only be a dishonest action.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have referred to the hon. member accusing me of being dishonest, and I ask that that word "dishonest" be withdrawn.

Mr. YEARWOOD: I am saying that the statement which the hon. member used against me was very dishonest.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has changed his words but he has not withdrawn that word "dishonest". Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you going to ask the hon. member to withdraw that word?

Mr. YEARWOOD: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said repeatedly.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. If an hon. member is out of order or if he accuses another hon. member of being dishonest, then it is the duty of the Chair to call on that hon. member to withdraw the remarks. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will have to rule. If you do not rule, then the business will be finished. You have heard the hon. member's words.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to withdraw the word "dishonest" I will withdraw it, but I am saying this. The hon. member has taken the opposite direction against what I really brought into this House; he has twisted it to his own liking for his own particular purpose.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. John is now accusing me of twisting something. You will remember, Sir, that I said I was not in the House at the time when the hon. member introduced the Resolution and therefore I do not know what he has said. If I have twisted it in my way, he is accusing me of knowing what he said; but, following the Resolution, I have not twisted anything.

Mr. YEARWOOD: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been in this Chamber for quite a long time with his mouth pinned down until this Government took over. He now feels that it is his time to get up at every meeting and say something whether he knows anything about it or not. He styles himself as the Premier of St. Joseph and therefore he has to give something to the people of St. Joseph to read. That being so, he takes it upon himself to say things about which he knows absolutely nothing. On the last occasion he said that he had heard this and that, and how can he say that he has heard this and that without trying to find out whether he has heard something which is truthful or not?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. The hon. member says that I did not investigate anything but I have made an investigation. There is the name of Jasper Higginson who, I think, works at the Public Works Department; and there is a Mr. Clarke who went around asking people if they were satisfied with this thing. I think Mr. Clarke has taken over a gasolene station. I am asking the hon. member if the three of them did not go around the place in a motor car with a Petition asking people to sign it. The hon. member says that I have not investigated anything. Well, I have called names now.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member is saying that he did investigate.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Well, I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he investigated in that particular nature, because he must have investigated with the wrong people, people who know absolutely nothing about the Resolution, like the hon. member. When I first started to speak on this Resolution, Sir, I made it perfectly clear that owing to competition by myself on the route on which I now live, that is Route 7, that route in St. John is the very best operated route, but each of the three hon. members who spoke stated untruthfully that I was trying to do something with the lady who really operates the route. I also said that I hoped that the other routes, the one owned by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the other owned by Mr. Lucas would come up to a standard of the service that operated in my section of St. John.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you read what those three hon. members said last Tuesday, you would have to believe what they said because I operate on that route too. What is worse, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that since I was returned, I gave myself a pat on the back for being returned in the parish of St. John owing to the bad transportation when I went there, and I want hon. members to realise that it is through good transportation in St. John that I am going to remain there. I would have absolutely nothing to say about

the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, because I realise that he was defending himself when he got up and said those untruthful things that he said.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I object to what the hon. junior member for St. John is saying about defending myself and about untruths, because I said here that the member who brought this Resolution should have found out more about it before he brought it here. He said here today that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not investigate things before he brought them here, yet he is speaking on things which he has not investigated at all. He stated in his Resolution that the Martins Bay service was inadequate, yet he cannot prove to this House that at any time for the year a Martins Bay bus carried twelve passengers from Martins Bay to Bridgetown. A bus making four trips to Martins Bay could not bring 25 passengers for the four trips; yet the hon. member is saying that the service to Martins Bay is inadequate. If the hon. junior member for St. John who has brought this complaint here.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has made his point.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am making a point of explanation and asking the hon. member to withdraw the word "untruths". I am saying, Sir, that because the hon. member sees his way after theatre to carry one passenger to Martins Bay, it does not mean that a bus service can run to Martins Bay with one passenger when you have to pay staff. He has to pay nobody but himself.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have at no time worked on the route on which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph operates, but it is through the complaints which I have received from the electors on his route that I have brought this Resolution to this House. From my investigations into that particular route, I have discovered that there are eighty-eight houses between Glenburnie and Foster Hall which have absolutely no bus service at all.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I think I mentioned on the last occasion that the Director of Highways and Transport called on the concessionaire, which is myself, to put in a trial service, but to no avail at all. A bus was run about three times a week and no passengers drove in it; therefore I feel that the hon. member should investigate these things before coming to this House with stupidness.

Mr. YEARWOOD: The hon. member should realise that it is only through my investigation that I have brought this Resolution here. I will go further and say that a bus goes to Foster Hall on Monday mornings at 7.30 and never returns until Saturday night at 7.30.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, can the hon. member say whether the bus had any passengers to carry back to Foster Hall? Should a bus be sent back empty to Foster Hall because it could be sent?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Those are some of my observations, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The people in Foster Hall are being charged 35¢ to be brought to Bridgetown, which as far as I know is high-class robbery.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, the people of Foster Hall are being charged 5¢ for that extra section to Martins Bay, then they pay from Martins Bay to Bridgetown.

Mr. YEARWOOD: If I remember correctly, the last scheduled price that was drawn up by the Department was that people pay 5¢ for every three miles or part thereof, and I am perfectly sure that from Foster Hall to Bridgetown could never bring 30¢, far more 35 cents.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, there again the hon. member is going in the wrong direction. He has stated that each section is three miles, which I, as a concessionaire, am saying is not so. A section under the hill is something different. I do not think that I should explain that, because the hon. member who is responsible for this Resolution should know that when the sections were laid out, there was no section to Foster Hall; therefore if Foster Hall was only half a mile or a quarter of a mile, it would become a section. The Route to which the hon. member is referring, 6A, runs from Bridgetown to Hothersal, and if you go two yards above there, it means five cents. I do not think I should teach the hon. member anything, because he has absolutely no right to waste the time of this House by bringing this stupidness.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I am not quarrelling with any person on this matter, and for the interest of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph I will read the Resolution.
3.15 p.m.

If they really understood the English language, they will understand what I have been asking Government to do and they should be looking into that question rather than getting up and talking all kinds of nonsense about me.

This is the Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker;

"WHEREAS the public transportation service in the parish of Saint John is irregular and inadequate;

"AND WHEREAS there is urgent need to remedy this situation;

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to issue directions through the appropriate channels to the private concessionaires plying in the said parish so as to ensure greater efficiency in the Routes under their respective controls."

That is the Resolution which I brought before the House and instead of hon. members debating that, I find that members have taken the privilege to say things of me and are trying to point me out as one who is vindictive against a concessionaire, when I indicated at the outset that the route which that person operated was the best run route in St. John.

What have I found in my investigations? From Martins Bay to Glenburnie and Foster Hall.....

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that the route operated by this lady is the best operated in the parish of St. John. Why did he put the police on that route?

Mr. YEARWOOD: Nevertheless, Sir, this is what I found out. There are twenty-six school children from Martins Bay, Glenburnie and Foster Hall who are not given a school bus at all. They are being brought to Clifton Hall and thrown out as you throw out wild pigs.

Mr. COWARD: I rise on a point of order. Let the hon. member tell you what he brought up and threw out by his pickup. If it were not possible to run a school bus as we do on Route 4, would it be possible to send a bus to pick up twenty-six children from Martins Bay to carry to and from there to Bridgetown? We bring these children by the passenger bus from Martins Bay and then turn them over to the school bus. They come by the passenger bus and then we turn them over at a reduced fare. The hon. member does not know that but comes in here and is wasting the time of the House with stupidness.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there was no need for better service in St. John, the people would not be complaining, nor would I be complaining to this House. That is my first point. I am also saying that it is purely vicious to take school children from Bridgetown and bring them to Clifton Hall which is not the end of the route and then they have to get home by other means.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph reminds me of one looking at everything as a joke. He does not understand that Martins Bay is the beginning of the bus route; therefore how can he expect the passengers from Martins Bay to fill

the bus when it has to come from there all the way to town? Martins Bay is the beginning of that route. If he gets only three people from there, it is his duty to go for them because it is the beginning of the route. But what the hon. member seems to think is that he should bring them only wherever it is payable to him. That is not what I want to see happening to the people of St. John. I am elected by them and I am making sure that they are given a proper service. When school children come up by the bus which is a passenger bus on evenings they have to pay full fare and that is ridiculous.

Mr. COWARD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am objecting to what the hon. member is saying. No school child pays the full fare on a bus. What the hon. member cannot understand is that if they travel by a passenger bus, well, then they have to pay the full fare; but if they are travelling by a school bus, they pay a school child's fare.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Sir, what I am dealing with is that school children have to ride on the passenger bus so as to get to and from school. I have said that when they travel on the passenger bus, they have to pay the full fare and they have to travel from Martins Bay up to Glenburnie, Foster Hall without having a school bus to travel on at all. That is the point which I am driving home to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. They have absolutely no school bus and what we want is to make sure that the Government issue directions whereby a school bus must come for those children.

I took up the matter with the concessionaires. I took it up with Mr. Lucas and he promised to do his best about it. As a matter of fact, I think he has recently acquired a new bus to put on his route to make it more efficient, but the hon. senior member for St. Joseph believes that because he is a parliamentarian I should skip that route. I have absolutely nothing to do with anyone man against the community. I want to make it perfectly clear that no matter who you are and you are bringing pressure on the people whom I represent, you have to ease your hand on it.

What I want the Government to make sure is that the bus concessionaires of St. John give a proper service and that is all I am asking in this Resolution.

Sir, I wanted to say a few words with respect to what the hon. senior member for St. Michael said on the last occasion, but I observe that he is not now in his place. Last week the hon. senior member for St. Michael spoke on this Resolution, but all he talked about was extending sympathy to one particular person and tried to make hon. members believe that I had a spite against that person. I wanted to tell him that I had more sympathy towards that individual than he has because he competes bitterly against her. He goes to her doorstep and breaks a job. However, the hon. member is not in here. I will only repeat that all this Resolution is asking is that the Government issue directions through the appropriate channels and do not be misled by the misleading statements made in this Chamber by hon. members last week.

The question that the Resolution so now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Honourables E. W. BARROW, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. CORBIN, WEEKES, LOWE, YEARWOOD, BATSON, BOXILL and Hon. J. C. TUDOR - 11.

NOES: Messrs. HUSBANDS, COWARD, HOLDER, SMITH and LYNCH - 5.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven hon. members voting "Aye" and five hon. members voting "No". I now declare that the "Ayes" have it.

RESOLUTION re REPORT ON FARM LABOUR PROGRAMME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:- To move the passing of a Resolution re the Report of the Committee appointed to report on the Farm Labour Programme in the United States.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the passing of this Resolution is being moved with the sole intention of debating something which has been current for many months among people in Barbados and outside of Barbados in respect of a subject of which they know absolutely nothing. The question of migration and migratory work in the United States would be of particular and special reference to Barbados. I do hope that hon. members have read this Report and this is done on the basis on which it should have been done by the Government. This Report was put in the hands of the Government in February, 1962 and it did not reach this House until April, 1962. It took two months before it reached here. The document was not a difficult one for the Government to consider and issue any statement which they would like to issue. This is a question of ventilating a very important public matter and that is not because I am one of the signatories to the Report.

I do not think that the majority of Barbadians are aware of the fact that the Farm Labour Programme in the United States of America is an unpopular programme from the point of view of the citizens of the United States of America. The United States citizens do not like the idea of labourers being brought into the United States to work. On one occasion Mr. Glasspole, Minister of Labour in Jamaica, had to make a special mission to Washington to woo the trade unions in the United States of America not to take too strong action against labour from the West Indies going to the United States of America. I say that so that hon. members of this House and members of the public will realise that this is not an aspect of the American life which is looked upon willingly by the citizens. I do not now mean politicians; but the average citizens of the United States of America feel that the American people should get down to the problem of paying so well for American work that there will be no necessity for bringing workers into the United States of America, unless there is an emergency, to do this work. The additional problem is that farm work, like picking cotton, cutting canes and working with vegetables, is not work which, with the impact of industrialisation in the United States of America, the American youths will want to do and there is a preference for people to work in factories and in towns and to engage in work which is more congenial to an industrial community.

For that reason, there has been this void and farm employers, being a very heavy political force in the United States of America, can use their influence on Parliament in order that they may be able to recruit workers in the United States of America to perform jobs which they could not get local labour to do. That being the case, there has been opened up an avenue for temporary West Indian workers generally. With that background, whatever complaint you may hear about migration, it has to be measured in the light of the type of work and the circumstances under which this work has to be done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will find in this Report that there are aspects of emigration which everyone must admit will be difficult. A man who is leaving here to work in the United States of America is not going to a job which is similar to a job in Barbados and the man's mind must be made up for that. As a member of that Mission, I say that I was asked by the Minister of Labour to go to the United States earlier this year. The report of the Mission gives all the details and, at this stage, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. C. B. Williams for the drafting of this Report and for the assistance which he gave generally in matters in connection with which he had to get all the statistical information which has now been given to hon. members. I raise this question today so as to save Barbadians and the Govern-

ment from more unnecessary and ignorant embarrassment by an ignorant Press at times, which publishes statements without a clear understanding of the technique, and the damage which it is doing.
3.35 p.m.

Now when you look at this statement, and I am not parading any migration scheme from Barbados as a panacea for all the ills, I doubt very much whether anybody could use one economic theory or one economic aspect of life to answer the multifarious problems with which Barbados has been landed with its endemic, low-living mentality and low standards of living which seem to generate throughout the community. It is with that view that I raise this question today to stop what is going to be of great harm to Barbados from the point of view of the large number of people which is looking for work and cannot find it.

When you look at the statistics of this scheme, Mr. Speaker, you will find, whether or not you like it, that it produces more money per head of the persons who work than some of the people who are employed here in Barbados. Those are some of the brutal facts of life. Some of them who go to the United States cannot earn a corresponding amount of money in Barbados, and you can go through the statistics and see what they have earned. If you go through the statistics, you will see that the number of Barbadians to Jamaicans has always been on that basis, and I would like the Barbados public to understand that the members of The Eight will have to form a Unit to talk to Jamaica, because after Independence Jamaica has already been promised by George Meaney, President of the American Federation of Labour, that he is going to see that President Kennedy allows Jamaicans to come into the United States without a quota system as if they were coming from independent places like the 21 Republics of Latin America; so you will see that apart from the Migration Scheme, they are giving them a more favourable outlook on Independence, and the Jamaicans would no longer be on the hundred quota system. Moreover, it takes an American about $32 to go from Miami to Kingston as compared with nearly four times as much to Barbados. Every time a Barbadian breaks a contract or goes without leave, it costs the employer that money because the employer is responsible for any man who goes to the United States of America and goes up to Brooklyn to look for a cousin and never comes back.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Barbadians should realise that if they want this temporary scheme, there is no point in advertising the scheme as though the American Government is bending over backwards to get West Indians to come there. Moreover, the American State Department, the American Labour Department and the American Agricultural Department are very stuffy, and they put up some very tough restrictions on the employees who want a quota to come there. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think Barbadians should realise that it is more difficult nowadays to get into the United States of America than to get into Heaven. No matter what you do, you can go to any Pentecostal Mission of God, get baptised next week, and if you die, you go to Heaven. On the other hand, if you have a cousin or an old uncle in the United States, you can write all the letters you care, you cannot get into the United States so easily. I say that quite seriously. You cannot get into the United States on the basis that your grandfather lived there.

Any certification to bring anyone into the United States is a strict one, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the problem of taking migratory labour is one in which the employers on the one hand have been hoping to get this labour, because it is steady labour. For example, if you have oranges to pick when they are ripe, it is easier to get migratory labour from outside the United States, because you have a labour force which is at your command, and it is easier to command that labour force. The American citizen can leave and go to another state and nobody can ask him anything about breaking a contract. A United States citizen does not break a labour contract by deciding to work in Florida and taking a bus and going to Alabama, New York or Connecticut, but a Barbadian worker does. Some complaints have been made here and in the Report we have answered these, and you will find that they are generally about food.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Barbadians at home complain about food. In a family of three or four brothers, one does not drink soup, one does not like cou-cou, one does not like fried fish and the other does not like fish boiled. Those who have been accustomed to army life know in an army of 800 men the kind of soup you get with dumplings, sweet potatoes and yams. When would you begin to make these dumplings to get them ready for 800 men? You would have to make them from last year, and when you put them in the pot they would be like bullets. Therefore you have to think in terms of cooking food which people can eat on a mass basis. Some people complain about rice. Rice is there every day, but I have heard people in Barbados say that if they do not get rice every day they do not feel they have eaten food. The American employers have investigated and found that if they do not cook rice, the workers say they want rice. Cou-cou is out of the question because you would have to get something like a concrete mixer if you wanted to cook it. When you go to America you have to fit in with their diet. There are West Indian cooks at these camps and Mr. Williams and I ate in the camps, because in Florida we were taken to the camps where the men get their meals, and from what I saw, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was provided for them and taken to where they cut canes in the sugar fields. There was a portable house in which they carried hot meals to the workers who were engaged in the cane fields, and as it was not convenient to give that kind of diet to those who worked in the citrus growing places, they were given sandwiches and milk to take along with them. The Report will give these things in detail.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been going to the United States of America every year since 1947. I have lived in American homes, and I can say quite frankly that I have an idea of the American way of eating. There is nothing unusual for an American to want a sandwich at what he calls his lunch time – it does not matter who he is – and have a heavy meal in the evening.
3.45 p.m.

I do not believe that they have grown accustomed to eating a sandwich during the midday. I am one of those persons who eat a heavy meal during the midday. The average man was not accustomed to eating a sandwich during the midday and, as a matter of fact, our people are accustomed going home during the midday and having a meal of rice or soup. But in the evening they would get this meal in the U.S.A. May be, the quantum or the number of sandwiches and milk was not enough for them.

I think Barbadians must be aware of this. In America you do not get a free feed. If you want a larger hamburger, it is going to cost you 50 cents. An ordinary sized one cost about 35 cents. If you want a large cup of coffee, you have to pay twice the amount for it as you would pay for a small cup. When you work with an American employer and you say that you want one pint of milk instead of half-pint, he is going to tell you that the cost of one pint is more than half-pint.

We have set out the Menu and the Diet Sheet on page 10 of the Report. This is nothing to be white-washed; that is the problem as we saw it. I think when you look at the Diet Sheet you will have to come to the conclusion that where a large number of people are fed, it is always a difficult problem for the individual who cannot fit in. The hon. senior member for the City cannot go on an emigration scheme. He cannot even go on a delegation scheme; therefore, the hon. member is like Mr. Ghandi. He has to carry his special arrangement for eating. You have some people who cannot eat everything.

We found, Sir, in a general way that the American employers were not making any profit on food. I would like the House to know that the employers usually give out on contract the preparation of food for the workers and the Liaison Officer's duty was to deal with it.

I have on purpose brought this Resolution to deal with this Report. It is true to say that the Hon. Minister of Labour is not here but it does not affect him. I do feel that in the interest of the community where an issue like this is

likely to affect Barbados, we should let the people know something about it. I say this quite frankly. We are living in a time when it is no point in making unnecessary enemies. I say this to all Barbadians. Within the context of world politics and the geographical position in which Barbados happens to be, there is no point in making an enemy of the United States - and this was not asking you to sell your birthright to go there and get bad food. The realities of this present century, the fact that Britain is driving hard to enter into the European Common Market, should bring all Barbadians to their senses that we have to create an area within this Western Hemisphere for ourselves in which we can live with the people who live closest to us and try to arrive at some means of living in peace with some of our biggest neighbours. If the people in Europe want to live with the people of the U.S.A., those in the Pacific Ocean and those in the Indian Ocean, I do not see why somebody in the Caribbean cannot live with the people of the United States from the point of view of getting the best which they can offer and some of the things which they can offer.

President Kennedy has made available over $20 billion to the twenty countries in Latin-America; therefore we in Barbados cannot close our eyes to the fact that if his Alliance For Progress is going to mean an economy of $20 billion to Latin-America and other countries, we in Barbados cannot make enemies with the people of that country. Far from that, we should make friends with people who want to be friendly. It is for that reason that I have raised this matter. There has been some propaganda going about concerning the Farm Labour Programme which inadvertently is likely to do more harm than good, not so much to the workers but to the area from which it comes. It will have a peculiar psychological affect on the nations. The American nation is very clannish. If you criticise anything which they do, particularly anything which they do in good faith, they just say, "Let us wipe our hands of it." The average American citizen does not like the emigration programme, and if he is willing to let somebody come in and work alongside with him, then you should not do anything to harm the cause.

Sir, it is not my intention to say anything more. I throw it out so that hon. members can be free to debate the Report if they so wish. The reason why I raise the matter now is because I expect to leave the Island soon. I expect to go to the United States soon but not on behalf of the Government. I am going to Washington to see some of my Trade Union colleagues.

I know this problem has been coming up to them and I know how some of them feel about it. Some have the feeling that Barbadians were breaking the contracts in a larger number than the Jamaicans. We are all West Indians, but I want hon. members of this House of Assembly to know this. Jamaica is quite willing to take the whole Farm Labour Programme if Barbadians do not want their part of it. You hear that the people of the United States treat the Jamaicans better than the Barbadians and, on the other hand, you hear some of the Jamaicans saying that the people of the U.S.A. treat the Barbadians better than they. You should read between the lines. There are more Liaison Officers from Jamaica there than Barbadian Liaison Officers.

Now I am on that point, there is the criticism that the Liaison Officers do not see the workers. You have had Mr. Darnley Lewis, Mr. Carl Neblett there as Liaison Officers and now you have Mr. Samuel Gibbons. They live in Connecticut and if you send farm workers to Florida, the average Barbadian has no idea about the size of the country. He does not understand that Florida which is only a part of America is bigger than Barbados. If you have to go o a place called Orlanda from Florida, you have to catch a plane. The size and distances do not seem to mean anything to Barbadian workers. As I said, I am saying all this because I know that the Jamaicans are quite willing to take all of that labour. It is my honest opinion that the Liaison Officers do their best from the reports which I see from them. The workers make complaints that they do not see the Liaison Officers very often and they cannot put complaints to them. That may be true in instances because the Liaison Officer's job is not only to listen to complaints and grievances about workers; he also has to send back to Barbados all information as to how the workers are working; therefore, he cannot do that and be all around at the same time.

The last point which I want to make is about cane cutting. In our Report we say that the Minister of Labour should explain this to the workers.
3.55 p.m.

The American system is a little different from ours. When you go to America you must have a previous period of fourteen days and the Americans will give you a row to cut. They make the assessment that you can cut a certain row in a certain time. If all of the men can cut that row in eight hours and you are only half way in the cutting of that row, they will check you out. That is what the average Barbadian does not understand. The Barbadian idea is that you must pay 8 x 90¢ which is $7.20, but the American say "Oh, no!" That is where they say that you must have two weeks beforehand, and if you cannot do the job then you will be checked out. There is no point in going to another country which has a different work economy from ours and expect our economy to exist. If you cut half a ton of canes in Barbados you are paid for that; but in the United States of America the system is worked out on a different basis. On an average of $1.04 per hour for some people, that is $8 (American) a day. We have made a check of the total earnings and we have found that in the average earnings people were working for $8.00 (American) and they gave us some indication of the values.

Working in Florida in the canefields is tough work. If you are recruiting men to go to the United States of America to work in the United Sugar Corporation, you have to get men who are willing to do tough work. There is no point in sending a man where the hardest thing he has ever held in his hand is a pair of dice. (Mr. MOTTLEY: No soft hands.) His hands are not hard enough. However, in any migration scheme you will have somebody or something slipping through the net. Any man who can fire dice well can play that he is sick inside the camp and whenever you come back inside the camp every man is broke. That man is sick but he is not too sick to fire dice or to play rummy or poker. *(Laughter)* Those are the normal pastimes of ordinary life. For a man who has dice in his pocket, those are his tools with which he travels.

I am asking hon. members who have read this Report to look at it in the right perspective. I think it has been circulated to hon. members. This Report has been done so as to create an image for the Barbadian abroad so as to remove the image that the Barbadian was not worthwhile. This Mission was sent to the United States of America in order to investigate the work and living conditions of the Barbadian workers on the Farm Labour Programme and to make its Report and we have done nothing but to make that Report. We have made certain recommendations and suggestions to the Government and it is for the Government to say whether the recommendations or suggestions of the Mission should be implemented. I should like to say that you do get some isolated cases but the position is not as black as it has been painted. I will give you an instance; as soon as we landed at Miami we went to Mr. Meranda's place and we saw a pitch where the workers could play cricket or football. Mr. Meranda said that they could dig a trench so as to let off the water; that could not be considered as putting somebody to work, but somebody said that you had to dig this trench. The workers remain at this Holding Centre near the Airport because it saves Barbadians fare on a chartered flight which is considerably cheaper than, and reduces the cost of, the scheduled flight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have moved the passing of this Resolution with the sole intention of our being able to discuss this Report and clear the air so that we will not have these cloudy things hanging over the programme on which we have to depend so as to give temporary work to our unemployed people. I have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. As the hon. mover has said, I too, feel that too long a time has elapsed before the appearance of the Report and its presentation in this Chamber. I do not want, however, to criticise that and make any adverse comments on it.
4.05 p.m.

Sir, this is a matter of which we have heard a lot and have been reading a lot recently concerning the treatment of Barbadian workers who emigrate to the United States of America for Farm labour work with cane crops, fruit and vegetables. From time to time I know that the Government has been having some headaches, especially since recently there has been a large number of workers who have returned here rather quickly and have vented dissatisfaction on the treatment meted out to them by the United States employer. I am very glad to see this Report appear as a very factual document, as things that are contained in it have been rather enlightening to me as they will be to other members of this Honourable Chamber. They have spent some time and have gone into the matter of the food and comfort of these workers, the heating of the camps and informing us as to what compensation is offered, the wage levels and how they vary, and of course this system of cutting canes by row about which I have heard so many complaints.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard complaints from workers about cutting canes by row, but one thing that has occurred to me as rather doubtful among all these workers when they return to Barbados, is that they do not seem to be able to give a very clear picture as to what complaints they are actually making; and if I am glad for one thing, it is that the Barbadian delegation sponsored by Government has visited the various centres in the United States and has been able to give us a somewhat clearer picture than we had in the past. One complaint I have not heard my colleague mention is that the complaint about food is not the quantity or the varied items in the diet, but having their Barbadian palates, they are accustomed to certain tastes and they do complain about the seasonings and condiments. They have developed here in Barbados certain tastes, and I have asked how they think it might be remedied. They think that if they had Barbadian cooks who understand their acquired taste, they would have a measure of greater satisfaction. (A VOICE: Some hot sauce!) My colleague mentioned "hot sauce", but small as that may appear, sometimes it matters a great deal, especially when one is far from home. Seamen sometimes make that complaint; they have made similar complaints about the presentation of the food, and I do not know if that was put to our enquirers, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Civil Servant who accompanied him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these matters may appear trival, but they mean a lot. I have had to read this Report rather hastily because I have only been able to see it just about a week ago, and I must confess I have only in the House today completed reading it. I know from what the Report does say about the Liaison Officer paying more frequent visits to camps that there must be some difficulty experienced in that case, but as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, distances means a lot, and if these gentlemen generally have a lot of routine duties to do in Connecticut and making Reports to the Barbados Government from there, they are not able from a practical point of view to visit our workers and to take *verbatim* complaints from them as frequently as we in Barbados would like.

However, Sir, facts are facts, and as the hon. member has said, it will serve no useful purpose for us to try to weaken our relationship with the United States of America. One worker has told me that America cannot do without these workers. I am very glad to hear that the ordinary American citizen views, I would not say with alarm, but not with equanimity of mind the presence of West Indian workers in the United States, and that means that we have got to erase any erroneous impressions that these workers may have and may bring back to Barbados. I do not think we can well afford to do without this source of employment for our Barbadian workers. Already the sugar cane crop in Barbados is fully reaped, and we are going to have this year a very long 'hard time'. During this crop, there has been evidence of very little money in full circulation; so unless we can do all we can to instruct these workers, we may lose this source of employment. The difficulty, Sir, is to get these workers to have a really honest-to-goodness, informative outlook on these things. Some of them really do not know and some of them cannot very easily express their complaints. That is something that matters a lot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been talking to some of these workers, and I could make out very little of what they were complaining about. I support the passing of this Report. It was impossible for those who made the inquiry to give us a Report that would contain everything that it is possible for us to know, but I believe that by and large they made a very good job of enquiring into the complaints which have from time to time been circulated in the Press as coming from these workers. I can see that my colleague was anxious to dispose of this Resolution as he has to undergo a journey abroad in the very near future, but I regret Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we did not have this Report a little earlier in the Session so that we could really debate it in more detail. As I said, Sir, it is a very comprehensive Report; I do not think there is any phase of the day to day experience of the workers that has been left out, and I do commend it for the adoption of hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think there is much necessity further to elaborate on the Report and the Resolution which is before us more than to say that I endorse what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said. It is one thing to make these investigations, but to leave them just there is not good enough. We have been hearing these complaints for years, but some of us, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, have failed to comprehend what were the real complaints of some of these people. Despite the fact that what I say might cause some prospective emigrants to America to feel that I am against some of them, I have actually told them to their faces that it is nonsense that they are talking. My experience in the United States is that you get a better balanced diet than in Barbados.
4.15 p.m.

I have some porridge on mornings, may be an orange and a cup of coffee and I go out to work. I may also get an apple and a sandwich. The hon. senior member for St. Peter talked about the size of a sandwich. I have a son who when he eats a sandwich seems to me as if he is going to burst. Anyhow, these workers take out a sandwich or two along with them. I do not mean a sandwich like that which you get at a party. On evenings, as has been reported to me, they get white potatoes. Barbadians do not like too much white potatoes. Everybody knows that. They also get rice but they do not get that big bulk of rice which they eat here. They also get a vegetable and greens. What our workers must understand is that America has gone in for feeding people in a way that they give you a balanced diet. They get a pie afterwards or, as the English people tell you, a sweet. I cannot find a real complaint about the food. I have had to do without the taste of black pudding and souse for over twenty years. Some people feel that if they do not eat black pudding and souse every week, they should beat somebody and make a row.

Sir, I am most concerned with the explanation of the type of work which the people do and what the situation is in America. I feel that that should be fully explained to the people before they go. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is absolutely correct. The idea of these workers is that they are going to get 90 cents an hour for cutting canes; therefore, it does not matter if they cut a half or a quarter of what they should cut. They do not know that the Americans try you out. They do not know it works like that.

What I would like to suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that there is no one in this country more suitable to be considered by the Minister for putting this over or addressing workers who are going to America to work on this Farm Labour Programme than the hon. senior member for

gret is that I do not see a similar dispensation of these honours in the Colonial territories as I have seen in England. I am sure the Hon. Premier and his colleagues would have seen in Britain people in all walks of life who have been honoured, and it is not regarded any longer in Britain that you have to be a man of wealth or affluence, but someone who has made a contribution to life in the community in which you live.
4.45 p.m.

I feel very pleased today. I cannot speak for any political party but I will speak for my family, my colleagues in the Trade Union movement and myself. We are very proud indeed to see the hon. senior member for the City honoured in this manner.

It is true that the hon. member has his own brand of politics. He has no counterpart anywhere in the West Indies that I know about. Sometimes I think that he has one in the person of Mr. Alexander Bustamante but then I think that he is so far away from the hon. member that I cannot regard him in the same vein as the hon. member. When I hear the hon. member pontificating that he is a Conservative and then on reflection know that he went into the St. Michael's Vestry which was really a Conservative setup and caused the whole thing to be so revolutionised that even the Socialists wanted that body to be more conservative, I myself wonder if he is a Conservative. I can very well remember his entry into Local Government and making those vivid descriptions of how they gave the poor old lady a pair of high heeled shoes as a means of saving the taxpayers' money which caused many of those people to dance the Twist long before that dance reached these shores.

The hon. senior member for the City is the doyen of municipal politicians. It takes a lot for a man to be *persona grata* with all sides and even in this Honourable House, one can claim that he is the only member in the whole House of Assembly that is *persona grata* with all members of the House. Everybody is on speaking terms with him - which is a good record for a member who is in the distinguished position in which he is as Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. member and myself, even before we were in this House of Assembly, have been wrestling with problems of this House and I can say that no member has been in politics longer than us with the exception of His Honour the Speaker and the Hon. Minister of Labour who are both absent from this House today along with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who are his three oldest colleagues in this Chamber.

Sir, I offer him my sincere congratulations on his most deserving honour.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, although I have already personally congratulated the hon. senior member for the City who has been the recepient of the honour of Companion of the Order of the British Empire, I too must say that I am of the opinion that the hon. member has very richly deserved such an honour.

I think hon. members who have already spoken regarding the bestowal of these honours are very ancient in their conception of the bestowal of these honours. I think that it must be more than ten years now that the conception of the bestowal of these honours has been completely changed. The modern conception behind such an act is that what is good enough for the people is good enough for the Sovereign. I do not think that any hon. member has stressed that. There was a time when honours were restricted to loyalty, gallantry on the battlefield and the way in which statesmen, politicians and people in the Public Service conducted their business. However, for some time now, the bestowing of honours has been granted to men of sport, men in the field of every endeavour and, as I have said, the modern conception is that what is good enough for the people is good enough for the Sovereign.

The hon. senior member for the City has been a very old politician in Local Government and Central Government politics and, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, the hon. member has his own brand of politics. But what has surprised many of his colleagues is that he is one who has endeared himself to all people, especially the people of the metropolitan parish and to some extent beyond the confines of that parish; therefore, it was obvious that sometime or the other his work would be appreciated in the way in which it has been appreciated today.

As I have said, I have already congratulated the hon. member personally, but I would not sit in this Chamber on this occasion without giving my personal congratulations to him.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as an independent member of this Assembly, I hasten to add my congratulations to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown on the recognition which he has recently received from Her Majesty the Queen.

I feel, Sir, that if there is an individual in this community who merits such a recognition, it is the hon. senior member for the City. The work which has been done by the hon. senior member for the City as a member of the St. Michael's Vestry as Churchwarden and consequently as Mayor of the Bridgetown City Council will ever stand as a shining monument, not only as regards his ministering to the poor of this Island, but the work which he has done in bringing the health of this Island to such a standard as it is today.

As a debater in this Chamber, the hon. member is very able and I think that I am correct in saying that he is one of the most able members in this House today.

There are times, Sir, when one would ask what has someone done to have such a recognition; but when it comes to the hon. senior member for the City, that question cannot be asked. One can only wonder when he has done so much for the community why his work has not been recognised before; but as the old saying goes: all good things come to those who wait, and as I would say, the hon. senior member for the City has waited patiently.
4.55 p.m.

Whenever the time came for criticism the hon. member has not failed to criticise, and he has now gained the distinction of being awarded the C.B.E. I feel that this recognition is but the beginning of good things yet to come; certainly a king has arisen to those who know Joseph. I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am very happy indeed to be a member of this House at a time such as this. I want the hon. senior member for the City to know that I am very pleased of this recognition which has been conferred on him and I know that he is not only a help to the people as a politician but he is very great where helping is concerned.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is both a pleasure and privilege to rise in congratulation of my colleague who has been honoured by Her Majesty the Queen in the recent Birthday Honours. Of all the humanitarians who have sat in this distinguished Chamber and who have passed on, I feel that my colleague might well claim kinship among them and have his claim allowed. The hon. member's name has become almost a household name not only in this City but in the environs. Quite early in the hon. member's political career he seemed to have realised that capital and labour were two blades of a mighty pair of shears, worthless apart, but powerful and irresistible when brought together. He it was who was the lonely figure which infiltrated at one time the patterns of privilege and promoted a wider and wiser humanity. The battle was not always an easy one; it is not an easy one today.

The Hon. Premier in his remarks currently forgot that the late and lamented Federal Government had bestowed one Order before it passed out of existence; that Order was the Order of the Boot which was awarded to the Hon. Andrew Rose in the sudden activity of that Government just before it died. I would remind hon. members that we, who are of the Conservative element, have nothing of which to be ashamed, because it was a Conservative member of this

Government who was crying in the wilderness asking that those who masqueraded under Socialism should not line their pockets with money out of the taxpayers. My colleague is not one who would be receptive of any fulsome flattery, but I feel it incumbent upon me that I had myself to accept by proxy many of the congratulations which would have been accorded the hon. member if he had been here at the time of the declaration of the signal award given him by Her Majesty the Queen. It would appear that my colleague has come at last to be recognised even by Royalty as one whose ideal has always been the service of the community, whose touchstone has been a becoming humility and whose motto has always been the importance of the common man. Now the hon. member sits here, high in the hearts of the people as he receives the approbation of the multitude, the acclamation of his colleagues and the recognition of sovereignty.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am very happy to associate myself with the kind and true remarks of hon. members with reference to the honour which has been bestowed on the hon. senior member for the City. I have to say that His Honour the Speaker has asked me publicly to associate him in offering congratulations to the hon. member who has, for many years, sat in this Honourable House with him. Like His Honour the Speaker, I would say that the acts, deeds and words of the hon. member speak loudly and clearly for themselves. *(Cheers)*

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to thank hon. members of this Chamber for the very kind remarks which they have made about me. This is not an occasion for me to make a speech, but on reflection, I can only say that I have accepted this honour with the same humble dignity as I accepted what I considered my greatest honour when the people of the City sent me to this Chamber. I say no more today than this; I receive and accept with humble dignity this honour on behalf of the people of the City of Bridgetown and the Municipality of Bridgetown. If indeed an honour has been bestowed upon me by Her Majesty the Queen, as I see it, it is an honour which has been bestowed upon the citizens of the Municipality and upon those people in the City of Bridgetown who did me the honour of sending me to this Chamber and to Local Government so that I can see what I had in me. What I say and do I say and do for the people of the City of Bridgetown. I accept the congratulations of all hon. members with humble dignity and I will say that no honour bestowed on me can ever change my outlook. As the Hon. Premier has rightly said, I have been one of the most severe critics in this House of expatriates and of officials and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has rightly said, it does show how tolerant the English people must be.
5.05 p.m.

From the floor of this House I think my reputation has gone out as actually running from this country two very high English officials through my criticism in this House, because I did not like what was going on. It does show, as the hon. member has said, that if your conscience tells you that you are right about something and you have to criticise it, the British way of life and British tolerance and outlook is different. As I said only a few weeks ago when I had the honour to be a member of the Barbados delegation to England, if there was any nation or people fit to rule over us, it would be the British, because they were the best that we had.

I accept your congratulations, and I again repeat, with humble dignity, that nothing will change me. My outlook will always be the same. I feel most grateful to you for your kind words which I accept on behalf of the people of the City of Bridgetown and the Municipality.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now resume Government Business. On the Suspension, the House was in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. junior menber for St. George was addressing the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: When the Sitting was suspended, Mr. Chairman, we were on the Resolution for $140,000 in connection with a revote for money for salaries. Much longitude and latitude has been given by Your Honour, and it did stretch a way out to St. Thomas and the quarry business, However, Sir, I should like to reply to the accusations made with regard to the previous Government, if I am permitted to continue. I speak now from memory as I do not have the files before me on this occasion, and it is a little over six months ago.

When Costain's, the contractor for the Deep Water Harbour, finished with the equipment that was used for the construction of the Harbour, it was offered to the Government first. That is what one would expect. The Director of Public Works was instructed by the Ministry of the then Government to go and inspect and study this equipment and make recommendations on the equipment from Costain's. As a Government we were advised by the Director not to buy this equipment for reasons already explained. We were at the moment operating a crushing plant at Black Rock, and it was not thought advisable to spend money in this equipment, as it did not appear to the Department that we should invest in that equipment. However, a company was formed some time after negotiating the purchase of this equipment with Costain's and applied to the Government of Barbados to operate this quarry. Incidently, the quarry is owned by the Government.

After preliminary discussions, I think, on the type of contract that should be drawn on this occasion, we were invited and the then Minister took the entire Cabinet out to the site, because it appeared there were some complaints by the residents in the area resulting from the dust and what not. I myself has a chat with a number of the folk who lived in that area, and some weeks later we were invited again to go back to talk with these people since it was felt that there was some dissatisfaction and nuisance. I went into a number of houses, and there was a good deal of dust, and you could see that they were smarting for a while with the inconvenience of what was going on during the period of operation by Costain's. On our second visit, Sir, we were told by most of the people who were more or less working with this new company that they wanted the assurance that the Company could remove this dust nuisance. I remember we were promised by these new people who were applying for the use of the quarry and who apparently bought this equipment from Costain that they would resurface the road, as that was one of the unpleasant hazards, and use dust equipment including cyclones and a number of dust collectors. We were satisfied that that should be done.

I remember at one meeting of the Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, that we were discussing royalties on the soil taken from this quarry, and I did ask the Minister in charge at the time to defer it because we wanted some more information on it. I myself discussed the royalty offered by this Company with a number of quarry operators who felt that they could pay a little more. When we came back it was agreed and this company also agreed to pay the royalties requested by the then Government. We were not sure how soon they would have been willing or have money to put in this new road or when they could bring in the necessary equipment to remove this dust hazard by way of cyclones and dust collectors, and it was obvious that the contract would not be signed until everything was settled with the Minister or for that matter with the Government and the contractor. In the meantime, you will remember that the last Government went out of power. No money was paid, but it was only a question of collecting it, and this happens to be a statement of fact. It was all settled on the files and discussed by the Cabinet with all concerned present at the Cabinet, and I am very anxious to hear what will be the ultimate end and the result of what has been said in here today. There was nothing clandestine or indecent about it. There was nothing indecent in the sense of the word, wicked or reckless in so far as the decisions of the Government with the people who wanted to operate the quarry were concerned. We wanted to be satisfied that there would be no

dust nuisance to the residents before any undertaking was given.

Mr. Chairman, the contract was not signed to the best of my knowledge, because many of the things which the Government wanted settled before were not concluded, but I do know there was some arrangement about royalties and what should be paid to the Government of Barbados for the soil and stone removed from that quarry site.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I would just like to say that the hon. junior member for St. Peter rose on a point of order and I interrupted. I think that the hon. member was quite right, although he has no right to rise on a point of order. It should have been a point of privilege, but he was absolutely correct that one should not call an hon. member by name. I did not understand that that was the purpose of his interruption; I was concerned about the hon. junior member for St. George, and therefore I apologise to the hon. junior member for St. Peter.
5.15 p.m.

I withdraw anything which I may have said. I have considered the matter and I would like to apologise for making a statement which was a bit bad and unkind at the time.

As regards the hon. junior member for St. George, he wants to give the impression that there is nothing clandestine in the occupation of this quarry which was due to the instruction of a member of the Party to which he belongs to people who are not natives of Barbados. I have before me a file. There is nothing to come out of the investigations because the conclusions are here. We do have certain checks and safeguards and although these checks and balances are even as strong as they are, they can frequently be ignored by a Government.

The former Government did not lease the quarry to Quarry Products although they had full consultation with Quarry Products. The people at Bagatelle had complained to Government about the breaking up of their property by stones from this quarry and not one member of the public knew anything of this other than those intimately concerned. I am saying now as a matter of law that there can be no disposal of public property unless it is done with the approval of the Legislature. God knows, Mr. Chairman, that it is hard enough to glean from the columns of the Press what is going on from time to time. Even with this Government, it is very difficult for anyone to know what is taking place until we come on the floor of this House and inform the people's representatives what is happening.

From March 1961, the Directors of Quarry Products had applied to the Government for a lease of this land. These are the conclusions of the Ministry of Communications and Works: "While Messrs. Quarry Products were informed of the Government's decision to give them a lease on principle, the final agreement was dependent on three factors: (1) approval of the Cabinet." That means that the Cabinet did not even approve. "(2) Approval of the Legislature; and (3) later agreement on the terms of the lease."

Those are the three dependent factors. That letter was dated 10th March 1961 which was fully eight months before the last Government came out of office and yet there was no authorisation to Quarry Products to take possession of the quarry. This Minute was not written by a Minister in here. Since the letter referred to was only a letter addressed to Quarry Products on this matter, no authority was given to Quarry Products to take possession and operate the quarry. This was only a communication to Quarry Products from the Minister and not from the Cabinet of which the hon. junior member for St. George was a member. It was not even that they brought the legislation to the Legislature. Since this was only a letter addressed to Quarry Products by the Minister, they had no authority otherwise. They did not have it from the letter; so what is the hon. junior member for St. George telling me when he says that there is nothing clandestine about it?

There were other people who were negotiating before. They are candidates who ran in the Local Government election in 1958 for the Barbados Labour Party. Some people who have quarries elsewhere and who were negotiating before - (Mr. MILLER: Call a name.) I do not have to call the names. He knows who they are. It might be slightly unfair for me to call the names here. I can show any member of the House who wants to see the names this file. If I may give the hon. member some information, they are candidates in the Labour Party in the Local Government elections for the constituency of St. Michael. By a process of elimination you can find out who they were.

Sir, the fourth conclusion was the fact that Quarry Products operating the quarry was fully known to the Ministry of Communications and Works since no less then two meetings were held between the representatives of the quarry and small quarry owners when the matter was fully discussed. This was fully known to the Ministry of Communications and Works because at two meetings the protest of small quarry owners was fully discussed; therefore, it was not strange that between the 10th March and 4th December, 1961, no member of the public, including myself, did not know anything about the matter. I did not know. I will be quite frank about my ignorance because if I had known, what I would have said at the meetings in St. Thomas during the election campaign would have been far stronger. Not even as an elected member for the parish of St. John and as a person who is interested in everything going on in this community did I know of that; therefore, how can the hon. junior member for St. George say that there was nothing clandestine about it? If it were agreed to, why in the light of what I have read out was the matter not finalised? Did they get the approval of the Cabinet? The terms of the lease would have to be actually agreed on before all of that. Let the hon. member state what royalty they were prepared to pay. Of course, it depends on what you mean by royalty, because some of the royalties were not royalties for the Treasury at all.

Sir, it is not strange. There are some members of the past Government who believed that all of the property which the Government owned belonged to them. I told the hon. junior member for St. George previously not to aggravate me on this matter because it would cause me to say a lot more. I am stating as a fact that not even the Cabinet agreed because of the protest of the small quarry owners. They allowed the Directors of Quarry Products to take stones illegally from Bagatelle quarry when they had not got the approval of the Cabinet or of the Legislature or the assent of His Excellency the Governor or any member of the public.
5.25 p.m.

It is therefore not strange that they have to go between the 10th March and the 4th December. If the royalty was agreed on, they take eight months and up to now the lease has not been produced. The matter is not even the subject of a Cabinet decision of the Government. That shows how ridiculous the hon. member can be. These are matters which have been recorded here for the benefit of posterity and everybody else. The hon. member challenged the Minister to bring that out and I have made the decision that that should be disclosed so that the public would not get the wrong impression. The hon. senior member for the City is entitled to ask any question he likes as long as it does not infringe on the Official Secrets Act. The ex-Minister can defend himself in the Law Courts; at the proper time I suppose he will be in a position to defend himself.

Mr. MILLER: He has discussed the file.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Peter caught my eye first.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the anxiety of the hon. member to reply to things which have been said, but I gave way to the Hon. Premier on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George will soon be able to reply to the Hon. Premier. In connection with this Resolution for the sum of $140,200 we see under Head 10 - Accountant General - Item 26 (New) Salaries Revision, that

the sum of $140,000 is required. Normally, as you would expect when salaries revisions come up at a time like this, one would have in mind certain things which, in his opinion and in the opinion of other hon. members, should be attended to. I have heard the hon. senior member for the City draw incidentally to the attention of the Chair something in respect of certain works, and I say that certain employees consider themselves to be in a rather inferior position in that they did not have their conditions of work brought into line. They were not servants of the Government as such, but they were employed by the contractors. I remember sometime ago that I had frequent clashes with the erstwhile Premier whom I told that he was very legalistic, but being realistic is quite a different thing. I am prepared to tell the present Premier the same thing. I remember that certain rock blasters were in a very similar position as compared with the conditions of certain of these workers today working on Government projects and with private contractors. These people are still employees of Barbados and they constitute a force which has to be reckoned with. From the legalistic point of view, these employees do not come under the ambit of Government employees, but they are employees of the immediate contractors. That is one side; in fact, more than moral responsibility can be proved in respect of the working conditions of these employees. I do not think that, on reflection, the Premier would fail to see that there is some purpose in reviewing a matter of this sort and paying some attention to these workers; although they come under the responsibility of a contractor, yet as they are on a Government contract and are working side by side with the people who are doing similar work for Government, that is more than sufficient reason for things being examined if we are to give justice to such workers. It is no fault of theirs nor that of the contractors if the Government made salary revisions at the particular time; but if we are facing facts and we are facing realities and we do not stress the legalistic attitude too much, I think we will discover that it is right, proper and fair for them to have some reconsideration in a matter of this sort. It can be argued that it is legalistic: but it is expedient for the present Government to ignore the moral side today and say that they are not legally bound and they need not do anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, there were a lot of things said incidentally and I would like to inform the Committee that certain complaints have been made by the smaller type of contractors in Barbados interested in the quarrying and stone crushing business that they were in a rather inferior position as not to have some sort of contract or access to the stones at Bagatelle. I have heard a lot being developed on either side of the House and I will not mention anything about which I am not very informed. I am quite willing to listen and to learn. I have just raised the point of view that although I see the legalistic side of it I will not close my eyes to the realistic side of it. I want to thank the Hon. Premier for offering the apology which has been tendered and I assure him that I have received it gratefully and that in this Chamber never will I be prejudiced against any one Party for the other or *vice versa*. I can assure you that my intervention in any form will always be to preserve good order and dignity in this Chamber.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again this is the sort of thing to which we have been exposed for the last three years – robbery, corruption, threat and "if you push me I will say this." In March last year the operations at the quarry began and we were thrown out of Government before we concluded the lease. They have been in power since the 4th December – six months ago – and they cannot even tell you that they have collected royalties.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. junior member for St. George to stick to the Resolution, because I am not going to allow the hon. member to waste time repeating himself on something which does not pertain to the Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am not going to allow myself to be misquoted. I have pointed out that there is no contract. We do not recognise the legality of the occupation of the quarry by Messrs. Quarry Products Limited. I made that clear; and therefore how can we approbate and reprobate at the same time by accepting a royalty from people whom we claim are taking stone illegally from Government property? That is the kind of thing the hon. member may find himself capable of, but I do not think anybody in this Government in his right senses can do it.

Furthermore, on a point of order, I think I have answered the question for the hon. senior member for the City and I have answered the hon. member. He has replied to me and I ask you now to put the question unless the member has something to say on the Resolution, because we can go on interminably on this matter, and he can go on to misrepresent the position of the Government on this matter. We are not collecting any royalties from any illegal transaction inspired by the last Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution...

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to sit here and allow the hon. member to interrupt the debate.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you probably feel that it is time now to get angry or anxious, but you must remember that you allowed members to speak on this and to bring in Quarry Products and everything else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.....

Mr. SMITH: It is not a question of what you would like.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not sitting here and allowing any member to waste time.

Mr. SMITH: You will have to sit there and rule me out of order if you find me out of order, and I will sit. I was Chairman of Committees for many years, and I know my stuff. I never ruled because I could rule. You will remember that on this question of Bagatelle quarry, the Hon. Premier said that the people there were operating the quarry illegally and selling the Government their own stones. He also said that a former Minister instructed the Managing Director of this firm to operate, but not to tell any person he had instructed him to do so.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want you to realise that this is a Resolution for $140,000. Are we going to sit here and allow the hon. member.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Mr. CORBIN: It is a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. CORBIN: In this Resolution, Sir, there is nothing concerning a quarry, because this Resolution is for backpay.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, are you going to rule?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew is in order.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is getting here and wasting the time of the House. We are discussing a Resolution for a certain amount of money, but the question about the quarry only came in by force of circumstances. Does the hon. member not realise that he is dealing with something which is not in the Resolution? Is he stupid?

Mr. SMITH: That is a speech the hon. member is making.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member resumes, I would like to inform members that I will permit members to speak on this Resolution, but if I hear anything more about the quarry business, I will close the debate.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Chairman, this will make one lose one's temper. The hon. senior member for the City asked a question to which the Hon. Premier replied. Now that the Hon. Premier has replied, do you not want hon. members to reply to the Premier's remarks? As soon as you want to put the question, or say that members should keep to the Resolution, you are straying. I have sat here the whole day while members referred to the quarry, and you allowed the debate to get out of control when you should have put your foot down on it. Now that you have allowed members of your Party to speak on it, even the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, you are saying that you are not going to allow anymore speeches on it. This is an Honourable House and it is a democratic set-up. What do you want me to understand? That I will have to pack up my trunks and leave?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.....

Mr. SMITH: On what is he rising?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH: You do not even know what it is.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I have not risen a bit too soon, because the extremely rude remark which has been passed a moment ago to you to the effect that you do not even know what it is, is very reprehensible indeed, and I rise to protest against the remarks of the hon. member who is inferring that you do not know what you are doing, that you have ruled badly, and that you should have done this, that or the other. The facts of the matter are these: that a question was asked, and that a Minister from this side of the House took opportunity to reply to it. It is not true, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants to say, that you have allowed one-sided discussion on it, because the hon. junior member for St. George has spoken as much on it as anybody on this side, and therefore it is very reprehensible for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to be wanting to put you in an embarrassing position, to hold you up to ridicule, and to say that you do not know what you are doing.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that my own memory of his rulings of previous Parliaments is very clear indeed, and he should never tell you that you are ruling at the behest of your Party.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just spoken should not be.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member goes on, I would like to go a little further than the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Minister of Education. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that the Chair did not know what it was doing. I would like to say that two wrongs never make a right. In the same way that he has deplored the fact that this debate has been somewhat protracted, he is now asking you, because debate was allowed and although it was wrong, to continue being wrong.
5.45 p.m.

Quite apart from that, the only reason why I answered this question at all from the hon. senior member for the City was not because it was germaine to the debate, but I was clear to point out on one occasion that I forgot a question asked by another member which prevented me from replying to it and I was accused of being a dictator. You can imagine the phobia and how I would be accused of trying to suppress something of importance if I did not answer this question asked by the hon. senior member for the City. It was only due to the intervention of the hon. junior member for St. George that this debate was protracted at all because I made certain positive statements. The hon. member got up and accused me of dishonesty and of not speaking the truth; therefore, I had to send for the files.

The hon. member has now accused you of not being able to reply to a reply. In legislative matters, you cannot reply to a reply. Not even in legal matters can you reply to a reply. I think that in a Legislative Chamber, if a Minister makes a public statement, the only thing which a member may do, if he wants to say something about it, is to get up and give notice of a Resolution to have the matter discussed.

If I may go back to history, about eight years ago, sometime in 1954, at half-past six in the morning when I was in a chair over on that side – and the Hon. Minister of Education was also a back-bencher at the time – the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who was in the Chair when the House was in Committee on the Estimates, put a question when I was on my feet. I was speaking then concerning the operations of British West Indian Airways and quoting from the records of this House.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Mr. Chairman, as regards that point by the hon. member, sit and listen; I am getting up too.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is not the Northern District Council and the sooner the hon. member remembers that, the better. His new position does not fit him very well. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, let us go on.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, if he goes and searches the records of this House, will see that he is the only Chairman of Committees who has ever had a vote of "no confidence" in him which was moved by me, and the only reason why it was not passed is because the party machinery was invoked to maintain him in the Chair. What was he criticised for? He was criticised for not allowing members to speak legitimately. On that occasion, when a member was speaking, the leader of that Party, the Hon. Sir Grantley Adams went and spoke to him and asked him to put the question. (Mr. SMITH: That is not true.) I am saying that he did come to you and asked you to put the question. (Mr. SMITH: That is not true.) If you did it off your own bat it only shows how wicked you are. I thought at least that he did it because he was afraid of being thrown out of the Party. If he did it off his own bat, it only shows how wicked and contemptible he is.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier has said that I was the only Chairman of Committees on whom a vote of "no confidence" was passed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said "moved".

Mr. SMITH: There is nothing wrong in moving a vote of "no confidence". I laughed at it when I saw it on the Order Paper.

But now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy got up just now and said that I was rude in my remark. The hon. member could not be sitting closer to the Hon. Premier when the Hon. Premier used certain remarks about the hon. junior member for St. Peter. Well, those remarks were put so badly that he came back and apologised: but the hon. junior member for St. Lucy did not have the guts to get up and say that the Hon. Premier was wrong. I pointed out to the Hon. Premier that he used some remarks to another member which would not even suit using in a place like Suttle Street.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. junior member for the City would give way, I will only just like to say that the remarks which I used, I do not want to repeat: but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is giving the impression that I said something unparliamentary. The House was adjourned shortly after, but there were no unparliamentary remarks used. What the

hon. member said affected the dignity of the Chair. He was challenging the Chair. You can only do it in the way I did it, even if it were defeated - by a substantive motion.

Mr. SMITH: Why did he withdraw the remarks? The Hon. Premier said that they were not unparliamentary.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I withdrew them because I had the decency to do so.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, we can as well get up and say things and then withdraw them. He said that the remarks were not unparliamentary, yet he still withdraw them. I cannot understand this Hon. Premier. It seems as if I will have to learn him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier made remarks and then withdrew them. He then got up and told this House that the remarks were not unparliamentary. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to sit and rule. I am speaking now. We are representing the people of this country. When they vote for us, they expect us to do their duty, and especially when one becomes the Premier of this country, he is the father of the Government. He is the boss and he must set an example - and I mean a good example, not a bad one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does that form part of the Resolution?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if you aggravate me.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is only taking advantage of you because you are a new member. If I were in that Chair, he could not get on so; he would have to take his seat. I say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is the last member who should rise in here and do what he is doing. He has been Chairman of Committees longer than anybody else in this Chamber, yet his example in the Chair is the worst parliamentary record of a Chairman because he was only a towline.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, that is not a point of order. The hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is wasting the time of the House. If the hon. member has nothing to do, why does he not stay at home?

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I am not taking on him today. I am not ready for him.

Now, Sir, I was saying that we are representatives of the people and members on that side are members of the Government. You have heard today that there is a company operating at Bagatelle illegally and selling the Government stone, which is a wrong thing.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have told the hon. member that I am not going to entertain anything about any stones now. I am listening to the debate on this Resolution dealing with salaries revision and nothing more. I will not tolerate this thing any longer.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if you are right, then you are right; but if you are wrong, then you are wrong. If you have allowed one hon. member to debate something, then you will have to allow it to all hon. members. It is not fair to the people of this colony for Government to allow people to be carrying away the people's stones and selling them to them. If these people are not operating legally then they should be locked up. If the Minister gave a directive to the Director, what directive could he get that he could go on to steal? This present Government is encouraging people at Bagatelle to carry away the people's property and this Government will not take any legal action in connection with that. *(Noise from the Gallery.)*

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Peter caught my eye first.

Mr. WALCOTT: I should like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that if there is no Marshal in the House you must keep order in the gallery. Visitors to the gallery must realise that they are here on sufferance and they are not in the Market Square. The most noise that is kept must be kept around this Table in this Chamber. I am not coming into this House to be told that I must keep quiet and allow persons in the gallery to speak.

Mr. Chairman, you have been innocent because the Government has fallen into the trap of answering questions which have absolutely no bearing on this matter and that has brought about a debate today. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is one of those members who play politics by air and not by music. He plays a guitar by air, but as soon as you bring the music sheet he is done. The hon. member has no contribution to make to this debate as an original contribution.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. What is the hon. member speaking on now? Well, Mr. Chairman, I will be getting up again.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member thinks he is dealing with me, when it comes to dealing with me - if the hon. member is fluttering before he dies, he could as well await his turn. He is one of the dumb members who have been in this House for 16 years and he has now come to life. He should have been the last person to talk about somebody stealing money.

Mr. SMITH: Did I accuse you of stealing anything?

Mr. WALCOTT: You have been associated with people in connection with whom public enquiries have had to be conducted. Do you think you are right to live by somebody else's pocket? The Hon. Premier answered stupid questions; I asked about rockblasters and nobody could get me to enter into anything about the policy of quarrying at these places. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has made a contribution which is accusing the Government of allowing people to sell Government's stones. *(ASIDES)* If you had an Election tomorrow, see if you would come back in here.

Mr. SMITH: The Election is your living, but not mine!

Mr. WALCOTT: Why then did you fight so hard to come in here?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter made the mistake about saying that somebody has fallen into a trap. Nobody has fallen into any trap; we are dealing with a Resolution which is asking for a certain amount of money. When I came in here the hon. senior member for St. Peter was talking about quarry workers on contract. I took the opportunity then to enquire of the Hon. Minister if he knew anything about what happened at Bagatelle. The Government could not have answered me otherwise. It is not true to say that they were sitting down and allowing anybody to steal anything. I will say that whenever I ask any question in here, I know the answer to that question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already told the hon. senior member for the City that I am not entertaining anything about stones at Bagatelle; I am only entertaining debate on this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, Sir, I will not talk about stones; I will talk about rocks, salaries revision and marl because you had all of them down at the Deep Water Harbour. I am saying that the hon. member is wrong even to suggest that somebody was sitting down and allowing somebody else to carry away the Government's money.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but I hate to stop the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. SMITH: You hate to stop the hon. senior member for the City, but you like to stop me. *(Laughter)*

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say anything more about this matter. I asked a simple question but I do not understand why people do not like me to ask questions. I have been asking questions from the time I became fourteen years old. I am only saying that I knew the answer, and I knew what had happened, because certain questions were asked in here about contracts with Local Government and if they were signed. I asked the question because I knew that things were being carried on at that quarry which could not bear a searchlight, and I was waiting to see what would happen.

The gentleman who was talked about, the ex-Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, has a habit – and he is encouraged by one of the Officers of this House – of coming and sitting down and opening drawers, taking out Minutes and publishing them in the Press before they are sent to the Government Printery, and I want the Speaker to know it. I want to say it is time that the Speaker called upon the Clerk of the House to let him know that an ex-member of this House has no more privilege than Ding Ding, and the Clerk of the House and the Librarian have no right encouraging Ronald Mapp in here to open drawers and take Minutes of this House to publish them in the "Beacon". These things are being carried on.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you reminded me just now that you were not going to sit there and allow me to waste time, and that I must speak on the Resolution. When you allow these new things to come in and then somebody else gets up to speak, you will say you hate to stop the member, but you love to stop me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I never said that.

Mr. SMITH: I said that, and I am going to get up after him and carry on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City was not in his seat when I made my ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to stop because I do not want to break any ruling that you have made. I am extremely fond of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph and he knows it, but he knows that he really cannot attempt to defend this ex-Minister of Communications. You cannot defend him.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of this House and I do not like what is going on. I know that the Librarian is encouraging it and it is within the knowledge of the Clerk and the Speaker. I am a member of this House, and it is my right to come here when I want to ask for something. When the people kick you out, you should stay out until they put you back in. You should not come here and usurp any authority. Mr. Chairman, somebody will get into trouble for it. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to deal anymore with Bagatelle, but if the hon. member thinks that the Government could have answered me differently, he is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, a man who gave the Barbados Labour Party $1,000 to run the election, came to me and complained that this quarry had been competing with him and others because they did not pay the Government. I told him he was talking nonsense, and he brought the other quarry owners to me. (Mr. SMITH: You do not get bread out of this quarry!)

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Resolution with which we are dealing is for a revote of $140,200 being part of the provision made during 1961-62 to pay salaries, wages and allowances at revised rates under Supplementary Estimates 1961-62 Nos. 30, 32 and 33. You are in a position, Mr. Chairman, not to allow this debate to go any further. You must stop it now regardless of who is speaking. Make your ruling now or never.

The question that this Resolution for the sum of $140,200 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63, No. 3

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to place the sum of $50,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part II – Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63 No. 3 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Before the Hon. Premier proceeds, I would like to remind the visitors in the Gallery that they are here on sufferance and cannot cheer anything said in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $50,000, and is also a revote of provision made during the financial year 1961-62 to pay salaries, wages and allowances at revised rates under Supplementary Estimates 1961-62, No. 31 under Resolution 86 of 1961. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more on this, except that you will notice that it is under Part II Capital – Miscellaneous Item 6 (New) – Salaries Revision.

As far as I can understand from these money Resolutions, the amount is really needed for the supplementary salaries of people working at the Hospital, as far as I can remember. The amount for Public Works Department employees is $44,790.54, and for the new Hospital employees who are being paid arrears of overtime, the amount is $347.12, making a total of $45,137.66; but the amount of $50,000 is being asked for as a precaution in case there have been any miscalculations and to obviate the necessity of returning to the House for money. If the money is not accounted for and spent, naturally it will lapse and not come out of the Treasury at all.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63, No. 4

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The next Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, to place the sum of $3,158 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I – Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63 No. 4 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Head 29 – Town and Country Planning – was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the amount being asked for in this Resolution is the sum of $3,158.
6.15 p.m.

There are two Heads under this Resolution. The first is for Town and Country Planning and under it is a new Item for furniture and equipment. The sum of $202 is required to provide furniture and equipment to accommodate additional staff of one clerk and one stenographer for the Town and Country Planning Officer.

I beg to move that Head 29, stand part.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, relative to this Head, Town and Country Planning, I want to throw out a hint to the Government and let them know what has been drawn to my attention, so that if it has not been drawn to their attention, they may know something about it.

It may be the law of the country but sometimes we do have a law which is too drastic and that is why we have amendments to the law. It has been drawn to my attention that in some cases the Town and Country Planning Officer has been very hard on people and not only when they want to build but even when they want to wash their houses. A certain individual told me that his house has three doors which are rather small to the front and he wanted to make

two wide ones instead of having the three. He took the matter to the Town and Country Planning Office and they told him that he could not do it but that he would have to pull down the whole front and set the building in. In my opinion, that is a little too hard because this person only wanted to change the front of the building by making two doors instead of three. He is not extending the building. I can understand if you are going to make extensions that you will have to comply with the law. The Town and Country Planning Officer told him that he would have to step his building back.

I can quite see the object of Town and Country Planning, but here it is, you are in an area with six buildings and the owner of one in the middle wants to do a little renovation. The Town and Country Planning Officer informs him that in order to do that he will have to step his building back in. He will have to comply with the law if he wants to carry out just that little renovation and the other five remaining buildings will be there for the next hundred years without being set back in. What is the good of making that man set his building back? You have not done anything if you do that unless you are in the position to call on all of the owners to set their buildings back in.

I am saying that if that person sets his building back in so as to comply with the law, one will have to drive right up to the particular spot to see that a house is there because the others would have it hidden. I repeat that this is a little bit too hard.

Sir, another matter was drawn to my attention by another person. He told me that he has a house in the front and he wants to build another one in the back. He therefore made the necessary application for building the house in the back to the Town and Country Planning Office and they told him that they could not allow him to build a house in the back until he carries back the house which he has in the front. I have said in my opening remarks that it may be the law of the land, but if I draw these matters to the attention of the Government, probably amendments can be made to the law. If the man has a house there already and he wants to build a house in the back.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I must draw your attention to the rules. There is an Act on the Statute Book dealing with Town and Country Planning. You cannot have a debate on that Act unless you are dealing with something to amend that Act. You cannot debate Town and Country Planning on a Resolution for furniture and equipment for the Town and Country Planning Office.

The hon. member has said that somebody had a building and they were told that they would have to set it back in from the road. That law applies to everybody. I know somebody who had a building to sell and somebody would have bought it but they did not buy it because they were told that they would have to set back the building. All that is in the Act. You cannot allow the hon. member to make a speech on that because that would be making a speech on the Act. You cannot get up in here and make a speech on the Governor's salary.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I particularly said that although it was the law of the land, in certain cases the law can be amended. If the Government agreed with me, certainly they could bring down an amendment. I was building up my case so as to focus the attention of the Government on the matter. I particularly said that you have to comply with the law, but in these particular cases, these persons had already had their houses there. In one case he was just only going to make a little renovation to the front of his place and in the other instance, that person had a house to the front and wanted to build one in the back.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. What are we dealing with?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. The hon. member may continue.

Mr. SMITH: I was saying that this person wants to build a house in the back; he is doing nothing with the front at all and the Town and Country Planning Officer has refused to allow him to build that house in the back until he sets back with the one in the front. That is unfair to that man. Just because they want him to step back with the one which you have in the front, they will not allow him to build in the back. It is not fair; it is too hard and I am appealing to the Government to look into the matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, a measure like Town and Country Planning is one which with a full sense of responsibility I say that there should be always the widest possible public discussion, and I think that you were properly correct in giving the hon. junior member for St. Joseph the amount of latitude which you did to discuss that matter. Anyone who has his ears to the ground knows that the people in Barbados do not understand a measure like this which prevents him from dealing with his property in the manner he feels.

When you have legislation like this which incidentally was not instituted by this Government - and we are not apologising for it because we think that that legislation was absolutely necessary - I think anytime the hon. junior member for St. Joseph thinks the Town and Country Planning Officer is discriminating against someone, that is to say he tells somebody one thing and then applies another yard stick to another citizen, then his duty, no matter what the occasion is, is to bring the matter to the House by a substantive motion and I think he will be in those instances performing a service. I do not think he will be right in asking us to say that this is the law but it is too hard and we must do something about the law, because we are living in a small country.
6.25 p.m.

The hon. member must realise that if such a case has arisen that the Town and Country Planning Officer did not ask the citizen to do more than what the law required him to do, we have to make a start some place. The hon. member has also said that you cannot ask a man to move back his place unless he is making some kind of alteration, but that is not true. At Eagle Hall Corner, within the last week, I saw that buildings have been moved back and the Public Market is being moved back as well. The right is given to move back anybody's property and in the case of the Eagle Hall Market and the two business premises which have been moved back it is for the purpose of widening the access road. The difference is that compensation was paid in the one case and in the other whether it is a question of enlargening a shop door or otherwise, the Town Planner is given authority under the law to say "I will give permission for you to do so and so."

In other words, there is a *quid pro quo* for doing something. In every instance there must be a dividing line. Some of the building activities in the City are bordering on criminal and that is why there is the dividing line between insanity and crime. A lot of accidents are due to the indiscriminate way in which we have allowed people to proceed in this metropolis within the last 40 years. I do not agree with it but I can foresee the time - I know that the hon. senior member for the City will not like this, as we are slightly Victorian in some of our ideas. You have the St. Mary's Church there and the churchyard is occupying a lot of valuable space and one expert says that we should level some of that in order to make more space in the City. I, personally, would think twice before I agree with that, but in other cities of the world that has taken place. It is not fair to ask a poor man to do one thing when you did not ask a big firm to do the same thing. In any democratic community the exercise of the kind of absolute authority which is vested by the Legislature in the Town and Country Planning Officer must be one under perpetual scrutiny not only by representatives of the people but by public opinion as well. A Minister in the United Kingdom two or three years ago lost his portfolio because of the unwarranted exercise by officials in his Ministry. I would not try to stifle debate on any matter which will eventually bring about the downfall of the Government if things are done in any arbitrary manner. I invite the hon. member that he should get directly concerned with the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works in any matter like this before he comes here. I do not think that the hon. member is really in order in raising

this matter under this particular Head, but if any irregularity takes place I am quite sure that Your Honour would give him some latitude.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier has omitted to mention one thing. I should like to draw to his attention that I was the sole objector when I asked the last Government not to vest too much power into the hands of any one man. I have always been 100% behind the Town and Country Planning Officer. As the position stands now, you could pin down the blame for anything because you have made mention of a Minister. As the law stands now, the Town and Country Planning Officer must submit his plans to the particular Council in connection with which the application is made. They must return it within a number of days. If you have disagreed with the Town and Country Planning Officer, then every person in this country has the right of appeal to the particular Minister. There is therefore no point in saying that the Town and Country Planning Officer has done this or that.

I should like to say that if people have not appealed to the Minister as yet, it is their right to do so. If a particular Council agrees with the Town and Country Planning Officer, you should still have the right of appeal to the Minister. I might say that there have been several cases similar to the one which the hon. member for St. Joseph has raised. There are those of us who have been courageous enough to disagree with the Town and Country Planning Officer. I would not say, however, that he is partial to one set of people and impartial to another set of people. Where a person must erect his house at a distance of six feet or so from another house and he can get consent from the other person, then you should relax this Rule with the consent of the Minister. If the Minister is satisfied that it is impossible for a person to go back any further than he has gone, I am saying that the Minister can use his discretion and say that he is of the opinion that instead of going back for a distance of 19 feet or 25 feet from the centre of the road, the law can be relaxed with his consent as the Minister.
6.35 p.m.

I only say to the hon. member that if he is still a Councillor, the thing to do is to know his whereabouts, know his law on the matter and advise his constituents how they should approach it. I have seen things happen in Hastings, for instance, and I mince no matters about this.

People who wanted to put up hotels on the road, which meant that pedestrians would have nowhere to walk, approached me to disagree with the Town and Country Planning Officer. There have been cases in the municipality, and I have gone out of my way to go and tell a man that it is against the law to put up his house at a certain place. His Solicitors advised him not to put it up though he had already dug the foundation, and when it came before my Board, I told him that he must obey the law. He went ahead and put up the house and nothing happened, but in a similar case in another area the man had to take down his house. That is what I call partiality. You have to be one way to all or to none.

I can say, Mr. Chairman, that I have always found the Town and Country Planning Officer willing to co-operate. If the former Minister who did not know what he was doing saw that I disagreed with the Town and Country Planning Officer, he would agree with the Town and Country Planning Officer and *vice versa*. There was a case in Roebuck Street where a house could not go back anymore because it would go in the gully. We must have a Town and Country Planning Officer.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there is just one explanation I would like to make. The hon. member said that people can appeal to the Minister. Now this is not strictly correct, because it is not done in that way. When an application goes before the Town and Country Planning Officer, and he takes unduly long to service the application, the person normally can request a Minister to have the application forwarded to him for investigation. If the Town and Country Planning Officer makes a decision, the person against whom the decision is made can appeal either to the Cabinet or to the Court. He would not be appealing to the Minister. I would just like to inform hon. members that I personally consider it highly undesirable that the Cabinet should be made the *locus* for an appeal. I have always been opposed to the idea of a political Appeals Tribunal, and we have always fought in here under the Income Tax law and other bits of legislation that came in here from time to time from 1951 when I was here, for the right of a person to approach the Law Courts when they have a matter of dispute, because you get Ministers and members of the Cabinet being placed in a very invidious position to overrule a Government servant in the first place, which should only be done in the most extreme circumstances, and even in cases where you have your own supporters committing breaches of the law, you are placed in the position of disagreeing with them.

Mr. Chairman, we are actively considering amending the Town and Country Planning Act right now to remove appeals from the Cabinet altogether, so that if an enforcement notice has been served, you have a right to appeal to the Courts alone. I just want to make that clear; but you do not appeal to the Ministers. You can have an application removed if the Town and Country Planning Office is holding it up.

There is only one other aspect of the present method and it is this: when an appeal comes out, there is no machinery whereby the applicant can be heard in his own defence, and I was surprised to learn that the Hon. Attorney General who sits in the Other Place had advised the previous Government — I would go so far as to say years ago — that this was not right. We are taking steps right now to remedy that situation. Personally I do not like the Cabinet to deal with appeals at all, because I do not regard myself as any judge on these matters, and what we are contemplating doing right now is setting up a special Appeals Tribunal similar to the Income Tax Appeals Tribunal, so that if you want to go to the Court, you can go to the Court, or you can go to the Appeals Tribunal as you can do on the question of income tax, or do both.

Mr. Chairman, you can go to the Appeals Tribunal under the income tax law, and if you lose there you can go to the Court, or you can go to the Court directly; so we think the same opportunity ought to be afforded so that people can have legal advisers to argue their cases for them. Right now if there are any appeals which have not been dealt with, it is because I am not going to sit in Cabinet on any appeal unless I can hear both sides of the case. If anybody has been held up unduly long, it is because we are contemplating this revision in the law.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If it is said, Mr. Chairman, that at times I am taking sides with the Government, I make no apology for that, because the Clerk can testify that I fought in here for over an hour to get appeals to go before the Court. It will shock you that the Town and Country Planning Officer actually turned down a man in the St. Thomas area and said that his should not go up in a particular area, but the Minister, because he had authority, gave the man permission to let it remain. Can you call that anything but dishonesty? I can call names and tell you about them. (Mr. WALCOTT: The man was a yard fowl.) He was a yard pig. Let us take the Market. It is an absolute fact that the Town and Country Planning Officer fought for days and weeks with the Government not to erect the Market in Bay Street, but the Government said it must go up there. I remember going to Eagle Hall when it was decided that an undertaker should not erect a building there and I disagreed with the decision. Eventually the man employed Counsel — who, I think, was the Hon. Premier — and they relented and he was able to put up his building. I was so happy to hear that they relented.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to correct the hon. member.
6.45 p.m.

I do not know if he is talking about a business place. He was trying to stop a man from doing what he was doing for years. I may say that applications came before us. They were turned down. The persons appealed but were never called in.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have been made to understand that they did not come before the Cabinet but purely before the

Minister. That is what Mr. Stevens told me. He said that he and the Minister will deal with it. If you were not a yard fowl, you could not get it up. I am happy to hear that you are going to amend the law. This is a British country and I would rather any day have the Judiciary than a political party with men whom I may have to curse next week dealing with the matter.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I will have to speak on this Resolution too, because I am supposed to be Chairman of the Town and Country Planning Committee of the Northern District Council. After hearing so much today on this money Resolution as regards the erection of various places I will have to speak on it. I will say that I do believe that the Town and Country Planning Officer has too much power, and officers in that Department are using partiality among people of the community. The Clerk of the Northern District Council told me that it is only courtesy of the Town and Country Planning Officer to write to the Northern District Council to have their views on a particular matter.

As regards this matter, I would say that the Town and Country Planning Officer sent me a regulation saying that no building should be erected on the sheet water area and that no agricultural land should be sold out for residential purposes; yet the same thing which they sent and told me not to do is the same thing which they are doing. Therefore, I am saying that the officers of the Department are confounded. At Ashton Hall, St. Peter, where there is sheet water, a hospital is to be erected. They say that they are going to erect a hospital there and I asked: where are you going to put the septic tanks of that building? I did not see it on the plan. I said: how can you erect a hospital on that area when you told me that it was not for that purpose? What is happening now? As I have said, the Clerk of the Northern District Council told me that it is only courtesy of that Department to acquaint the Council on the matter. I said that if it was courtesy only to acquaint us, I would have to see my Government about it.

There is agricultural land which that department is now introducing to people for residential areas. They told me that that land could not be used for that purpose. Is not that partiality? I am saying that the Town and Country Planning Officer has too much power.

Sir, I am not against this Resolution to provide furniture and equipment for the Town and Country Planning Office. I am only speaking to point out the evil which is being done by the office. A big man can put up his building anywhere he likes and that office does not stop him. At Speightstown, there is a Supermarket. I say that the owner of that Supermarket was allowed to erect a gasolene station there which took up half the road. When it was being erected, I asked the contractor: what are you doing there? Have you permission from the Town and Country Planning Officer to erect that there? He told me to hold my peace. I asked him again who gave him such permission. He said that it was their land and they were putting it there. I went to the Town and Country Planning Office and told them what I had seen and asked if that person's land was the public road. I told them that anyone who is going to erect a building has to set it in so many feet from the public road; therefore, why had they allowed those people to erect that gasolene station on half of the tenantry road. He could not answer me. It seems to me as if they are getting away with bribery or receiving filthy lucre.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I must stop the hon. member now. I said to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that if he knew of any case where he thought discrimination was being practised, he should bring in a substantive Resolution to discuss the matter. I personally have heard of none and I do not think the hon. junior member for St. Andrew should get up and make wild statements, casting aspersions on people. At the same time, I cannot allow the hon. member, whether he belongs to my Party or another Party, to say that people are receiving bribes and anything like that in the exercise of their authority.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that those are the words which I said, but I said it may be so owing to the action of the people in that Department and the statement which they had given to me. However, I am not charging any man. I will not charge any man wrongfully because I know the evil, the sin or the punishment which I would have to bear if I charge a man wrongfully. I have said that they may have been.

I was saying that when I went to Speightstown, I saw them erecting this building and I saw that it was being erected on the tenantry road. It was blocking the road. I think it is called Mango Lane. I told them that they could not erect it that way, they would have to step back in so many feet from the road. When I went back the next time, I saw that the contractor had cut it off. It was about twelve feet; he cut it in half and that meant that he had went back about six or five feet. I have the Council to verify what I am saying is true. I will have to make an apology when I talked about these people receiving bribes and filthy lucre. I hope that the Town and Country Planning Officer will operate according to the regulations laid down and that there will be no more dispute. As I have said, I agree with the money which is being voted under this Head for the purpose of getting furniture and equipment for that office.

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

6.55 p.m.

HEAD 47 - SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — stand part of the Schedule. Under this Head there is a new Item — Item 54, Junior Chamber of Commerce — and the amount required is $2,956. The note to this item fully explains the need for this money. It sets out that this amount is required as an annual contribution to the Junior Chamber of Commerce being 50% of the cost of operating two full-time life guard stations as Rockley and Graves End Beaches. The Government is contributing 50% of this money, the Junior Chamber of Commerce has contributed a similar amount and the purpose of the vote, as has already been indicated, is to supply two full-time life guards at Rockley and Graves End Beaches all through the year instead of being on a part-time basis as at the present time.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favour of this proposal but inasmuch as this provision is being made within the municipal area, I think that the Government should have had the courtesy to tell us something about this matter which is engaging the attention of the City Council. *(ASIDES)*

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you do not have to stop the proceedings at 7 p.m. of the clock. I was going to make the point which the hon. member has made. The Local Government of Barbados is not charged with carrying out these facilities, but these are facilities which the Local Government should perform throughout the island. I should like to say that the beaches in Barbados are becoming a disgrace and there is no point in having these life guards operating only at these beaches where the tourists go. I go throughout this island of Barbados and there is not a decent beach in an island like this which is surrounded by sea. I say that over and over again. It is a positive disgrace that there is no proper utilisation of beach land where you have some sort of boulevard. The beach is like the sun; it is something natural and you should keep it in good order. I will carry a crowd of some of the blackest people I can get through Sandy Lane and I will make somersaults on that beach if they cannot make it look as a place where people can go and bathe. When you see me start to bathe down there you will want to know what is happening. The best beaches are those which the private people want to commandeer; Heywoods has gone over to some of these people and Sandy Lane has gone over to some of them. I will have to go down to River Bay so as to get a little bath; I have to ride all around the

island so as to get a little bath. At Rockley Beach you have a lot of broken bottles which will cut people's feet. I am asking the Premier to keep the beaches clean; we must make a campaign for the preservation of our beaches.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that I thought a little courtesy would have been paid to the City Council in relation to this matter. Presently we carry four men for the purpose of cleaning the beaches and, as I have already said, I was going to make the point which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has made. You take the Rockley Beach; I feel in relation to this site that while we can only clear the beach of dead animals, this site should have been put into the hands of a Committee. You have the Esplanade, Rockley Beach and Graves End; I quite appreciate all that the Junior Chamber of Commerce is doing; but if they were charged with keeping these beaches in a proper manner, that would be a good thing. These are things which should be put into the hands of the Municipality where we should be able to borrow money and provide seats at these beaches and also have plants and trees growing there. In all countries Local Government takes charge of the beaches and they should be places where we can have trees planted and so on.

I should like to say that when Sandy Lane was sold — I have some respect for these people who have brought a lot of business for Barbadians — the last Minister of Communications told us that we were having a 20-foot entrance which would be reserved for the public to bathe down there. Fortunately for me, I have a place down there where I can go and bathe, but nobody can go down to Sandy Lane Beach and bathe as in a public place. I like to see people mixing together not only at a Communion rail but at a dinner table and mixing in bed too. I am calling on the Government seriously to make it known that they should reserve an entrance to the beach at Sandy Lane for the benefit of the public. I will not surrender to private people the right to bathe at Sandy Lane. I challenge anybody to show me that 20-foot right of way which the ex-Minister of Communications said that the Government will preserve. This is going to be a very serious matter in this country.
7.05 p.m.

I told the Government to buy Sandy Lane and turn it into a place where people could enjoy the amenities of this country. I also told them to buy Heywoods. I went to Mr. George Manning who was owner and got Mr. Jack Wilkinson to back my suggestion, and Mr. Manning agreed to sell it. The Government turned down the suggestion, because they felt that if it cost £5,000 I would get 5%. There was the idea that I was getting something out of it, but I was getting nothing. I am not a member of the Government, and I am not ashamed to sell something to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against the Sandy Lane people. Far from that, I know what hotel accommodation means and what they have done for Barbados in bringing a certain type of people to Barbados and advertising Barbados, but I strongly suggest to the Government to find out where the right of way is and open it up. If necessary, send the Director of Highways and Transport and let him have a proper road made and erect a sign to read "This is the entrance to the public beach"; if not, you are going to find yourself in the position of the last Government. If the people want to go on the beach, they have to pass through Mr. Dowding's backyard or that of somebody else.

The other night when I was in St. James, I got my car tyres cut up because a white Canadian invited Negro people to take tea with him; and you know my wife is strictly black. Certain white people down there felt that this man should not be entertaining Negro people in his house, and at 12 o'clock I had to get a garage to bring me two brand new tyres to put on my car. I am sorry that you, Mr. Deputy, are on the floor, because I am mad about this. I have the Sergeant at District "E" and several other policemen to prove this. People came down that gap and said it would take somebody like me to "mash-up" this, that they were accustomed to passing that road to the beach, but were now prevented from doing so. If you are going to die, nothing can stop you. People made these remarks in front of Sergeant Marshall.

Mr. Chairman, Sandy Lane is a place where people from St. Thomas and other parishes went on Sunday mornings to bathe, but people are now complaining that they cannot get to the beach. I counsel Government to go and have the entrance defined; if not, tell us that the last Government was really fooling people. If you can define it, cut a road to the beach and put up a sign. I am not one of those people who believe that people should be encouraged in this country to go on the beach where there are tourists, pull off their clothes and bathe naked or be common and ordinary. I do not subscribe to the idea of people going on the beach and annoying tourists because I would not like it done to my family; but I subscribe to the idea that we were born here, and if these people do not like the water washing black people's skins, let them stay out of the water. I counsel Government between now and the next two months to put a proper entrance to Sandy Lane beach. Nobody has a right to a particular beach.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, what I want to draw to the Government's attention is shooting at Graves End Beach which I consider to be a nuisance. There is a place in St. Andrew where they can go, or they can carry it to St. Joseph if they like. People come from St. George, St. Thomas and Christ Church to bathe at Graves End, and it is rather unfair after a person has left as far as St. George or St. Thomas to find that they are shooting on that beach and he cannot bathe. There is a 600 yard range which runs from inside the Aquatic Club premises, but they do not usually use that; they use from the 500 yard range down, which means that when someone comes from St. Thomas, St. George or St. Philip for that matter, he cannot get a bathe. I want to draw to the Government's attention that something should be done. These people should be asked to take their shooting somewhere else, as it is serving no useful purpose.

The question that Head 47 — Subsidies and Grants — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded in each case by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 7.15 p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 8 o'clock p.m.
7.15 p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as there is no quorum, I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 2, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism who is not in his place.

Relative to this Order, there is no report to hand from the Select Committee which was appointed to consider it.

Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Premier in whose name that Order stands in not in his place.

I understand from him that it was not his intention to proceed with the second reading at this sitting; therefore, I ask that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)

(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1962

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1962" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the twenty-fourth day of May one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave on behalf of the Hon. Premier to proceed with this Order.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as hon. members will see, this is an amendment to the Civil Establishment Order and it involves the creation of certain new posts in certain departments. It deals first of all with the creation of the post of Records Sorter in the Accountant General's Department. This work had formerly been performed on a contractual basis which the Accountant General in the past has not found to be satisfactory and it is therefore felt that the permanent establishment of Records Sorter in the Accountant General's Department can very well carry this post on a permanent basis. If this is done there would be an effective improvement in this branch of the Department.

Secondly, there is the establishment of the post of Cricket Coach. Hon. members will remember that some years ago the last Government had decided to employ the services of a Cricket Coach which has proved very valuable indeed but it was done on a contractual basis. That contract expired, I believe, some time in October, 1961, and the officer was permitted to carry on for a further two months. Since then, he went on vacation which was his due.

During his absence the Ministry of Social Services considered that it was advisable to establish the post of Cricket Coach on the scale $5,328 - $6,288.

I believe it is generally admitted both by those who are familiar with the work of the Cricket Coach and those who know the present holder in the field of sport that he performed his duties with exceptional brilliance; therefore, the Government has no hesitation in recommending to the House that this post be established on a permanent basis.

Then, too, it is considered necessary to increase in the permanent and pensionable establishment of the Town and Country Planning Department the post of Long Grade Clerk and Stenographer. It needs no argument on this side of the House to make hon. members aware of the fact that this Department is expanding more rapidly than was at first envisaged, and consequent on the expansion it is agreed that the Department should be increased by the establishment of these two posts. The post of Long Grade Clerk is at a salary of $1,200 - $2,832 and the post of Stenographer is at a salary of $1,260 - $1,728 or $1,440 - $2,352. This increase is due to the volume of work in that Department.

With that explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now beg to move that the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1962 be now approved.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say that I came back from a party to deal with this Order specifically, and the part which I am going to deal with is the part dealing with the establishment of the post of Cricket Coach.

I think that the Island and people of Barbados should pay a tribute to the Cricket Coach, Mr. Everton Weekes, because he has made a special contribution to our national life by being an international cricketer. I think the Government is very fortunate in getting his services so cheaply. The figures of $5,328 - $6,288 are in my view an extremely meagre fee to pay a man of his status. I am aware of that. Those figures are meagre to pay to a man of his professional calibre. You should pay to a man of his professional calibre a salary of not less than $600 a month. I say that because none of his counterparts has been offered a salary of less than that. When you reach a certain stage, nobody thinks of offering you a salary of less than a certain figure. Mr. Weekes is a Barbadian and after equipping himself with great credit internationally in the field of cricket he came back here and kindly consented to throw in his lot with his own country.

The salary which is now offered to Mr. Weekes is an improvement on what it was, but I would like the Hon. Minister to give it serious consideration. I have heard what the Hon. Minister has said. He said that you do not call people up and ask them to accept more money. All of those professional cricketers like Mr. George Headley and Mr. Clyde Walcott are getting more than what you have offered to Mr. Weekes. Messrs. Bookers Limited offered Mr. Walcott a salary of $600 a month many years ago.

8.15 p.m.

I feel that the status of this person should not be less than that of a person who is drawing $600 a month. In order for Mr. Weekes to earn a pension it will be another ten years for him to become eligible and it will be another 20 years before he can draw anything. I do not feel that the status of this person should be at a point which is below $600 a month. If I had to negotiate for a man of Mr. Weekes' calibre, in my opinion, it is just like if you wanted to have the services of Joe Louis. You cannot begin to talk about these people unless you are going to talk about a proper figure for them. Without drawing any odious comparison, I will say that Clyde Walcott gets more than $600 a month.

In the Addendum to this Resolution this is what is stated:-

"For the past three years a Cricket Coach has been provided on a contract basis. The coaching programme has been invaluable to the improvement of the standard of cricket in this island and the scheme should therefore be placed on a permanent basis.

The holder of the post should be a cricketer who has had extensive experience in International Cricket."

Mr. Weekes not only has the experience in international cricket but he is one of the greats and his name will go down in history. He holds the record of making five consecutive test centuries, and the names Weekes, Worrell and Walcott have become legendary. The impact of Walcott in British Guiana has changed. When you play British Guiana you know that when you think of Kanhai, Butcher and Lance Gibbs, you have to think about Walcott. They have broken the sound barrier by beating Trinidad at Port-of-Spain. That is something which Weekes has done; that is the sort of calibre. He is a character instilled by international fame. When these sportsmen are modest they are too modest, and when they are immodest, they are extremely difficult. The hon. member who is sitting next to me, the hon. junior member for the City, knows that when you get a difficult sportsman you cannot get anything more difficult than that. I think it would be a good thing if the Barbados Government could give Mr. Weekes a little better treatment.

In the next place, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister that we must not allow any of our good people to rust out in our community and not make the best use of them. Mr. Frank Worrell did not make Barbados his home because his appointment was not such as to make him stay at home. Barbados has the distinction in which the only foot-baller that was able to make a West Indian team and play football in England with distinction is a young man

called Mr. Reggie Haynes. We must begin to organize sport in this colony because that is a question of utilising the maximum leisure of our people. Our people in the majority are poor people; I hope that the Ministers will watch sport in Barbados. All of these outstanding people have been people who have come from humble beginnings. You take people like Sobers, Soloman, Conrad Hunte; they have emerged during the last war and we should give recognition to these people. We give half holidays and we should utilise these people. I am sure that the members of the City Council would not mind having these people to be able to take care of the various grounds which they have. I would also like to see the Government utilising the money which we have to be spent on these grounds. We want people to know the difference between putting a cricket pitch North and South rather than putting it East and West.

Reggie Haynes has represented Barbados with distinction and I do not like to see people wither away in unproductive fields because we are not making the maximum use of them. If men have a bent towards international fame, well, lift some of them out of nothingness and put them in international fame. As soon as a man can be raised to the international sphere you can give him anything. I want to say that if firing dice was international sport; *(ASIDES)* if a man can reach the stage of outvapping all the others, you must take some account of him. I repeat that I would like to see the Government make use of these people. I am not opening the door too widely because the hon. junior member for the City would not be too slow to move in with his athletic field. The hon. junior member for the City would not claim that they have rich athletes, but there are those at present in Barbados who have reached the same international stage such as the ones I have called.

Unfortunately, athletics have had their unfortunate difficulties and they have not been able to be as cohesive as they should have been in order that we can get the best we can out of the athletes. However, in the context of those sportsmen who can make a contribution to our life, we have many playing fields. I was driving through the country last Sunday, and as a representative, I was told - and any representative would be told: "You see where I am playing." In St. Peter, the parish which I have the honour to represent, my boys tell me: "Mr. Walcott, you see where we have to play: we have no playing ground."
8.25 p.m.

Now I make this plea for two gentlemen. Do not think that Mr. Weekes has sent me here with any plea on his behalf. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider that for a man of his standing, a salary of $600 a month with a pension and all the other emoluments is not too much for him. I would also like to see the Government generous enough through its Sports Department to see Mr. Reggie Haynes and give him an opportunity to make an added contribution to sports life in Barbados by taking this young man in the flower of his years, so to speak, and not allow him to wither as he is likely to do, and the next thing we know is that he has gone off to the London Transport and we cannot make the best use of his ability.

I am sure that those of us who can see the talent among us will agree that it is best to bring in these people, because they will give an added impetus to our sports. I may say to the Premier and his Government that this is the type of indication in our generation that must emphasise the type of thinking of persons who form part of the growing aspirations of the generation that we represent, and it is a reflection of our thinking in this Century.

I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what I have said is taken with the sincerity with which I say it, because I speak for these two people. I have a special leaning towards Mr. Reggie Haynes, because the whole of Barbados knows that as far as Everton Football Club is concerned, I can claim to be its godfather, and I feel very proud about it. Unlike some of the other members who have become associated with sports since they became members of the House of Assembly, I happen to be one of those people who in colloquial terms, had 'boy days' which other members may not have had, I have had even the colloquial 'stumped toe'. Those of us who know what it is to engage in athletics are aware of the discipline it requires. Mr. Haynes has been the sole Barbadian representative on the first West Indian Football Team which toured England. He had a very good tour, has been unspoiled and is a gentleman.

As the hon. senior member for the City usually says, Mr. Deputy Speaker, gentlemen are not only to be found in high places, but you can find gentlemen who do not possess a cent or do not have any of the things in life which would make them gentlemen; it is something innate in them. I feel that we here as Legislators should do our best to bring the best out of people like that and give them some of the highest positions we can. I hope that the members of the Government can consider what I have said despite the restrictions on the economy, because the amount would be less than a mosquito on the rump of a rhinoceros; so I do not think it would make any impact at all. I agree with the Civil Establishment Order. I can do nothing about the money, but I can ask the Government to consider what I have said. The amount is $5,000 a year, but again I would ask the Hon. Premier whether an officer like this should not be on a fixed salary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no point in putting a person like Everton Weekes on the Civil Service structure. The next thing you will have is Ministers being put on a sliding scale, starting at $800 a month and working up to $1,000. If you want a Cricket Coach, you should pay him the salary you want and review it from time to time. If you put him on the "G" Scale, with whom are you comparing him? Do not look for a scale to put him on; look for $600 a month to pay him and not put him on a scale rising to something, as you would do with a loaf of bread when you have put in yeast, and if the rain falls it stops rising! I hope, Sir, that the Government will accept my views. If I asked the hon. senior member for the City to give me a valuation on a property, I do not want to know what he is going to charge before he does it. When he is finished, then he can tell me what he is charging, and I will pay. Similarly, if I asked a lawyer to represent me, I do not ask him how much he is going to charge. I want him to defend me, and when he is finished, I will pay him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope what I have said is accepted. Within the Sports Department, the Minister can see that football forms a part of our national game, and there are plenty of playing fields around this Island which are not being utilised. I think it would be a good thing for this young fellow Reggie Haynes to be incorporated into the service. You should not, like people in the Civil Service, ask if these people have School Certificates. Mr. Broodhagen is a very good sculptor, and I can remember that some time ago he had to wait a long time before he could be sent to England. You do not want a certificate to draw something. Sometimes a man with a certificate cannot draw a teacup or an ordinary leaf and shade it. When you have reached a certain stage in education, you must specialise, and if Art is the man's calling, it is that. In your profession, Sir, some men go to the University and come out as lawyers; others go to study law and come out as brilliant lawyers because they make law their special study. We have a classic example in H. O. B. Wooding who received a gold medal, but who said he did not have time to waste in spending three years studying Classics and then doing law.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope it would not be expected that the gentlemen to be recruited or employed must have School Certificates because they are only to be employed in the field of cricket and football, and that is what you require. I hope I will have some support from the other sporting members of the House who have similar views on these matters.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider that to praise Mr. Everton Weekes, our cricket coach, would be but to gild the lily. I must support what was said by the last speaker relative to Reggie Haynes, the footballer, because when I was in Jamaica very recently, I heard him spoken of as being almost a contradiction in terms, a good Barbadian footballer. Barbadians are not noted for being good footballers. Time was when they had to look for the cricket

score board when Barbadians journeyed to Trinidad to engage that colony in football. The groundsmen were sent early in search of the cricket score board to dust it off and show the spectators the run of play. However, in Jamaica, it was agreed that Mr. Reggie Haynes was a very promising footballer and they spoke very highly to me of him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Jamaicans, as you are no doubt aware, pay a great deal of attention to sport, so much so that a few weeks ago they had a footballer there from Brazil training the Jamaican team which was about to meet Haiti. Speaking of Internationals, in as much as one has been mentioned in cricket and yet another has been mentioned in football, I too would like to make mention of a third in the field of athletics.
8.35 p.m.

I refer to Mr. Wedderburn who journeyed with the West Indies Athletic team to Rome and took part in the relay race and acquitted himself most creditably. He was watched on television by thousands of people also because it must be remembered that many people who watched the Olympic Games on T.V. do not know what cricket is and care even less. It must be remembered that cricket has a narrow appeal in so far as it is only played within the British Commonwealth, but athletics are universal and worldwide in its appeal.

The time has come when Mr. Wedderburn is about to graduate and I understand that he is going to offer his services to the land of his nativity. He is graduating soon from the New York University and is willing to offer his services and the knowledge which he has gleaned over a period of years to this community, and I think it will be a fine gesture on the part of this Government if they availed themselves of his services. While Mr. Wedderburn was in New York he was instrumental in gaining a Scholarship to that University for another Barbadian. That person too would have as distinguished a career as Mr. Wedderburn who studied physical education at the New York University.

There is another youth who gained a scholarship at Illinois University and he has broken the record of the distance of 60 yards by doing it in 6.4 seconds. The former record was 6.5 seconds. That might not seem of great importance to some of the non-sporting members of this Chamber but it means a lot to members in the sporting sphere. A great amount of national prestige is bound up with proficiency in sport, except, of course, in Barbados where cricket is looked upon almost as a religion where sport is concerned. It is high time that we realise how we are looked upon in sport other than cricket. We are looking forward to the dawn of another day.

Now, we have to thank the Government for the assistance which they are giving to sports and athletics generally. There are other sports which are now engaging the attention of the young people of today. I refer to basketball and netball. Any cohesive effort to improve a particular form of sport and to improve our form of playing it should be greatly encouraged. Fortunately, we have officials here who are willing to support these various games and we have legislators who in their youth took part in one form or the other. I am sure that there are Ministers who have run a yard or two even if it were only in anger sometimes, and we are looking forward to them to support athletics generally. I am making an appeal by saying that there are other forms of sport which should receive a measure of consideration by this Government.

I will also like to say that Mr. Keith Gardner who was second in the 100 yards which was run at the last British Empire Games at Cardiff and who also won the 220 yards has been retained by the Government of Jamaica until they find a suitable job for him, so determined they are to keep him with them. Jamaica also has her eyes on Mr. Wedderburn if we do not snap him up at once; therefore, it is incumbent on us to retain some of our talent.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to the speeches of the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for the City. Much has been said about sports and as Minister of Sports, I feel that it is my duty to reply to one or two of the points raised by those hon. members.

I feel that the Hon. Minister of Education who introduced this Resolution would be able to deal with the financial aspect of this Civil Establishment Order. However, on the question of the establishment of Cricket Coach I would just like to say that this post was not created for one individual person. This is to establish the post of Cricket Coach and when other things were taken into consideration in the establishment of this post, we did not take into consideration any particular person to fill the post.

Secondly, I would just like to point out that it is only when you have a particular person that you think of that person. Reference has been made of Mr. Everton Weekes who has already accepted the principle of working on this present salary. He has been working for some time now on it on a temporary basis. I hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter refer to his retaining a lawyer, but I do not think that the retaining of a lawyer by the Barbados Workers' Union or by the hon. senior member for St. Peter himself can be compared with the establishment of a post in the Government Service. You have lawyers working in the Government Service who accept the salary of the posts as are established and they do not accept the post in the Government Service and then tell the Government what it should pay them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not like that analogy. What I said was that if you were recruiting a person of a certain calibre, for example, if you were recruiting Sir Stafford Cripps who was an eminent lawyer to do a certain job, you would have to offer him a fee commensurate with his position. Likewise, if you are recruiting a person of a certain calibre, you should offer him a fee commensurate with his position. What I was saying was that Mr. Everton Weekes was an international cricketer. A Civil Servant does not coach anybody. When you bring a person of that calibre to coach youngsters you do not have to think of your Civil Service structure; you offer such a person a salary according to that person's status.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I take it that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was listening when I made it clear that this post was not created for any particular person and that it was an established post created by the Government. I said that the Government was creating the post of Cricket Coach.
8.45 p.m.

It was not a post created for Mr. Everton Weekes; it was a post created for a cricket coach. That is what I said. There has been much said about sports and I would like to assure hon. members that much is hoped to be done for sports in the not too distant future. Of course, we know that not everything which is desirable to be done was done for sports in the past, and I am endeavouring to do all I can do to assist sports during my term of office. It is quite true that I may have run a three-yards race at some time or other, but I think I can boast of knowing something of sports and the value of sports to any community. I had some 'boy days' at one time and I know what help sports would be to any community. Already.....

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to cast any aspersions on anybody sitting on the Government Bench. I was merely trying to impress upon hon. members the value of sport. When Pelé, the Brazilian footballer went to England, he was presented to Prince Philip and that shows the value of sport in any particular community. I repeat: I was not casting any aspersions on any member sitting on the Government Bench.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was saying, Sir, that already we have gone into the question of boxing. We have encouraged boxing in this island. We know that boxing seems to have been dead for some time and we are trying to revive it. As to the question of netball, right now encouragement is being given to the staff of the Social Welfare Department

at Weymouth. I would like to say that presently there is correspondence between my Ministry and Mr. Wedderburn and in the not too distant future our policy on that score and with regard to sports in general will be declared.

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

REGISTRATION (BIRTHS, BAPTISMS, MARRIAGES AND BURIALS) (AMENDMENT) No. 2 BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) Act, 1891.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I should like to say that hon. members would have had an opportunity of studying the Objects and Reasons which briefly set out that under the present system the Registrar of Births for District "A" is appointed by the Commissioner of Police, and in the case of Districts other than District "A", the Registrar is usually a Police Officer, usually a Sergeant in charge of the Police Station or Sub-Station. The purpose of this Bill is to make the Registrar of Births to be subject to appointment by the Governor and all fees received by the Registrar shall be paid into the public Treasury of the island.

At the same time I should mention that it is intended that, although the Bill does not make any specific provision for it, hon. members may have some queries to make about the remuneration of the Registrar of District "A", I think that already that Officer is receiving his pay on a higher level than he has been receiving it hitherto and the present holder of the office, who is an ex-Police Sergeant, will continue to carry on the duties of the office and receive the remuneration which he is receiving. After the retirement of the present holder of the post, then the post will be made a permanent one and it will be subject to appointment by the Officer administering the Government of this colony. With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that I think it was Your Honour who questioned the feasibility of enacting such an amendment as would enable people to get within reasonable distance of the Registrar. As the matter stands now, a person who is living at Silver Sands has to journey over to District "B" in order to register a death or a birth because it is so laid out in the districts. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier would give consideration to allowing this registration to be done at a more convenient place. I am wondering if it could not be arranged that the registration of these deaths and births could take place with the Police Officer of the particular district.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that there is a Bill on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business standing in the name of His Honour the Deputy Speaker. That is a Bill which deals with this matter.
8.55 p.m.

In the Committee stage, I will have to take out the Registration of Births (Amendment) Act, No. 2, because we are dealing with this first; but on today's Order Paper, His Honour the Deputy Speaker has a Private Members' Bill dealing with this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will appreciate the fact that I have not been able to pay attention to this, but I am wondering whether it should be done in this way. I have not read the Private Members' Bill, but I am wondering whether it would not have been better to incorporate the amendment of the hon. senior member for St. James into the Government's amendment instead of having so many amendments to the Bill. I am not trying to throw cold water on the Deputy Speaker's amendment, but instead of having two amendments, perhaps you could have one proper amendment to this Bill. I do not know what the hon. Premier has to say to that. In going around this was brought very forcibly to my notice. In St. Michael it is all right, but as the Minister of Agriculture himself can point out, in the parish of Christ Church, for instance, and in St. George, it works a tremendous lot of difficulty and hardship on people, and ofter people who have forgotten now and then to register have to go and pay a solicitor or a fine for not registering. With that experience, I am wondering whether the Deputy Speaker's amendment should be incorporated into this instead of having two Bills.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has raised a point. We would not like to encroach on the province of Private Members' Business. They have a perfect right to introduce any Bill which does not impose an additional charge on the Treasury. The effect of the Bill which the Deputy Speaker has introduced and which is on today's Order Paper is to make it easier for the inhabitants of the parish of St. James and certain other parishes to get to the Police Station or wherever the place they are supposed to register is. That does not impose any additional charge on the Treasury of this Island, and we thought it advisable to leave Private Members' Business severely alone as a matter of constitutional principle.

Quite apart from that, Sir, if we suspended the debate on this Bill in order to rationalise the two and introduce one amending Bill, it would actually involve the Treasury of this Island in a certain amount of expenditure which in my opinion would not be justified, because the legal draughtsman would have to incorporate the provisions in the Private Members' Bill into this Bill or *vice versa*, then it would have to go to the Government Printery, and I personally do not see any useful purpose would be served by doing this. The laws of Barbados are at present being revised; so all of these amendments would be incorporated in the substantive Act, or principal Act, whichever you feel like calling it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not agree with the Hon. Premier that this would create any additional expenditure at all. I appreciate the fact that the Government does not like to intrude on Private Members' Bills. If the whole idea of the hon. member's amendment is merely to cover St. James or St. George, I was thinking of a simple amendment which in my humble submission would say that instead of having to go to the Central Station, whether it is District "A", "B" or "C" or wherever it is, that one might be able to go to any sub-Station. For instance, instead of people having to come from Crab Hill to register at Speightstown, the legal draughtsman might draft a Bill which says "wherever there is a Police Station". I fail to see where that would entail additional expense on Government.

I appreciate the fact, Sir, that the Hon. Premier has said that it is not a money Bill and therefore it can be introduced by a private member, but it seems simple to me that if you have a sub-Station at Crab Hill, a person could go and register the birth of a child there instead of having to go to District "E". If the Premier feels he would rather the Private Members' Bill as well as this, it is a matter for the Government, but I would prefer to see one amendment. I remember the hon. member on the floor definitely mentioning the parish of St. James which he represents, that is District "E", Holetown, as against other places from where people come. I would go so far as to say at any Police Station, because all the fees and records come back to the Registry and it is more convenient for some of these people by way of our net work of transport to get from Martin's Bay to Four Roads Station; but if the amendment is only for St. James or St. Lucy, that is not good enough. I cannot use the actual parliamentary language in making a suggestion like this, but I am sure I would understand it if I saw it drafted, because there are several sub-Stations at which it could be done. I would prefer to see one amendment, but if Government feels that the hon. member's amendment should stand, that is a matter for them.

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

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

9.05 p.m.

Clause 1 was called. It reads as follows:-

"This Act may be cited as the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1962."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part, with the following amendment: in the last line, delete the word "No.", the figure "2" and the parentheses, so that it will read as follows:-

"This Act may be cited as the Registration (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) (Amendment) Act, 1962."

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

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

Clause 2 was called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, as regards Clause 3, you will remember that the hon. senior member for the City was asking that the Bill by the hon. senior member for St. James and this be merged so that people would not be inconvenienced by having to go to different stations which may be a great distance away to have their children registered. As you will see in Clause 3, Section 3 of the Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(2) Any birth occurring in a District may be registered at any police station, sub-station or other place in such district designated for the purpose by the Governor-in-Executive Committee by notice published in the Official Gazette."

This Clause in itself may cover not only the points made by the hon. senior member for the City but the Private Member's Bill as well. I have not fully investigated it, but I asure the hon. member that I have it under consideration.

I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I appreciate that and I must confess when I was making that point, I did not read this part of the Bill. However, Sir, I have not seen any definition of the word "district". If it means what it is meant colloquially and does not mean a magisterial district it would be all right; but if it means a magisterial district, then we are no better off. If it means that you can go to the closest police station, then it covers everything and it would become easy to everybody. Colloquially, it would mean, let us say, the district of Charnocks and you can go there. I hope that the Executive Committee would appoint people in these different areas.

If you take a District as defined under the 1891 Act, it would mean that a woman from Silver Sands since she is in the area of District B, would have to journey all the way there to register a birth. The Government now has the authority to appoint the schoolmaster at St. Christopher's as a person with whom you may register your child, and by doing so it would save these people from going all the way to Boarded Hall to register their children.

As I have said, I do not know if it means a magisterial district. This subsection says that the registration may be done at any police station, sub-station or other place in such district designated for the purpose by the Governor-in-Executive. It can mean that the Governor-in-Executive Committee can designate, let us say, the district of Charnocks for that purpose.

I hope that the Government would exercise its discretion and fix places other than a police station. You can fix a school as a place for the purpose and appoint the Schoolmaster to do the registering. There are no more respected men in the community than schoolmasters. I see that Justices of the Peace are dished out to some yard fowls and I am suggesting now that schoolmasters are among the most respected people in a district and they are persons whom you should make Justices of the Peace because they can help people by swearing to their declaration forms. I want to be satisfied that "district" here does not mean a magisterial district and I hope you will use your discretion and appoint persons in the several districts which are built up to carry out this work.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affimative without division.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

Clause 5 was called and passed.

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, do you see how Clause 7 is worded? It merely says: "The Infants Vaccination Act, 1907 is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the last sentence of section nineteen."

I do not think that is quite clear. I do not know who drafted it. Of course, I am speaking as a layman. I do not know if the Hon. Minister can tell me something about it. I will look at that Act..... I understand what it says now. It means to delete that the Registrar who performs this work should receive a salary of £5. I am quite satisfied.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would look at Section 4 of that Act, he will see that the Registrar used to receive a salary of £5. That was amended by an Act of 1956, Chapter 36.

9.15 p.m.

The person responsible for registering births is also given the duty of making the registration under the Infants' Vaccination Act, 1907, but the salary will be put on a fixed scale like the Civil Establishment posts and therefore the remuneration will be fixed more by a Civil Establishment Order than by the Act itself. These duties have all been amalgamated and the persons are getting one salary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer; but if this is the correct way to do it, then I am satisfied with it.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I now beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman do now report the passing of the Bill in Committee was put and resolved in the affimative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900 and certain other enactments relating to the period of notice required to be given to road authorities by the Public Utilities before opening up public roads.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking that this Order be postponed and that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Service Commission Act, 1959.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members will have read the Objects and Reasons of this Bill and therefore I do not intend going into them in any detail. I will mention very briefly that under the Local Government Service Commission Act, 1959, the Local Government Councils have to refer any disciplinary action regarding any officer to the Local Government Service Commission. It has been found that this provision does not give the Local Government Council any authority to suspend an officer pending the investigation of a complaint against him. It has also been felt that it is undesirable for the Local Government authorities to have to wait for the approval of the Local Government Service Commission before they can ask any officer to stay at home, on such terms as the order advocates. However, this Amendment is to give the Local Government Authorities the power to suspend an officer pending the hearing of a complaint or a charge against him.

I do not think that there is any controversial aspect of this Bill unless it be that some hon. members may want to express their opinion on it. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my duty as a Councillor and Vice-Chairman of the Southern District Council to express my feelings as regards this amendment and to give it my support. In doing so, I am sure that my brother Councillors are conscious of their responsibility and will use the power which is vested in them in the right direction, that is to say, that justice must be done. In granting power to the Local Government Councils to suspend employees who commit serious offences, I am quite satisfied in my mind that this Government has taken the right course. I know of certain cases in which employees are unfit for carrying out their duties, but they are still performing such duties because the Councils do not have the power to deal with these employees. These employees are still receiving their salaries regardless of the manner in which they perform their duties.

In my opinion, the Local Government Councils should be the mouthpiece or lynch-pin of the Central Government, and therefore with this power being given to the Councils, the Central Government would be in some measure assisting the Local Government in carrying out its functions well. In conclusion I would like to draw to the attention of the Government, although the point is irrelevant, that certain big firms and factories are not paying their Trade Tax to the Southern District Council and the Government should investigate that matter immediately.
9.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I want to say is this: this is very uncontroversial. I am very happy to see that the Government realises that its duty is not to enact legislation which they think is personal or spiteful like the last Government. As a matter of fact, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, you can call all these Bills "Mottley Bills". There is just one question I want to ask, and it is with regard to suspension with pay. If a druggist or some other person is found incompetent in doing his job, all you can do is to suspend him with pay. That is how it has been pointed out by legal advisers, but you cannot suspend without pay. Does this Act now give power to suspend without pay until you have investigated the matter?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I cannot agree with the hon. member. His legal advisers to the Bridgetown City Council may have told him the way to get around this is to give holiday with pay, but there is no power to suspend under the Local Government Act at all, and if they send a notice to an employee telling him that he is herewith suspended on full pay, that could be challenged in the law courts; but if they want to get around it, by telling him not to come back to work for the next six weeks, and he can go and draw his money at the end of the month, what they are doing is giving holiday with pay and not suspending.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I realise that, but I only wanted to get from you whether this means you have power to suspend without pay.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Central Government Regulations state that suspension is with half pay, and it would not be proper for the Local Government authorities to depart from that practice. A suspension always carries half pay.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you put the question, could we take the second reading of more than one Bill and then go into Committee on all?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not customary.

The question that Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE SAVINGS BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.
9.35 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This Bill is to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914. Under Section 15 of the Act, the rate of

interest payable to deposits on Savings Account was fixed at 3% per annum. This was a very reasonable rate of interest when this Act was passed, and the Savings Bank has gone on from strength to strength despite the fact of the limit which depositors at that time were allowed.

The amount of money which can be deposited by a depositor has varied from time to time. It has varied four times and it is not what it used to be before. The limit used to be £300 and I believe that at present they would accept up to $10,000. Personally, I do not think there should be any limit. One of the reasons for imposing a limit on any one depositor was that the Barbados Savings Bank was supposed to be the small man's bank and the people could come and deposit their money there and get a guaranteed rate of interest at the time when only comparatively recently the commercial banks were only giving a rate of interest to about 2 1/2% on money which was banked especially for the purpose on a Savings Account and, furthermore, as regards Current Accounts at these banks, you actually had to pay for your accounts being manipulated. As regards the Barbados Savings Bank, you get a Current Account and get 3% on the money left over from month to month. The limitation on the amount deposited was to retain the identity of the bank as one for the middle and lower income groups instead of a bank where people could speculate and make money at the expense of the taxpayers.

The Barbados Savings Bank is guaranteed by this Act and there is no danger that you will not get your money whenever you require it. During the past six or seven years we have witnessed violent fluctuations in the rate of interest, usually activated by the policy of the British Government and the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom because the Bank of England has two departments: the issue and banking department, and one of the purposes of the Bank of England changing the rate of interest is to control the level of the economy, the balance of payments and things of that kind in the United Kingdom.

I have always contended that the local commercial banks should not slavishly imitate the fluctuations of the United Kingdom banks, when the conditions which prevail in these territories are diametrically opposed to the conditions which activate the Chancellor of the Exchequer to bring about these conditions. The market rate in England is about one half per cent above the bank rate; yet the market rate in Barbados is still 7%. However, I do not want to say too much on that. But we notice that every time the bank rate goes up the banks down here are ready to follow suit: but when it comes down they are not in a hurry to follow suit. When I talk about rates, I talk about what they charge on overdrafts and matters of that kind. Their lending rate always follows slavishly the movement upward; but when it comes down – and it was brought down to 4 1/2% recently – we have not witnessed a drop here to 5% or 5 1/4%; it is still up to 7 percent. Anyhow, we are living in a modern world and since the banks are charging this high rate of interest – 7% – for overdrafts and loans, that is to say if we use other people's money, you pay a rate of interest in excess of 3%.

Quite recently, we had a movement of money out of the Government Savings Bank into the commercial banks because they were paying a higher rate of interest on savings. If the Savings Bank had power to move up their rates of interest payable on deposit – I am not talking of lending rates because this is not a commercial bank – I cannot say categorically, but it is not difficult to assume that the movement of money out of the Savings Bank into the commercial banks would not have taken place. As a matter of fact, as early as the budget this year or a little before, I indicated that I thought it was desirable that we should introduce this measure to give the Governors of the Savings Bank more discretion from time to time to allow a rate on deposits in excess of 3% and I say "in excess" advisedly because we would not like to alter the character of the Bank. If from 1914, there was a minimum of 3% interest, any amendment which we make in these days should be in an upward direction and we should not give the power so that they would be able to alter the rates downward.

Sir, all that we have done in this Bill is to pay to people who use the Barbados Savings Bank whenever the Governors deem it fit because of market conditions a rate in excess of 3% and to vary it to any figure above that: but at no time would the rate be allowed to fall below 3%.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite agree with the view expressed by the Hon. Premier. During the period of the recession sometime around 1929 when it was found that people were removing their money from the commercial banks, not only money on Current Account but on Savings Account, the Barbados Savings Bank was still able to keep up paying their rate of 3%. It did not go down below 3%; but what they did was to limit the amount to £300 because these people who had their money at the other banks and were getting nothing on it were taking it off and putting it on the Government Savings Bank so that they could get this 3% interest. 9.45 p.m.

I agree with you that while people thought that the movement of money from the Bank was for other reasons, the reasons really were that the other Banks were offering three-months periods at five per cent, and it is obvious that people would remove their money. Who is going to allow his money to remain in the Government Savings Bank when he could get a period of three months at 5% in other Banks? It was a question of economy, that is to say, that people were getting more money by way of interest and they put their money in the commercial banks. People get more money on their savings during the year and I think that the Government has done rightly. We have passed through a period of 1929-33 when they limited the amount so as to prevent people from speculating too much, because in those days you would speculate from the point of view of drawing money from the Bank. People had nowhere to invest their money, and even by way of real estate you could not get any money on your investment.

Would it not be wise seeing that the Government would say that the people's money is safe - do you not think that there should be a limit to which the Directors of the Bank should be able to go? If you follow this fluctuation - it happened in England and they went back up to 5% - I think that there should be a maximum to which they can go. You are fixing a minimum of 3% and are you going up to a maximum of 5% or 6%? (Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have a limit of $10,000). Yes, that is the limit of the deposit. There are people who deposit money on the Bank and they never draw off any, so much so that they forget how to sign.

I am worried somewhat as to whether the Directors would be given authority to go up to a maximum of 6%. Just as you limit them to an amount below which they cannot go, I think that there should be also a maximum above which they cannot go. The people have always had confidence in the Government Savings Bank; as a matter of fact, I feel that something more could be done for that Bank. I will make this statement; somebody has said that one of the things which would aggravate people when they go to the Savings Bank is that they will be kept standing in the Bank and the Clerks are not giving the service which is rendered in the Commercial Banks. I am not accusing anybody of being discourteous or anything like that; but I really think that we could do a lot more in relation to the Government Savings Bank. The Bank wants a lift or a push. I feel that, as a Bank, it should be more broadly advertised and used in respect of emigrants who are abroad.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can answer the hon. member simply. No provision has been made in this Bill to limit the rate of interest payable by the Director of the Bank, but they are surely limited by the Rate of Interest Act of 1754. Every other Bank is limited by that. Quite apart from that, one has to remember that the amount which the Savings Bank gets has to pay interest on current accounts. No other Bank pays interest on current accounts. At any time the rate of interest would not be as high as deposits from other

Banks; they would not have to go as high in normal circumstances. If the other Banks are paying 5% I do not see any reason why the Barbados Savings Bank should have to pay more than 4% because there is the element of liquidity with the Government Savings Bank which you do not have if you are getting interest from the Commercial Banks. I do not think that we should fetter the discretion of the Directors of the Savings Bank from time to time to pay the rate of interest which they think is in the interest of preserving the viability of the Bank itself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are in a way doing it. Up to a period of about three years ago, the Government has paid at the rate of 2% and 2 1/2% and the rate now remains at 3%. Current Accounts at the Government Savings Bank are not referred to as Current Accounts in the Commercial Banks. There is not the same kind of withdrawal as you get at the Commercial Banks.
9.55 p.m.

Anyway, if the feeling is that they should not be restricted to a certain amount, and be left at the discretion of the Interest Act, that is all right. Of course the whole matter has to go before the Executive and it can always be controlled.

I was going down Board Street the other day and a man approached me on the question of the Government Savings Bank. He is a very old man who likes to come to me for advice, and he asked me whether I thought he should catch at the 5% offered by the other commercial Banks and remove his money from the Savings Bank. This is a man who was saving money for 35 years or more, but he felt that he was putting his money into the Savings Bank and never got below three per cent interest, but if he took his money and placed it in one of the Commercial Banks, he might get 5% for a few weeks, then it might go to 6% and then drop again to 5% or 5 1/2%, because you know that they seem to change every six weeks. If the Premier thinks that this way is correct, he has the experience.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER reported resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill which we have before us is one of some urgency, and this is the last Bill I intend to deal with during this Sitting of the House. We have been experiencing some difficulty over the question of carry overs from one financial year to another in the Local Government Councils. The position at present is that they can borrow money for a fixed period of time, and the Banks usually look to them to pay that money back within the financial year. But until the rates are actually approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, no Bank or similar institution would advance money against the rates for the current year to any of the three Local Government Authorities.

The purpose of this Bill therefore is to give them authority to borrow money to meet their commitments pending the approval of the Estimates and rates for the current financial year, whatever that year may be.

There is one alternative method of financing the projects and the expenditure of the Councils pending the raising of the rates, and when I say "raising" I do not mean carrying up the rates, but pending the raising of revenue and the approval of their Estimates and rates - and it is that they should be allowed to budget for an excess for the carry-over period. That is a method of financing that we do not particularly approve of in the Ministry of Finance, because it means that the rate payers would have to be overtaxed, it would encourage the Councils to be very lazy, and actually it would encourage the Executive Committee to be a bit lazy about approving the Estimates if they knew that people have been overtaxed for the carry-over.

I do not know what the people who are in the Councils feel about this matter, but that is the way we feel about it. We feel it is far better to give them authority to raise money pending the approval of the Estimates, because then they would have to go and argue with Bank Managers rather than impose additional taxes on taxpayers. I do not want to say anymore because the Objects and Reasons are pretty plain, and I do not think that members who are in the Local Government Councils and know the difficulties they are confronted with at this time of the year, would have any ground for contention against the principle of this Bill.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am making a personal appeal to the Premier and his Ministry to listen carefully to what I have to say. While I appreciate this Bill, I am going to draw certain things to the Premier's attention. The present situation is more difficult than you think it is. I will draw to your attention first one of the things which make you run into snags.
10.05 p.m.

The last amendment which the last Government made to this Act-and that was to Section 183(b)-was that the rate on trade was to be 18.5% as fixed in the law, not anything to do with being put in the Expiring Laws. I will preface my remarks by saying that the bulk of the money which comes into the hands of Local Government Councils is raised from trade tax. Now, that Section, 183 (B), goes on to say that this money must be placed to the account of the Local Government Commissioner. You paid that money into that account for the year 1961-62 and anybody who understands the running of Local Government knows what it is to collect local taxes. However, the law goes on to say that you cannot sue a person or levy on them within a certain period of six months.

During that period, there are something like 7,000 odd persons whom you must levy on or put in Court. I am drawing this to the notice of the Hon. Premier. All taxes that are collected after the 31st March and paid into the Local Government Fund are frozen by this Act of the Legislature until all of your outstanding taxes have been collected. I say that it is the most stupid, worthless thing done by a Legislature just because they wanted to spite somebody, Let us say that the Northern District Council would have $100,000, the Bridgetown City Council, $400,000 and you paid $200,000 into the fund and you have not got one cent to run the parish between 31st March last and today. The law says that until you have collected every cent of your outstanding amounts, you cannot draw any of your share of that money which is put into that Fund. That is the law which the last Government passed and what stands today.

In the interest of running Local Government, in the interest of harmony between Local Government and Central Government, I am making this suggestion. I think that the time has come when some of us who have the knowledge of running Local Government and sitting on these Councils should be called in to discuss what must be done in the interest of running Local Government. Between the period of 31st March and the laying of the Estimates, you cannot borrow money. That is what the Premier says. I do not

know when this advice was given but as the Act stands, you cannot use any more money than you use for the previous year. In other words, if you had in your Estimates of last year $10,000 and you have in $12,000 this year, you cannot spend any more than $10,000. But of course, you can go on borrowing money.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. It is within my knowledge that certain banks have accommodated Local Government Councils because they feel that their money would be reasonably safe. As far as the Act is concerned, I have been into it very carefully and I am satisfied that they cannot lend you the money because you have no authority to borrow it until the approval of the rates and the estimates which sometimes may be delayed due to the fault of Local Government or sometimes the fault of the Central Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite appreciate that. Now that you are in office, you have seen the difficulties which the Local Government Councils were faced with. However, this is not what I am saying, this is what they told us that we could do. I agree with the Hon. Premier that we really have no authority to borrow. You will be surprised to know that that was the legal opinion which was given us. The legal opinion was that the banks could use their discretion but we had no authority to borrow. They themselves could not give us because the Act did not allow us to do it.

I am drawing this to the Hon. Premier's attention. Is it not stupid to have an Act that every penny collected between 31st March goes into a fund and just lies down there? In other words, there are $400,000 odd to be collected by the Bridgetown Municipality. You collect $200,000, the Local Government Commissioner cannot pay you out one cent. You must go and borrow money. That is stupid and that is to my opinion a very wicked thing to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are the Chairman of the Northern District Council. Tell me the last amount of money you got from the Local Government Commissioner out of your share. You cannot draw one cent because the Act says that you must get in all of the money outstanding.

I do not want to waste the time of the House because it is getting late. I entirely agree with the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I understand the hon. member correctly, does he mean to say that the Local Government Commissioner has money this year for the Councils?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have in my possession here right now - and this is signed by the City Council's Treasurer - a request for an amount of trade tax which has not been granted. I asked the reason why and Mr. Howell pointed out to me that he was told by the Local Government Commissioner that the Treasurer could not get any more until he had collected all of his trade tax. That is stupid. That is ignorant. Suppose 40 people do not pay you. They tell you to go and collect that. Well, you go and sue and get judgment and the only thing which stands in front of that is death duties. You can levy, but you know the difficulty we get by doing that. I know that the question was raised that we should take every step to get in your taxes early.
10.15 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I do not understand the hon. member. Is he saying that they have paid their full share of the trade tax and that they now want money to spend, and the Local Government Commissioner has refused to allow them their share? You got, I understand, 80%.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: The position is this; we must collect half million dollars in Trade Tax. The North and the South must collect half million, which makes one and a half million dollars, and during the year you collect your taxes. At the end of the financial year 1961-62 there is the sum of $400,000 or $200,000 outstanding. We are going on collecting taxes and at the 31st March we paid in $44,000. At the 15th April we have no money and we ask them for 80% of what they have there. The law says that you must have collected every cent of your arrears for 1961-62 before they can give you any money. I am submitting that it is impossible to run Local Government in that way.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What the hon. member is postulating is this; he must get 80% or $1 1/2 million. If he needs the money he will not draw the full amount of that $1 1/2 million. If he draws money when it has not been paid in, then he would be depleting the other Councils.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, no! No!.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is the hon. member's contention then?

Mr. MOTTLEY: May I put it in this way?.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member must be about three years in arrears.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You pass an Act saying that you are limiting the taxes which I can collect and draw each month. At the end of the month the Act says that you cannot give us any more because we have outstanding arrears. In other words, unless something is done now, the Treasurer writes to the Local Government Commissioner and he says "Oh, no, I cannot give you any money." The same thing continues with the North and the South. The Treasurer cannot give you any money because of your arrears. You cannot expect to get tax as of $1,000 for 1961-62 at the end of 1962.

Another point is this: they have amended the Local Government Act. You are dealing with Income Tax and I ask the Premier what is the position. You are fixing the local rate of trade tax. The Act was amended; I am asking whether you are going to fix it there every year. The position is this, that whatever you do, as it stands now, unless the Executive Committee comes in and amends the Act to remove the rate from 18.5, it remains there. I am asking you to look at the Act and see how stupid that is. Unless you help the other Councils they have to carry the taxes to about 29 cents or 30 cents in the dollar. In this whole matter it is the most stupid thing that I have ever seen, that is to say, that you cannot get any of your money unless you collect your share of it. I suppose that the people who thought of amending this provision thought that they were running a rum shop or something like that. We were told that there was no authority to borrow this money because the rates were not confirmed and there was nothing wrong about that; but I am saying that no Council can be run without borrowing money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall discuss this matter with the Mayor and other members of my Council as to whether we should not have a delegation to wait on the appropriate Minister and let us see what is the true position in this matter. It is true that the Act is being amended now, but the position is as I have outlined.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you 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.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

10.25 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes Government Business.

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that you have a communication from His Honour the Speaker to bring to the notice of the House. Perhaps you would like to give that communication before I move the Adjournment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members, I am in possession of a letter dated 5th June from His Honour the Speaker thanking members of this House for the kind thoughts of him and the expressions of sympathy. He is hoping to rejoin us all as soon as possible and before the end of the current month.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think on behalf of the whole House you may thank His Honour the Speaker for his letter, and assure him of our continued best wishes for a speedy recovery on his part.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th June, 1962, at 2.30 p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th June, 1962, at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

10.30 p.m.